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Abstract

Since its inception, public education in the United States has billed itself to the masses as an “equalizer” that “prepares the citizenry.” Although there are varying institutional types in higher education, Americans believe the myth that higher education is an extension of the same K-12 educational values. Despite higher education teaching the components of civic engagement separately, the skills are seldom combined for students to practice. Students do not learn how to transfer or combine these skills into their “real lives” outside of higher education. Since graduate students are electing to further their education, higher education has an increased responsibility to ensure their graduates are equipped to participate and succeed in civic life. An international literature evaluation demonstrates that student disenfranchisement is not a uniquely American problem nor is the discontent that arises from institutional personnel governing higher education. This paper provides a detailed examination of my understanding of education, the structures in American history that leave students disenfranchised from their educations, and options to reengage students in controlling their education, before then pressing forward to propose using shared governance for graduate student mentorship. Graduate students have been found to be the most politically stable student population, making them ideal partners as community leaders to guide student participation in shared governance (Love, et. al. 2003). More than Just a Seat at the Table provides the mentoring teams a cohort model to engage in curriculum, problem solve their experiences, demonstrate their learning, and make lasting change in their institution.
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Introduction

Education in the United States pre-dates Western conquest of the “New World.” However, the U.S. education system elected to blend Eurocentric Judeo-Christian ideology with radical Colonial thought as the foundation of the current U.S. education system. Much like primary education, higher education was founded with a religious function, training white Christian men of means to become future clergy (Geiger, 2014). While attending both K-12 and higher education in Catholic schools, community service was a means to increase our Catholic engagement in our community as well as proselytize.

Every time I am asked about my community service experience, I share one of my earliest childhood memories. I was about four years old when I vividly remember the sheer joy that I had with my family distributing reelection fliers for our local mayoral race. We got to run from house to house to meet them and give them this shiny, brightly colored flier! We got to pick from an entire van full of normally restricted snacks and we got to do it with our entire extended family. Technically, my family's motives were not entirely altruistic because my father was the solicitor for the incumbent candidate, but his rationale stuck with me. No one can do everything all at once. Also, not everyone is good at everything. As a result, people elect other people to speak for them because they cannot or they are not good public speakers. More than thirty years have passed and now I have a much more nuanced understanding of his meaning.

I am a very literal person. There are many belly-laughing stories about me following the exact directions versus the spirit of the directions or mischief I caused due to incomplete directions. My unconventional thought process has been lauded for producing unique solutions to previously
unconsidered problems. My systems-based approach to a subject is what is colloquially called my “superpower.” I applied my superpower to an area of higher education that was a major source of my frustration, my inability to participate.

As a white, third-generation college student, daughter of two lawyers, with English as my first language, and previously being labeled gifted, I grappled with being gaslit about my participation in my own higher education career. My 6-12 guidance counselors told me that I had to take certain classes but I could pick a few from the electives to graduate. They insisted that I was legally required to endure the full gamut of the state-mandated curriculum. My family of teachers was unique in that they were honest and told me, “I had to take the classes to play the game and get the piece of paper.” Everyone kept saying, “College is different.”

Before I began my official college search, I was privileged to explore at least twenty-three institutions of higher education. From visiting family at work on campus to visiting family attending school, and family vacations to pillars of American educational ideals, I had visited Ivy Leagues, State, Private, Catholic, Military, Technical, and seemingly every other institutional type in between. During my actual college search, I did the traditional white suburban middle-class “college visit” process. I went on tours. I met chairs and deans. I slept in dorms. I ate in cafeterias. I still believed the myth, “College is different.”

I expected college to be completely different. After numerous attempts to shape my education, I discovered college is a similar game wrapped up in different packaging. When you sign your student handbook you enter a long and lengthy contract with the school that has seemingly endless headings that regulate everything from “acceptable technology use” to “parking” and everything in between. When you declare a major, you are declaring that you have entered into a contract with the university to give them money in return for them to present a curriculum in which you must perform according to their performance standards for them to give you a numerical value with which you can use to get to the
next level of curriculum, etc. until you have done this enough times to have fulfilled your contract for which you are given a heavyweight and embossed declaration of completion.

To remotely deviate from the initial contract requires enough paperwork with signatures from some of the busiest people on campus so few attempt and less will undertake the feat again. As the daughter of lawyers, I read contracts carefully, and I am fastidious in pursuing the exceptions to policy. I am an outlier in the data set.

From the outset of life in the higher education system, higher education does not prepare students for civic engagement. All higher education institutions teach some combination of skills necessary for civic engagement:

- Communication skills (both expressing and understanding facts and opinions)
- Democratic deliberation/collective decision-making
- Critical analysis of political information. (CIRCLE Staff, 2010)

Although these skills are taught, they are not taught in relation to each other and/or then combined with actual civics practice to help students learn to transfer the skills into a new setting and apply them (Indeed Editorial Team, 2021). Since civic engagement is the only legally sanctioned way to affect policy and/or law open to all American citizens and Visa holders this practice has ripple effects throughout society. Most immediately, without civic engagement students can not affect the terms of their contract with their institution nor can they affect the terms of future contracts with theirs or any other institution. In the long term, unprepared students lead to unprepared graduates for civic engagement.

**Basis for my intervention:**

Multiple generations of my family endured military conscription so the irony is not lost on me that I am proposing the opposite of authoritarian rule. Through their military experience and my parents’ participation in local politics, I learned that you need to learn the rules of power to effectively participate to really affect change. Mentoring both students and stakeholders through shared-
governance committees is one of the least costly options to help people learn to navigate the murky waters of power to affect change.

Democracy is not a perfect or flawless endeavor. To many options and participants to quickly devolve into inaction, the French say “Trop de choix tue le choix” (too much choice kills the choice) (Economist Newspaper, 2010). My hope is that structured training and participation in shared-governance leads to a larger pool of candidates to lead within our larger context of democracy.

**What is shared governance?**

Shared governance is complicated and messy. Shared governance is the sum of its parts. I define “shared” as equal means, opportunity, responsibility, and culpability. I define “governance” as the rulemaking process that controls actions within/ surrounding a society. The combination “shared governance” means every stakeholder has an equal position to impact the rules that maintain their society. This is adjacent to forms of Democracy that rule a nation, nation state, etc.: but a few key ways. Shared governance occurs within a larger form of government and is intended to rule a subset of people that join the organization i.e. companies, nonprofits, higher education, etc. In shared governance there is no illusion that leaders are elected, leaders are appointed and have governing roles written into their job descriptions. The organization decides what elementary teachers describe as the “five Ws,” who, what, when, where, and why, people can participate in governance (IT personnel contributions, 2022).

In the instance of higher education, a place run by capable adults for capable adults, the most equitable ruling model is shared governance. The State University of New York system has the most common higher education definition for shared governance, “...refers to structures and processes through which faculty, professional staff, administration, governing boards and, sometimes, students and staff participate in the development of policies and in decision-making that affect the institution”(t., Authors for the S. U. N. Y. Voices program, 2019). I specifically take issue with the trend of “sometimes” student participation in the governance of a place that adults pay for the privilege to
attend, work, live, eat, date, and socialize. Graduate students are posited to be the most politically stable student population, making them ideal partners as community leaders to guide student participation in shared governance (Love, et. al. 2003). (Read more about this in chapter 3.)

**My positionality**

The basis for Critical Action Research is that the practitioner is intimately involved with their research. Although the researcher may never fully be able to commiserate or integrate with their research, researchers have life experiences that shade how they interact with their research. In the spirit of transparency, it is important for you, the reader to understand some of the relevant factors that influence how I view governance and why I believe in my intervention.

**My race/cultural identity**

In every culture, your family is seen as your first teachers. My life did not stray from this paradigm. My conception of race is tied up in ethnicity because I was raised in a multigenerational family that heavily influenced my life. As a preschooer, my father and his parents would fight about their neighborhood. Although there was a new playground built one house away from my grandparents’ house, we were not permitted to play there. Understandably, my parents were concerned about the dime bags and hypodermic needles littering the field. My grandparents abided by my parents’ wishes but maintained that drug dealers, drug paraphernalia, drug raids, etc. did not make their neighborhood unsafe. Since my family continued to come and go from that house for another twenty-plus years, I have to wonder if either side was really wrong in their assessment of the neighborhood.

My father was a first-generation American. He was mixed Albanian and Italian, making me “mixed” by default. When I asked my grandmother to explain the neighborhood fight, she explained that some people do not like other people for things that are completely outside of their control. She explained that her family was disliked in our community for being Gypsies. I was confused because my family looked and lived nothing like Walt Disney’s Gypsies (Disney, 1964). In fact, our “Gypsy status” is
something that my generation knows nothing about. We often forget that we are Albanian. However, whenever my friends from Italy bring up “Dirty Italys” or “Dirty Gypsies,” I know that they are talking about my heritage. Albanians have gone through two ethnic cleansings since the American Civil War so it is unsurprising that they choose to relocate. But twenty years after having this talk with my grandmother, I do not know why Albanians have a lower social status than African refugees. Knowing no other Albanians, I can tell you decidedly that my family in no way resembles the caricature used for this ethnic cleansing.

I always understood race to be a color descriptor and ethnicity to be a cultural descriptor. I have lived almost my entire life with people disbelieving that I am Irish-Italian-Albanian American so few believed that I was not my physically expressed race either. People believed that I was the Irish part of my heritage so I am “white.” After many years trying to make sense of how I am white, but only sometimes, to some people, in certain circumstances, I still have this nagging feeling of “other.”

**Race and class**

Before I had a concept of race, I had a strong sense of class because access to resources seemed more divisive than anything else in life. My grandfather’s aunts and uncles lived across the street from a rail line so I quickly learned that there is no “right side of the track.” Living anywhere near a track is undesirable due to the environmental impact and negative class connotations of trains.

Most of my racial identity development happened long before my undergraduate years. I explored my “white shame” and “racial victimization,” as described by Thandeka (1999) in my elementary and middle school years. Though I did not have a word for it yet, I have never been able to conceive “race” or “class” without Kimberlé Crenshaw’s explanation of intersectionality. Her theory is that a person cannot divorce themselves from part of their identity to have life only impact one part of their identity (TED, 2016). Lacking formal training about race relations and occupying a homogenous bubble, I had no scheme to navigate my “White Working-Class Privilege.” I could literally see the
disparity between my “White Working-Class Privilege” and race/class differences through the campus fences staring at housing projects but I did not have the vocabulary needed to really research the causes of these major structural inequalities.

My undergraduate years

By American convention, it is often considered impolite to discuss sex, religion, politics, money, and any other subject that makes people uncomfortable in any mixed social setting. Then, no longer under the watchful eyes of family enforcing “conventions,” people go to college. Although I had no one kicking me under the table when I spoke “out of turn,” the topic of race made me uncomfortable.

I started my undergraduate career at a place that resembled a more urban version of my hometown. Even though I was in the International Relations and Diplomacy program, I could not tell you if there were any other races in my classes. There were many international students but as far as I could tell, everyone identified as “white”. In fact, during our racial and cultural sensitivity training in Freshman Seminar, I asked how we were going to practice these skills if there is such a lack of diversity in our program. I got a wholly unsatisfactory answer about respecting our roommates, the off-campus community, and the international students/faculty. As the weeks progressed, after endless campus alerts about off-campus violence, the gates were closed to the poorer, browner sections of town and it was suggested that we only stay on campus. Since I could literally see high-rise projects daily off of our highly gated campus, I interpreted the message to mean that model minorities and international students are good but everyone else should be kept on the outside. Until now, I never considered if the gates were also to keep us inside the campus with strategic exits into the acceptable neighborhoods, like queuing in amusement park design. The campus brochures boasted about the quick train ride to New York City, charming downtown, and community service. There was nothing listed about the other 75% of the surrounding neighborhood.

By the time that I got to my third undergraduate institution, I was determined to find out the
secret to race. I found a state school, drawing from places that I knew well, and going into a field that every child in America is compulsorily affected by, teaching. Here, I thought that I would learn about race. Through my sheer determination to learn more about the structural inequalities regulating my environment, I started taking classes in Youth Empowerment and Urban Studies to enlarge my understanding of race, class, and their intersectionality (TED, 2016). I took extra diversity requirements and sought out African American professors. It was 100% possible to graduate from any of my undergraduate programs without taking any courses with professors of color or courses with goals of addressing major social justice issues. My personal values prevented me from picking this “easier” graduation plan. I did the extra work to find courses and professors that would help me find answers to my questions about race and class.

**My graduate years**

My cognitive dissonance, mental discomfort due to the conflict created through forced compliance in the workforce, lead me back to graduate school seeking answers to questions that I have been asking since Pre-K (Cherry, 2020). While entering my graduate program, I was still grappling with my discomfort in discussing race with both my superiors and my peers. Previously, knowing that race was mostly socially constructed in a design to “other” people, I grappled with the potential harm of discussing race. In my experience, people of color are “tokenized” to share traumatic stories for the benefit of white people. Although these stories sparked change in some of the participants, there never seemed to be any benefit to the people being asked to relive their trauma. Also, there is always at least one audience member/participant with a “hard heart” that is there to heckle the people discussing race. Much like Climate Change deniers, Holocaust deniers, and Creationists, there seems to be no amount of science or logic that can persuade these hecklers that “othering” based on race is destructive. Since “othering” based on race is not unique to one race it seems more difficult to combat. Much like the ineffectiveness of abstinence-only sexual education (Mcammon, 2017) in
preventing teenage pregnancies, lack of racial and class’ intersectionality education does nothing to improve racial/class tensions in a community. As students arrive in a new location, having lived experiences of race combined with their potentially inaccurate, personally constructed meanings of race, places of higher education are left to create an inclusive learning environment for all students of varying ability levels amidst high racial and class tensions to maintain enrollment. However, as stated before, racial identity development research seldom examines the lack of teacher preparation to assist students with racial identity development implying an ineptitude to address race issues as well. Shaun R. Harper, during his keynote address to the American Conference Personnel Association, described some of his research as a longitudinal study of both new higher education faculty and higher education students that transitioned into higher education student affairs professionals or faculty (American College Professional Association, 2021). Harper’s results found that both higher education programs and new faculty/staff orientation programs offered little if any training on racial identity development. None of the participants felt that they had received any training on how to resolve racial conflicts or help move students through the models of racial identity development. Like their students lacking education, it is not a leap to imagine that many student affairs professionals or faculty make their own meanings of racial identity and perpetuate those ideas in their educational spaces.

Since the United States of America has over a 400-year history of negative race relations, it is difficult to imagine why pre-K-16+ educators are still woefully underprepared to address race relations unless you look at the benefactors of negative race relations. My grandmother tried to explain the benefactors of racism while explaining hatred for Albanians. She explained that mixing groups can be challenging because nationalism simultaneously encourages pride and division. “Mixing” people that hate others due to nationalist ideals or religious affiliations, causes fights. Clinging to these ideologies ensures that people fight each other instead of the important things that affect all of us regardless of color, ethnicity, race, ability, etc.
In the simplest terms, the elite benefit from negative race relations. In a capitalist society, the elite are the wealthy. In relation to education, in Pennsylvania, public pre-K-12 education is funded partially by state taxes and mostly through property local taxes (Del Grande, 2022). In Pennsylvania public higher education has a small portion of their costs covered through state taxes and tuition dollars cover the remainder (Myers, 2021). This steady disinvestment in public education has greatly accelerated since the Reagan Administration (Cooper, 2019). Regardless of the type of tax, taxes are levied by politicians that are elite themselves or beholden to the elite to fund elections. Individually, an elite uses money to maintain power, but collectively, the elite use money to fund ideology to maintain power. These funding ties to the electoral process help ensure that leaders are put in place to replicate the current ideological culture.

**Graduate student participation in shared governance**

Graduate students are expected to have one of the largest enrollment increases in higher education in future years (RNL & PLEXUSS, 2021). As the graduate student numbers grow, logically graduate student engagement should also grow. One way to increase engagement plus the viability and competitiveness of graduate programs is to increase graduate student involvement in shared governance. Students can learn and practice skills necessary to become actively engaged citizens while increasing their connectedness to the university. Revising institutional bylaws to include shared student governance will increase diversity, equity, inclusion, and student engagement. Institutions will benefit from having diverse student perspectives represented in decisions, increasing graduation rates, and cultivating strong student relationships to convert to strong alumni relationships.

The major catch to this change in processes is training mentors and students to actively engage in shared governance. Currently, there is often little mentorship for graduate students to participate in higher education governance. For students to learn to effectively participate, they need a robust employee-student mentorship program. This mentorship program will increase faculty/ staff
engagement through responsive professional development and student engagement beyond graduation.

**Economic impacts of engagement to increase retention**

Schools hemorrhage talent through graduate/PHD student attrition and faculty and staff resignation. This wound is at a detriment to the individual as well as the institution. There is reputation loss locally and nationally from graduate attrition numbers. (Colloquially, attrition translates to quit/resign but since it is the term used in literature, I have adopted the usage.) There is an institutional knowledge loss and disruption in services due to staff/faculty resignations. There is a regional loss because skilled positions are perpetually unfilled (Meador, 2021). As a basic example, in Jaret 2020, describes the success of a government-funded program billed as “attracting the next generation of rural doctors.” Although it is fantastic that the U.S. government is formally backing a recruiting effort for rural Americans, it does beg the question, “If more than 50% of people graduated from their graduate program, would the doctor shortage be as severe” (Cassuto, 2013)? It is notable that in 2021 Meador and countless others researchers explain the lack of representation in medical school contributes to the rural doctor shortage but it is conceivable that the lack of graduates equally contributes to the doctor shortage. This attrition issue is not specific to a region, program, class, or career, the issue is much larger (Cassuto, 2013).

If the opportunity cost of brain drain due to attrition is not concerning enough, think about the money. In a neoliberal society, “She Works Hard for the Money,” by Donna Summers comes to mind because there are endless needs but finite resources (t. Island Def Jam Music Group, 1983). Conventional human resources wisdom states that it costs from 1.5-2% to tens of thousands of dollars to recruit new employees (Altman, 2017). The search process to fill a position in a university typically involves a search committee, conference interviews, and an in-person interview before a position is offered (t. Career Center at the University of California Berkley, 2022). This lengthy and involved process
can often be drawn out across several weeks.months (t. Career Center at the University of California Berkley, 2022). When time equals money, the higher process in higher education is extremely costly. During the “Great Resignation” higher education is struggling to recruit and retain talent. These staffing issues are not unique to higher education however they greatly impact regional stability as students decide if, when, and how to continue their education.

Less costly but still significant is the cost of recruiting students. In 2019 Simpson Scarborough’s survey determined, “institutions spend between $429 and $623 per enrolled student, per year, on marketing.” Despite a pandemic dip, consulting company Kantar reported college “advertisement spending nearly doubled in the first quarter of 2021 compared with the same period last year, to $870 million” (Marcus, 2021). These marked increases in both for-profit and non-profit education marketing spending have made it to Congress with bills requiring, “colleges to report what they spend on marketing and advertising” (Marcus, 2021). Can schools increase both graduate/PHD student and staff/faculty retention with the same intervention? Can a formalized mentoring program increase civic engagement and retention in different but related populations?

**Preview of Thesis**

In order to fully understand the context of my thematic concern, I will guide you through my entire thought process. Chapter two explains my positionality. As you read my educational philosophy you will glean the passion that I have for student participation in governance. In chapter three you will learn how I currently understand the history and research surrounding graduate student participation in shared governance. In chapter four you will review my proposal to use mentorship to provide consistent training for graduate students to engage in service learning surrounding shared governance. The final chapter you will see *More than Just a Seat at the Table’s* budget, leadership requirements, limitations, and future considerations. The appendices include guidebooks for implementation and so much more to explore.
Chapter 2
Theoretical Frameworks

*Philosophy of Education, Higher Education, and Student Affairs*

Education is a curious field because in a compulsory society, everyone has experienced “formal education.” (When I use the term “formal education,” I mean education in a classroom, with other students, monitored by a trained educator, for a mandated number of hours, with legally defined goals for the people meeting.) Some of those that have experienced formal education feel experienced enough to regulate educational practices without formal data or training. As attacks on formal education regularly pepper the national news, I am reminded of the insight from celebrated French author Honore De Balzac, “Opinions are caught like infection, and put into practice without examination” (De Balzac, 2021).

I am extremely socially justice-oriented so I believe in the American mythology about what education could and should be. In 1848, as cited by Growe (2003), Father of Public Education Horace Mann succinctly states, “Education, then, beyond all other divides of human origin, is a great equalizer of conditions of men—the balance wheel of the social machinery” (p. 23). Like many new inventions, the common school had equity issues that have had people question for the last 150+ years, “Who is public education really for?” Mann’s proposal, as described within the pages of this Twelfth Report, makes it clear that the choice to employ local property tax to fund school was for the purpose of maintaining inequality, not fixing it.

This question is extremely important to understand in the higher education context because if K-12 education is not equitable, how can students be admitted into college equitably? From the outset, there was divisiveness about the Protestant leaning values of Mann’s schools which spurred a stronger religious school movement and the basis of the Church versus State cases in schools currently (Warder,
This dilemma of what should be taught gave me great anxiety as a middle school and high school teacher. As a former Long-Term Substitute Teacher extraordinaire, M. K. Ashante’s memoir Buck resonated with me because he wondered some of the same things. Much like I felt in school, Buck said that in his private Quaker school, “Nothing they teach here is useful—just a bunch of stuff to memorize and spit back, like this is karaoke night. I don’t see the point” (Ashante, p. 16). Ashante was decrying the “Banking Model of Education” also condemned by Paulo Freire (2020). In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire (1970) explains the Banking Model of Education to be: “knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing” (p.11). This unequal power dynamic between the educator and the student has oppressive side effects.

Oppression is a widely used term to explain and justify many forms of injustice. Apple (2015) “The denial of respect and the stigmatization of “others” reinforce material disadvantages... (and)can lead to their production. Furthermore, inequalities in class can themselves “impose harms of disrespect” as well” (p. 303). Reminiscent of modern victim shaming, Hegel (2019) used the oppression inherent to the servant master relationship to suggest complicity in consciousness for both parties. Hegel explained that without an unequal balance of power within relationships, people cannot truly know their roles because there is nothing outside of human interaction that can validate a person’s place in life (Hegel, 2019). In direct opposition to Hegel’s ideas, Angela Davis wrote about the acts of resistance against slavery.

Despite the prevailing racism of the time, African Americans have always been searching for knowledge. Following African-American history in the United States, Davis (1984) began, “As early as 1787, Black people petitioned the state of Massachusetts for the right to attend Boston’s free schools” (p. 4). As African Americans demanded more rights and education through things like the Nat Turner Revolt in 1831, “legislation prohibiting the education of slaves was strengthened throughout the South. ... In the words of one slave code, “… teaching slaves to read and write tends to dissatisfaction in their
minds, and to produce insurrection and rebellion” (Davis, p. 9). While enslaved people begged their masters and snuck Bibles to learn to read (Davis, 1984). After the Civil War, the quest for African American education grew. White Northern women joined the African American Southern women to eradicate illiteracy (Davis, 1984).

W.E.B. DuBois and Adams both wrote about how the “white man’s education” was designed to gaslight minorities to confirm white superiority. In The Souls of Black Folk, W.E.B. DuBois (2007) that due to the extreme hatred of white people, all black people enter into a state of double consciousness to survive. DuBois (2007) explained double-consciousness is “this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity” (p. 8). While trying to succeed in the face of hatred African Americans study the knowledge of the white man despite its lack of relevance to African American life (DuBois, 2007). DuBois explained that education is a step towards liberation but African Americans cannot be tricked into thinking that they approach education without knowledge or they will lose their true identities (DuBois, 2007). While African-Americans tried to integrate into society while living within society, contemporaneously, Native Americans were sent to boarding schools for acculturation. Adams (1995) explained,

if they (Native Americans) were to become economically self-sufficient, and if they were to adopt the values and sentiments of American civilization, then they must be instructed to achieve these ends. For this reason, while new recruits were adjusting to life in the total institution, they were also being introduced to the world of the classroom, and with it, the curriculum of the white man’s civilization. (p. 136)

Similar to African-Americans, Native Americans were taught to be ashamed of their heritage.

The most insidious part of boarding schools is that they proudly broke up tribes so that students had to learn to exclusively communicate in English (Adams, 1995). By making the children ashamed of their language and culture, students could no longer communicate with members of their tribe let alone their elders if they survived the school and returned home (Adams, 1995). Between the extreme shame about
their identities, the language barriers, and the cultural barriers, Native Americans did not frequently address the slave labor that they were subjected to in these schools (Adams, 1995).

More than one hundred years later, M. K. Asante (2013) explained that school was still designed to make minorities feel bad about their culture, their material possessions, and their family situations etc. Despite all of the sacrifices Asante’s family made to send him to a private Quaker school that did not respect him, he did not share the daily insults with his family. According to Asante (2013), Buck’s father shared in a television interview, “I can honestly say that I have never found a school in the United States run by whites that adequately prepares black children to enter the world as sane human beings” (p. 13). The irony was not lost on Asante as he was left wondering why he still had to endure this form of education. Asante’s experience is just one of the many examples of how the “white-man’s schooling” is still not relevant to minorities.

There is a very specific reason that education does not serve minorities, as explained by the Gramscianism theory of “hegemony.” Backer (2019) explained from the first two chapters of The Prison Notebooks that hegemony, “(is a) function that the dominant group exercises throughout society. ... (It) creates “spontaneous consent... to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant (class)” (p 12). This consent is ideological so no violence or coercion must be applied to the complicit masses (Backer, 2020). Backer reported, “Intellectuals are the dominant group’s “deputies” (p. 12). These deputies perpetuate hegemony through government action and education of societal norms (Backer, 2020).

Norms are socially constructed standards for the ways people interact with each other. Like humans recognized before, babies are not born knowing how to survive or interact; they must be taught usually by society and schooling. Althusser explained teaching social interactions can only happen through a personal reflection of external responses, “interpellation” (Backer, 2019). Interpellations teach us how to act to get the desired reaction from others (Backer, p. 9). When explaining Althusser,
Dr. Backer (2019) stated that "(I)nterpellation makes it so that acceptable behavior is now part of who you are. It’s second nature" (p. 5). Since norms are created by the ruling classes to maintain domination (Altuser, 2020, p. 4), by reproducing behavior, people participate in the cycle of oppression (Backer, p. 11). Hegemony is precarious for the ruling class because a delicate balance must be maintained to remain in power. Backer (2020) quoted Althusser, “When nothing is happening, the Ideological State Apparatuses have worked to perfection... (but) when they no longer manage to function, to reproduce the relations of production in the ‘consciousness’ of all subjects, ‘events’ happen, ... at the end, ...the revolution” (p. 19)

Educational reformists have been writing to address the negative effects of hegemony, interpolation, and oppression. Krupskaya (1957) stated, “In a bourgeois state, ... the school serves as an instrument for spiritual enslavement of the masses. ... The school’s objective determines the entire organization of school” (p. 47). She thought that schools must be revolutionized to provide education to every part of a child within their developmental boundaries to create physically healthy, emotionally capable, socially well-adjusted and productive children (Krupskaya, p. 47-54). Dewey (1916), was also concerned about the aims of education,

Each generation is inclined to educate its young so as to get along in the present world instead of with a view to the proper end of education: the promotion of the best possible realization of humanity as humanity. Parents educate their children so that they may get on; princes educate their subjects as instruments of their own purposes. (p. 10)

Wills further proved Dewey’s concerns through youth participatory action research in Hammertown, England. Wills (1981) observed fifteen male students, “in class, around the school and during leisure activities; regularly recorded group discussions; informal interviews and diaries” (p. 5). Through this observation, Wills was able to closely examine his research question, “How do working class kids get working class jobs?” and determined that it was a large combination of factors between parental attitudes, teacher attitudes, school curriculum, neighborhood resources, etc. that perpetuated the class phenomena. Oppressed people within the superstructures that reinforce and replicate
oppression are less likely to be able to critically analyze hegemony and make changes. If universities continue to perpetuate the oppressive norms of a society, they will never grow to meet the needs of their students and/or their communities. To disrupt this phenomenon the options are abolishing, reforming, or transforming the current education system.

Given the options, I propose transforming education into the “great equalizer” as it was mythically promised. Education must give students the tools and practice necessary to transform students into independent learners to succeed in life. Education is a lifelong process that is most successful when it is internally driven. Once you get past education for basic survival, education should be to deepen every individual’s understanding of the world. Should be, could be, and reality seldom align. Schools are obligated not only to teach students to be metacognitive but to ensure that skill is practiced and honed so that it can be easily transferred into multiple situations. Metacognition is a vital life skill for reflection to be able to improve and communicate that must be well developed to become a habit. In this Capitalist society driven by social media and consumerism, students must be taught to carefully evaluate products and sources to make the most educated decisions as savvy consumers. Metacognition and savvy consumerism require constant practice and a strong knowledge base so that people can be confidently engaged civically. Education needs to be more than surface knowledge to achieve both goals. Instead of an “an inch deep and a mile wide” approach to education, education must provide deeper knowledge for students to develop and practice the skills necessary for civic engagement.

**Educational Philosophy and Technology**

Technology has advanced the survival of humanity in food production, germ theory, vaccinations, refrigeration, etc. In the last 150 years, food production was considered vital enough that schools like Penn State University were started through the Morrill Act land grants to promote the
development of more technology to stabilize the food supply (t. Staff Authors of Encyclopædia Britannica, 2013).

Seemingly, every technological advancement comes with a cost. The Morrill Act gave away stolen land to educate white men and exclude the majority of the population. These schools did devise new agricultural technology to produce food more reliably but some of these innovations were disastrous for the ecosystem. Mechanization developed at universities made farming technically easier but lead to over-tilling, non-native food planting, famine, and massive migration (Trimarchi, 2021). After World War II, veterans came back to their homesteads with a mosquito killer that they found overseas, DDT, dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane. DDT was so effective in killing mosquitos that farmers applied it to kill their crops, inadvertently they poisoned themselves, killed the wildlife, contaminated the water, and pushed the Bald Eagle to the brink of extinction (Conis, 2021). DDT, won the inventor a Nobel Prize and protected millions from mosquito-borne illnesses but caused an environmental catastrophe (Conis, 2021).

Inside the classroom, technology has equally mixed results. Assistive technology has brought communication and movement to people that would otherwise struggle to participate in public spaces and improve life for the general public. Talk-to-text features and read-aloud features help people with visual impairments, processing issues, dexterity issues, and people chasing toddlers while working (Castello, 2021). The struggle with many educational technology tools is access.

One of the positive effects of COVID was putting educational technology under a microscope. Daily, news reports of school district closings, continuity of learning plans, and alternate opening plans to “traditional” K-12 schools plastered the news for months. Initially, the hodgepodge of paper-packet pickups, asynchronous, and synchronous learning were foreign terms but as weeks turned into months in the Spring of 2020, the disparity between classes was becoming impossible to avoid. In April 2020, the New York Times reported, Los Angeles is trying to get them (devices) to more than 100,000 students
In November 2020, the Philadelphia School District delayed hybrid learning because they had still not provided devices to every student (6 ABC Digital Staff, 2020). Even in places that had devices, internet access/bandwidth is still an unsolved problem. Giving out hotspots and free internet to low-income families only helped people near lines. Rural America is still left with major dead zones without fiber-optic lines, cell phone towers, and satellite services, and students struggled with online learning (Siegler, 2020).

Digital Citizenship and Media Literacy are the foundation to teaching and learning in a digital world. Unfortunately, Mister Rodgers stopped producing shows before the digital age because he taught generations of children how to handle their emotions and treat people with dignity. In the smartphone age where people share the most intimate details of their lives, people are conversing in private with people and bots instantaneously. Technology advances ahead of regulations. Cyberbullying and sexting are being litigated while the policy is trying to keep up.

Media literacy is a fickle beast. As disinformation campaigns become more sophisticated, people struggle to adapt. Children cyberbully over fake posts, social media platforms are pulling non-science-based medical advice, and deep fakes are being passed as news. As bot farms assault democracy, people need to learn to become more sophisticated consumers of information or they will fall victim to being manipulated by fake news (Vincens, 2020).

**Role of Student Affairs in Higher Education**

When people ask me to explain my master’s degree, I explain, “A degree in Higher Education Policy and Student Affairs helps me get a job in the behind-the-scenes offices that make a college run. This field covers everything from academic advising to Federal Work-Study and the vast world in-between. After many puzzled faces, I searched for a more academic answer. According to TopHat, a popular learning platform for college students, “Student affairs is the department or division of services for student success. ... This office ensures that appropriate and student-friendly services and programs
are accessible to a school’s student body” (t. Staff Author at Top Hat, 2021). This definition contains two ambiguous areas that can be stretched widely to become giant umbrellas, “appropriate / student-friendly services and programs” that “are accessible to a school’s student body.”

**Appropriate**

This is a dangerous colonizing word that imposes majority cultural norms onto the group. “Appropriate” is often coded language for civility and manners which translate to “acting in a way that is acceptable to the majority.” From the colonizing ideology perpetuated through meals served during events to the American myths codified through programing during Native American History Month, student affairs professionals must work diligently to combat colonization (Maharaj, 2020). Student affairs professionals must ensure that “appropriate” means culturally competent programming to retrain and recruit a community that is as diverse as its catchment areas.

**Accessible**

This is another potential pitfall for student affairs professionals. As a person that self-identifies as “handi-capable,” I often report that the shortest distance between two points is the fully able-bodied way. From my handi-capable perspective, accessibility is typically an afterthought in new construction and haphazard in retrofits. Even though it might technically be possible to get to a place, it may not be reasonable to attempt. (Some examples of this design flaw include: handicap ramps that are opposite not adjacent to the front door, hybrid events held in spaces without speaker microphones, in-person-only meetings, etc.)

Accessibility does not only refer to the disabled, colloquially in this context, it typically means, “Will students get there?” Since student affairs programming is typically evaluated on at least one of the following: turnout, engagement, and/or completion of learning outcomes, professionals want seats filled. Staff utilize various data collection models to predict when students are most likely to attend
events and what types of events drive student participation to make the most of their program’s potential impact due to a scarcity of resources (National Geographic Society, 2020). Schools face unlimited needs in the face of finite funding and resources, so they try to stretch their programming dollars to provide the largest number of programs to the largest number of students.

**Critical Participatory Action Research**

Thinking back to elementary school, my first experience with something labeled “Science” was predicated on the “Scientific Method.” Since the standards-based system has swept K-12 education, schools have implemented Scientific Method standards into their curriculum. Similar to other states, Pennsylvania has elected to base their “Inquiry and Design” standards section on the Scientific Method in 3.2 C to ensure that 4th, 7th, 10th, and 12th grade students progressively display their understanding of this singular way of “knowing” (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2002). There is strong value in modifying a hypothesis and repeating an experiment in a controlled environment with controlled ingredients until the results are consistent (T. Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica, 2021). However, life is not a controlled environment and living subjects are not controlled ingredients. This indoctrination into the scientific culture can make it difficult to see or accept other forms of science but there are other ways to know. For research to be effective the method must be appropriate to yield valid results.

My coursework helped me to readjust my bias to realize that there are a lot of ways to conduct research. “At different times in different social contexts, what constitutes valid ways of creating knowledge will vary. It is not by accident, for example, that emancipatory, grass-roots approaches to research emerged from the oppressive social conditions of the third world” (Anderson et. al., p. 18). These less formulaic but equally valuable research methods stem from the Action Research tradition. The Action Research tradition is similar to the Scientific Method in that reflection on results informs future action however Action Research has zero expectation of producing replicable results (Anderson et. al., p. 20). Criticism of action research warns that” attempts (to) formalize the process were intended
for social control and lose its inherent value as a tool for liberatory practice” (Anderson et. al., p. 22-23).

Action researchers have constructed their own methods to determine the validity of work in their field.

To coincide with my concerns about equity, I found evaluating action research is through examining the process and outcomes to be the most telling. “Process validity or trustworthiness asks to what extent problems are framed and solved in a manner that permits ongoing learning of the individual or system” (Anderson et. al., p. 41). Researchers must undertake multiple reflective cycles and adjust processes before submitting outcomes. The researcher is encouraged to employ “triangulation” to ensure that multiple perspectives, observation methods, and sources of data are included before an outcome is declared (Anderson et. al., p. 41). Outcome Validity... is the extent to which actions occur that lead to (a) solution of the problem or a deeper understanding ... in the context of the site and is “solved” or “understood” within those parameters, possibilities, and limitations” (Anderson et. al., p. 40). All of this data is then scrutinized via a peer review before it can be published, dialogic validity, before it is further scrutinized by the wider scientific community (Anderson et. al., 2007). Since action researchers’ lifeblood is dependent on their ability to validate their field and given the multiple redundancies built into this system, I am a convert to action research as science.

In Higher Education, the most effective method to authentically research complex beliefs, behaviors, and attitudes in response to intervention appears to be Critical Participatory Action Research. Traditional college-age students are well beyond the age of reason. Graduate students have fully formed brains. Faculty and staff are equally capable adults. Conducting research on people without their informed consent is both unethical and illegal. Conducting research on people instead of with people is illogical and insulting at best. Many minority groups have co-opted a famous disabilities rights slogan, “Nothing About Us Without Us” to echo the same sentiments (Carmel, 2020). In 2020 Rusoja expressed that all research must be done with the community not upon the community to have a decolonizing effect. Potentially well-intentioned groups with “Savior Complexes,” imposing changes into strangers’
lives without consultation is both presumptuous and offensive (Raypole, 2020). From the pre-planning stages of an institutional review of committees to joining the mentoring program and leading training to proposing community partners, the goal is to engage mentors and mentees in their development. Reflection and multiple forms of data collection are necessary to ensure the goals of the program are being met.

Universities can work for the community with the community through critical participatory action research. Changes to the fundamental university approach to interacting with the community would help institutions serve their communities, improve students’ lives, and help communities thrive. Universities will be most successful in changing their approach if they remember to bring all of the interested parties into all stages of the planning process so that the changes make sense for their communities.

Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, while learning about my educational beliefs and technology philosophy for education you have observed how important I value critical consumption of everything from perception to media. As such, I believe that Critical Participatory Action Research is the only ethical position Higher Education can adopt when studying adults. In the next chapter, you will learn how I currently understand the history and research surrounding graduate student participation in shared governance.
Chapter 3
Literature Review

Historical Context: American History

Formerly being a hopeful social studies teacher, I struggled to narrow down the history of this problem. As I broke down the issue into its simplest form, I realized that America’s governance issue started long before the country was founded. The history of this problem is at the base of American History. It permeates every facet of every underpinning structure of American life. It is well beyond the scope of this project to be able to provide a comprehensive history of power inequities, education or governance in the U.S. My intention in this section is to give you a very brief introduction into topics that have entire dedicated sections in libraries. I have attempted to give you the basics of the who, what, when, where, and whys of the issues that created the power imbalances that shape my thematic concern. As you read, please remember a major philosophical question that faces every educator: “Education of whom and for what purpose?”

Governance: How did America get here?

The hypocrisy of governance was formally baked into the U.S. Declaration of Independence with Thomas Jefferson’s words, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness” (Hannah-Jones, 2019). Hannah-Jones explained that some of the fights while drafting the U.S. Constitution fervently protected property rights while denying that property any recourse or rights in the new government (Hannah-Jones, 2019). I was taught, the Founding Fathers included minimum citizenship lengths to become an elected government official to prevent other Europeans from ruling. But the Constitution excluded Native Americans, Blacks, and women from office as well as failed to acknowledge them as citizens or people. (U.S. Const. art. I, § 2 & 3; art. II, § 1).
Similarly, by affording citizens of each state protections and rights under the law, the same people were strategically left unprotected (U.S. Const. art. IV, § 2).

Each group newly protected by a Constitutional Amendment or Supreme Court ruling has its own long story of activism that brought them more fully into this “More Perfect Union.” Unfortunately, once the grueling battle is won, the “victor” is still left with the burden of ensuring that the new ruling is applied. The easiest example that I can share to explain this idea draws from my teaching experience. Through multiple legal advances for people with disabilities, people with disabilities are now entitled to a Free and Appropriate Public Education, FAPE, in the Least Restrictive Environment, LRE (t. Staff Writers for the Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2002). Special Education students are evaluated and provided with an Individualized Education Plan, IEP. This IEP is then shared with the student’s teachers to execute and monitor. The student/the parent/teacher follow up to determine if the accommodations are being provided, utilized and if they are effective. The parent/teacher then calls another IEP meeting to amend the accommodations if necessary.

In a utopian world, everything progresses as expected and the student gets all that they need. In the real world of budget constraints, unlimited class sizes, and staffing issues, students do not get all that they need. According to the Disability History Museum, Horrace Mann’s attacks on sign language and Thomas Gallaudet’s work at the American Asylum for the Deaf in Hartford, Connecticut “may represent the opening salvos of oralism” (Warder, 2022). This observation concluded that despite accommodations being practical, people prefer their normal means of working so they resist accommodations. Parents often have to fight with schools to get the process back on track and/or pursue legal action. There can be a mediation phase that occurs before the case actually gets litigated in hopes of avoiding legal proceedings. After several cycles of this process, students graduate and/or age out and are left to navigate the World. Even when students are heavily involved in their transition planning, they are often woefully unaware of the full bureaucratic scope of this process which leaves
them less equipped to handle similar processes in their adult lives. So, even though people with disabilities have won FAPE in an LRE with an IEP, they have to monitor and advocate to ensure that they actually receive their rights. Then, as they move into the World outside of K-12 they have to navigate similarly complex processes to engage in everything from housing to employment and everything in-between. According to Schmidt (2022), people with disabilities have to engage in the governmental process for things that others take for granted like sidewalk access (). Waiting three years for a resolution to sidewalk access is definitely not part of the “American Dream”. The constant battle for access and inclusion into public places is part of the reason that I have held two Graduate Assistant positions in Disability Services. After people endure their mandated education, when they get to college they should get the American myth that they have been promised.

*What is my obsession with myths?*

Think back to your early memories of circle time at your public library and/or in your elementary school. Remember racing to sit on the special spots on the floor with the best view of the teacher. Do you remember feeling excited when you got your favorite spot? Do you remember feeling proud when you were chosen to pass out the egg shakers or tapping sticks for the song? All of these memories are part of building the American myth. View figure 1 below for the definitions from T. Staff Authors for the Public Library of Youngstown and Mahoning County (2020).

**Figure 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>An example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myths</td>
<td>a story that is passed on from one generation to another that explains how the world is the way it is. Myths also discuss how the world was created.</td>
<td><em>The Iliad</em> by Homer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legends</td>
<td>a particular type of folktale that is told as if it is true in a historical text. The stories take place in human history and seem to be understandable and believable.</td>
<td>King Arthur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall tales</td>
<td>a funny, exaggerated story about the life of frontiersmen in America around the 1800s. Tall tales became popular in the twentieth century.</td>
<td>Davy Crocket</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social norms are reinforced as children race for favored seats and vie for the teacher’s attention (Egan, 1997). Then, teachers share legends and tall tales that support American Nationalism reinforcing American Mythology. This example is a simplification of the process that includes everything from parades to days off from school and everything in between. Making applesauce in honor of Johnny Appleseed, making sailboats in honor of Christopher Columbus Day, barbecuing on Independence Day, etc. are all examples of the supporting details that contribute to the American Dream mythology.

Dr. Kieran Egan (1997) devoted an entire chapter in *The Educated Mind: How Cognitive Tools Shape Our Understanding* to the development of the “mythic understanding” to explain how myths help people bridge the gap between the fully understood and the known but not fully understood. These “inevitable consequences of language development” permit a person to commit a leap of faith through/around the mysterious while appreciating its existence (Egan, p.33). This myth has a value in that people can move about their lives unencumbered by understanding the myth. A person might come to fully understand the mystery after studying the item, in later years, or in descendant generations but the myth is vital to existence. To examine the myth, according to Egan (1997), is to unravel the “myth understanding” when “learning consequently ceases to be effortless and begins to require deliberate work” (p. 36).

*Founding American Radicals in Education*

As I mentioned earlier, the roots of the American education system are heavily steeped in religious tradition but secular ideals transformed education from a solely religious undertaking into the modern machine that it has become. Many of the most successful proponents of educational expansion in America used a patriotic tone to appeal to the masses. Government tends to expand with popular support because taxes fund the expansion. As Przybyla (2021) argues, losing popular support results in less taxes and crumbling infrastructure like the conditions found in some public schools.

*Founding Fathers*
Multiple founding fathers took up the issue of improving higher education in America. According to Castel (1964), Doctor Benjamin Rush outspokenly worked for a “federal university in which everything connected to government” (p. 280). Despite being voted down during the Continental Congress, George Washington took up this mantle during his presidency to improve current college conditions to encourage Americans to study locally and improve patriotism (Castel, 1964). Despite the efforts of several presidencies, a federal university was not formed. However, their painstaking work was not lost because their work trickled into other universities. Many of Dr. Rush’s ideals influenced colleges founded by his students, the College of Physicians that he co-founded, as well as the two Pennsylvania colleges he founded, Dickinson College and Franklin College (now Franklin and Marshall College) (t. Staff Authors of the University of Pennsylvania Archives, 2018).

Other notables

Horace Mann was not the first to propose but he was the first to bring Common Schools to the masses as the Massachusetts Secretary of Education in 1837. He observed, "A republican form of government, without intelligence in the people, must be, on a vast scale, what a mad-house, without superintendent or keepers, would be on a small one”(t. Staff Authors of PBS Online, 2001) His implementation of free primary public education in Massachusetts led other states to follow suit, making him the Father of Public Education.

Americans have bought into this patriotic rhetoric about the mission of public education. Americans pay taxes to partially fund higher education (National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, 2020). Americans take out trillions in student loans to fund their time in higher education (Sheffey, 2021). Since higher education leaves graduates woefully unprepared for civic engagement, what is America’s return on its investment?

Higher Education’s Place in America’s Educational History
“The “crisis” of the university... of adapting the university to the new kinds of publics that have arisen in the wake of the student movements, as well as the social justice issues that those moments highlighted. ...we are the inheritors of this insurgency and its backlash, and it behooves us to learn its history” (Ferguson, p.6).

Since the inception of universities in the United States of America, rooted in Western-European tradition, they have been a site of power struggles. In the Western-European education tradition dating back to the 13th century, university meant “academic community” (Harper, 2021). By the 14th century, community had evolved to mean, “a society or association of persons having common interests or occupations” (Harper, 2021). Neither of these words addresses the imbalance of power held within a university. American universities born out of the Western-European education tradition perpetuated the same cycles of inequity in their design and curriculum. Teachers were “ones who showed” (Harper, 2021) students “studied” and pupils were “student youth or any person of either sex under the care of an instructor or tutor”(Harper, 2021). This idea of being “under the care of the instructor” led to the legal precedent “in locus parentis,” acting in place of the parents, in both the US and British legal systems in the mid-1600s (Harper, 2021).

Universities in the United States decided as a parent, they knew what is best for their students and community. Initially, American universities were designed as programs to produce religious leaders in a specific religious tradition (Galvin, 2018). Universities decided who could begin religious education, what constituted religious education, how students could conduct themselves, and who could complete their education program. As universities expanded to include more professional training programs, with older students and longer terms for program completion, they replicated the same program dynamic. This power-differential has been fought since the beginning, “Throughout the colonial era of American higher education, students protested everything from institutional practices to the political ideologies of U.S. leadership” (Wheatle, pp.12-13).
The intent of “in locus parentis” was to ensure hegemony, “the function of that the dominant group exercises throughout society ... creates “spontaneous consent... to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant [class]; this consent is “historically’ caused by the prestige (and consequent confidence) which the dominant group enjoys because of its position and function in the world of production” (Backer, p.12) Perhaps it was foresight or perhaps it was observational knowledge about young adult identity development, American universities decided from their outset that students needed to be pressured into compliance with the dominant culture.

Universities crafted their honor codes in line with the “in locus parentis” position to replicate the social norms of their era to ensure that students behaved in a way that the dominant culture of the time expected. “According to a 1971 document published by the US Department of Justice’s National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, “The doctrine of ‘in loco parentis’ ... required a force equipped to patrol the campus, its vehicles, and environs. Regulating the mobility of the automobile was part of ensuring the gender propriety of women as well: “... It was a question of students, particularly women, behaving within proper moral constraints—that is, not having sex outside marriage” (Ferguson, p.29-30). By creating these honor codes, and security forces, universities were implying that even though admission is selective, students would not willfully submit to hegemony (Emma, 2019).

Identity Development Theory

Theories are a curious subject. For normal people, a theory is a personal idea but for scientists, theories are proven facts (Darwin, 2021). Unfortunately, for the non-scientific community, this distinction is often lost in translation leading to fundamental misunderstandings of science. Investigating human experiences culminates in theories, like the ones explained throughout Student Development in College: Theory, Research, and Practice. After reading over two hundred pages of college development theories, I was struggling to describe how my college experiences matched the models. Reconsidering Dr. Madyun’s case study (Madyun, 2021), I realized that these two hundred pages were not an
exhaustive explanation of college development theories nor a full list of developmental theories.

Introspection helped me to realize that as a post-traditional student, I was firmer in my identity development than the traditional college student described. My experiences mirrored Love and Miller’s 2003 research showing that graduate students are more consistent than undergraduate students in politics suggesting that graduate students could add stability to governance in higher education.

**Critical Incidents Leading to Identity Development**

Although not widely studied when American universities began, identity development has become a major field of study within the last fifty years. College is a major transition point in people’s lives as they move from compulsory education into the endless possibilities of higher education. From choosing where to live, what to study, when to eat, etc., higher education is when people typically become independent of their family’s influence and decide their core identity. Since higher education is the physical setting for development, it has become interested in its role in facilitating the process.

Every student development model studied from the master text, *Student Development in College: Theory, Research, and Practice* list a “critical incident” that moves a student from unquestioning complicity in their role in society into a period of introspection about their role in society. Hopefully, this introspection helps move students into a space of determining their own identity in relation to the world. These critical incidents and periods of introspection are constrained by the honor code and bureaucratization of the university to mitigate the dangers to the hegemonic power of the university. Universities realize that students have experienced a lifetime of interpellation, conforming in ideology, thoughts, actions, and speech to a dominant culture’s expectations, before reaching higher education (Backer, 2018). Backer explains, “When you are interpellated, you become a subject of that ideology, recruited to the ideology so that you “go” all by yourself and follow the ideology without any force compelling you” (Backer, 2018).
In an effort to remain in power, the curriculum is designed to ignore or leave the structural inequalities and historic inequalities unexamined. As part of a student’s identity development, students often must independently research the inequality that leads to their critical incidents. When students organize to protest curriculum and program cuts like the City College’s Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge (SEEK) Program’s strike at the City University of New York (CUNY) in Harlem, creative solutions are tried. Beginning on April 22 1969, the SEEK occupation shut down CUNY’s official business and constructed a free Harlem University for two weeks. Harlem University, “hosted a walk-in clinic, tutorials, nightly community meetings, as well as a “free breakfast program for the children in the neighborhood, daycare, [and] political education classes... with hundreds of community members holding the gate” (Reed, p. 9) In response to the SEEK strike, the “CUNY Board of Higher Education accelerated and expanded the admissions demand for the creation of “Open Admissions” (Reed, p.14) ... five years earlier than planned with zero increase to resources... “could arguably be measured as a form of institutional reform-as-sabotage” (Reed, p.15) As any student that has experienced institutional “growing pains“ can attest, more people with the same number of resources and staff equals a less robust educational process. When students are fighting for seats, not spots on the floor, and teachers are struggling to tread water with the volume of work more students produce, everyone looks for simpler ways to survive sabotaging the educational reforms the SEEK strike had intended (Reed, 2018).

As if suddenly struck by historical amnesia and youthful optimism, student movements falter when students give back their collective power to the university. For over three centuries of American higher education, by structural design, universities have worked to maintain a similar process of graduate production through exerting power over students to maintain power under the guise of the “integrity of their process.”

“Process” is a small word with large implications. An official process is composed of small procedures that must be undertaken to achieve an outcome. Some university procedures serve the
common good, i.e. disaster response procedures, some university procedures exist to organize daily life, i.e. hours that departments operate, and other procedures exist to maintain institutional power, like the admissions process. Regardless of intent, procedures are often spread diffusely throughout a university to add levels of bureaucracy to a process that removes the executors of the procedures from the outcome of the process and extends timelines needlessly. This diffusion of work can result in people executing procedures with little understanding of how their work connects to the output of the process. Ethically, people are obligated to examine how their work contributes to the process because they are culpable for both their actions and their results. In 1804, the Supreme Court’s case Little v. Barreme set a legal precedent against a commonly attempted defense “of following orders” (Thomson Reuters, 2021). In practicality, this precedent means that all people are legally responsible to consider the ethics of an action before taking an action. Although most people are not held accountable by the judiciary, history is retroactively holding people and institutions accountable for their actions (Georgetown University, 2021). Students have the power to expedite this process however, it takes a well-organized and concerted effort to push an institution. Students must be taught to critically examine history before they can practice civic engagement to move the conversation forward. There have been more modern Constitutional Amendments that have also impacted modern life in higher education.

Recent Constitutional Amendments’ Impact on Higher Education

My award for the Most Valuable Amendment in the 1900’s goes to Amendment 16. Amendment 16 permitted Congress to levy income tax on individuals (U.S. Const. amend. XVI). Congress elected to give Native land to states in order to fund higher education typically called “land grant colleges” (T. Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2017). Women’s right to ownership varied greatly throughout the states so some women were paying taxes to maintain places they typically could not attend (T. Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1999). Very few private universities permitted women into professional
programs like Drexel, but none were publicly funded (T. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Webmaster, 2021).

After years of unequal taxation with zero representation, women finally won the right to vote, Amendment 19 (U.S. Const. amend. XIX). Although female voters did not immediately change the landscape of higher education, the momentum from this 100+-year-old movement had ripple effects on campus. Social issues became part of the regular local legislative agenda as men were forced to attract the female vote (Gertner, et. al., 2021). (Amendments 13, 15, and 18 were National social issues often driven by women; however, these National changes had a very small impact on daily life.)

Unfortunately, division in the women’s voting movement left their victory half empty. Initially, the Women’s Movement was closely tied to the Abolitionist Movement. Men like Fredrick Douglas told women that freeing slaves and freeing women at the same time was too radical so everyone should focus their efforts on freeing black men to vote (Little, 2017). Without some major revisionist conjecture, it is difficult to gauge the validity in splitting the movement. It is clear through the creation of Amendments 13-24 meant that neither side really got what they had intended.

Without another 100 years of cooperation, Amendment 24 of abolishing the voting tax would have been impossible (U.S. Const. amend. XXIV). After the end of the Civil War, women in the North and South worked together as a coalition to educate freed people and their children (Davis, 1983). The boom of cooperation during Reconstruction was short-lived. As the country lost the stomach for continued Southern occupation and Congress pardoned Southern war criminals, the female coalition fell apart as well. Amendment 24 came to pass due to strong Northern allies coming to the South to aid Southern Movements to defeat poll tests, poll taxes, etc.

Amendment 26 is a strange period in American voting history (U.S. Const. amend. XXVI). During the Civil War, it was not uncommon to have children join the military (T. Editors of American Battlefield Trust, 2021). During America’s second-longest conflict in history, Vietnam, life dramatically changed.
Children of Veterans and young people were protesting on campuses across the country the elitist conscription laws. Military force was used against protesting students at Kent State which contributed to changing law enforcement relationships on campus (Ferguson, 2017). Also, Amendment 26 was radical in passing because it changed the way the military functions abroad ever since (T. Editors of Selective Service System, 2021). Now, the conscripts have a vote to hold their local and national officials accountable.

Amendment 21 ending Prohibition rounds out my top five higher education amendments because alcohol use is a scourge in Conduct Offices and Title IX Offices across the country (U.S. Const. amend. XXI). During Prohibition, speakeasies and Moonshiners kept alcohol flowing creating a new type of campus criminal. After the repeal of Prohibition, universities were left to manage their own codes of conduct. Dram Shot Laws removed some liability for injury from the student and placed it on alcohol providers (Mothers Against Drunk Driving, 2012). Also, tort law transferred some blame to situational risk, i.e. rock climbing while intoxicated, sports participation while intoxicated, etc., leaving event facilitators culpable for determining a person’s fitness to participate in events (Lake, 2011). Some schools thought changing the National drinking age to twenty-one would alleviate alcohol violations however litigation surrounding all other aspects of alcohol violations keeps school officials very busy. As tort law evolves and states continue to legalize marijuana, I believe this area of college law is going to expand exponentially. As law expands, policy develops to mitigate risk that shapes campus culture. It is imperative that students participate in the policy-shaping and policy enforcing processes that rule their lives.

**Governance in Higher Education**

Governance is a complex process concerned with the sustenance of the community at large. Similar to legal governance, higher education has an expansive selection of governance models. Initially, I imagined higher education governance models directly relate/reflect their local governance structures.
In 2011 Minksová and Pabian completed a historiography analysis of European governance which echoed my hypothesis. However, further research has revealed that although Great Britain (Minksová, et. al, 2011) and South Africa (Griffin, 2018) share a recent colonial history, their higher education structures are remarkably different. Born out of social democratizing efforts, the Higher Education Act of 1997 was a South African legal mandate to build and refine its shared governance process into something that can be transferred into other contexts (Griffin, 2018). South Africa struggles with the same issues Italy, the Czech Republic, and the United States face working with students, how to maintain steady progress with consistent participation from a transient population (Minksová, et. al., 2011) (Griffin, 2018).

Gallos, Director of Higher Education Graduate Programs, explained that since shared governance issues are not particular to an institutional type or culture, the entire model needs to be reimagined (2009). In 2003 Love and Miller replicated a research study initially designed by Miles in 1997 to prove that student governance mirrors other forms of political participation (representative democracy and shared governance). Unsurprisingly, Love and Miller’s 2003 research showed that graduate students are more consistent than undergraduate students in responses to politics suggesting that graduate students could add stability to governance in higher education. In 2006 Pontius and Harper decried a lack of educational standards for graduate and professional student engagement resulting in insufficient support across institutions. This critique suggests that if institutions want to tap into the potential stability provided by graduate students for higher education governance, institutions will have to develop their own standards or draw upon undergraduate standards (Pontius, et. al., 2006).

To my surprise, there is a wealth of data about higher education governance models. Unfortunately, most of the research surrounded the disfunction of governance. I found no work surrounding graduate students in governance, the effects of graduate student civic engagement post student governance, etc. Although this thesis concern governance, the crux of this project is that
students deserve a well-trained mentor to help them navigate the governing process. I have shared cautionary tales of why people must engage in governance to protect their rights in order to persuade you that you are the best one to protect your rights. I have also shared some of the bureaucracy that dissuades people from participating in governance. That bureaucracy is precisely why mentorship is needed to help students successfully engage civically.

**Community Engagement through Service Learning**

Throughout my life, my family has been committed to community service. As I grew older, I began to realize that community service and service learning are not the same. Although these few-times-a-year visits to help my neighbors, community service, were valuable as a small child, developmentally I was prepared to do more. Adult education institutions need to adapt to both generational changes and new research to move into service learning. The University of Northern Iowa’s adjacent table clearly explains the nuanced differences between community service/volunteering and service learning (University, 2020). Higher education institutions must recognize the distinction and support service learning in a coordinated effort to improve both students’ experiences and the geographical community at large.

Congruent with my experiences, Dr. Corey Seemiller explained in her interview, “Generation Z is not interested in short-term volunteerism. ...Generation Z (usually) wants to address the problem not the symptom” (Shea, 2016). Dr. Semmiller suggested that to engage both Millennial students and
Generation Z students, universities need a blended approach, community service for people short on time and service learning for people craving for pathways to address structural issues in their communities (Shea, 2016). Regardless of the institutional size or resources, See’s research at Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania, UPenn, showed that even Ivy League Universities in the United States with mega endowments are not responding quickly enough to build the service learning programs that students are requesting (See, 2010), for example Wharton’s course catalog only offers two percent service learning classes out of one hundred and fifty course offerings (See, 2010).

With a fundamental misunderstanding of how Millennial and Generation Z students want to engage with community problems, it is likely that the same communities are not harvesting the potential abilities of these generations. My experiences and anecdotal observations have shown me that people that are engaged in the moment can lose engagement if there is not a career or local connection to the participants’ lives. Dr. Semmiller shared that there are complaints about the lack of generational engagement in the electoral process but she cited that the same generations are the social media presence, small donors, and community organizers, so their engagement is not captured by traditional measures (Shea, 2016). There is research to suggest a correlation between service learning and civic engagement. McCollough’s work showed engagement in the student body and two years post-graduation from Columbus State University (McCullough, 2020). Although two years of post-graduate data is a good start, since people do not typically stay in the same jobs/ careers until retirement, more longitudinal data collection is needed.

Student affairs educators are evaluated in part on student participation and students are requesting a change. Students want programming that teaches them ways to address systemic issues of inequality. Rethinking community engagement strategies will improve student participation quality and rates of attendance. Roberts eloquently quoted in her presentation, “Student activism is the new student activities” (Roberts, 2020).
Mentorship

Mentorship is a major area of research interest in both the business and private sectors with limited research as it relates specifically to diverse populations within higher education. All of the research contained a similar definition of traditional mentorship “as a “communication relationship in which a senior person [i.e., mentor] supports, tutors, guides, and facilitates a junior person’s [i.e., protégé’s] career development” (Mansson, et. al., p 54). E-mentoring’s research most closely aligned with the traditional mentoring definition because it examined ways e-mentors could better support e-mentees (Columbaro, 2009; Ongoz, 2018; Panopoulos, et. al., 2013, Tominaga, et. al., 2018). There is a large body of research surrounding poor mentor/mentee relationships contributing to graduate and doctoral attrition, (Mansson, et. al., 2013; Columbaro, 2009) but no research on effective professional mentoring methods for graduate or doctoral students. All of the research found surrounded the benefits to the mentee with barely a mention of tangible benefits for the mentor (Fountain, et. al., 2016). The most promising mentorship model for higher education, “Predicated upon reverse mentoring, the Intergenerational Mentoring model reflects the positive aspects of reverse mentoring without the hierarchical framework of mentor and mentee; rather, it is based upon the notion that everyone leads, and everyone learns” (Satterly, et. al., p.447) has no completed research studies yet. Cavanaugh (2017) made an excellent point about the lack of enthusiasm in higher education professional development, implying all forms including mentorship, since higher education prefers external promotions there is a lack of enthusiasm for expanding abilities that benefit the institution.

Mentoring is an extremely wide area of research however, there is very little specific to graduate students. I found no research about mentor experiences within graduate mentorship. I found zero formal mentoring programs in higher education for graduate students. Also, there were no published studies completed on the “Intergenerational Mentorship” model, the seemingly most obvious mentorship model for higher education (Satterly, et. al., 2018).
Social Media’s Role in Higher Education

There is an idiom that comes to mind with this section, “Meet people where they are.” Although it used to mean literally in the space that a human occupies it has now come to include the digital space as well. As offices, programs, departments, and school mascots build their social media brands to engage with the community, it is important to consider how a school prepares its students and staff to build their brands as well. In the next few sections, you will explore research surrounding which social media platforms may be most useful for professional development.

The Internet and Mentoring

Despite the lack of enthusiasm for professional development, higher education professionals must stay current with trends to serve their students. Like e-mentoring suggests, internet tools have been integrated into classrooms, professional development, and mentoring. Organized mentorship programs struggle to facilitate regular communication between the program, the mentors, and the mentees. Mentorship cannot be effective without regular communication so increasing two-way communication would lead to a more successful mentor/mentee relationship. In our pandemic-telecommuting society, using technology to facilitate this communication was/is the logical choice. However, it is essential to choose the “right” Web 2.0 tool for professional development.

Currently, higher education utilizes a variety of Learning Management Systems, LMS, to communicate with its staff and students. Unfortunately, the “LMS, is focused on the institution and the course rather than on the learner, which means that they do not satisfy one of the final learning stakeholders” (Conde, et. al, p. 189). Institutions are afraid to include Web 2.0 tools for two reasons addressed further in this paper: “the difficulty to support 2.0 tools by LMS (Mott, 2010; Sclater, 2008); and the inclusion of 2.0 tools in learning processes is going to make bigger the gap between digital natives and immigrants” (Conde, et. al, p. 190).
Both the Ongoz and Bista studies explored different tech tools that they used to orchestrate their classes. Ongoz (2018) organized his graduate class to e-mentor his undergraduate class in project construction through their own chosen communication methods while each participant submitted reflections about their choice of tools. The class data revealed that all thirteen groups elected to use instant messaging and ten of the thirteen groups elected social networking (Ongoz, p. 82). Ogonz quoted “Jacobset al., (2015) suggest that e-mentorship program participants prefer to engage in real-time communication using synchronous technologies” (p. 85) to explain the findings. Bista (2015) limited his forty-two international online graduate class to discussion through Tweeting as opposed to their traditional Learning Management System, (LMS). Bista’s (2015) findings supported Ogonoz and Jacobset’s findings that students enjoyed the quick real-time communication that social media affords a class.

In addition to the positive student data, there is industry data supporting a push for more social media proficiency for higher education graduates. Freberg and Kim conducted a qualitative research study based on interviews with twenty social media industry leaders with over five years of industry experience ranging from the following fields: “major nonprofits (four), consulting firms (three), public relations agencies (six), corporate brands (five), and one university along with one non-government organization” (Freberg, et. al., p. 384). Although the research was conducted on people hiring people with “social media” responsibilities in job descriptions, the skills the leaders requested added into the curriculum were transferable to many other positions like data analysis, writing, marketing, crisis management, etc. (Freberg, et. al., 2018). Teaching these skills outside of social-media-specific classes and across the curriculum will strengthen the community at large.

Having worked with different LMS in both Higher Education and K-12 education, I am a proponent of working outside the LMS with a free preexisting tool. As stated, before choosing the “right” tool is where hierarchical decisions need to be made. Conveniently, there is an existing
international body of research surrounding choosing the correct social media tool for the job of professional development. Although much of the research has been industry-based, there is a smaller body of research that promotes the same tool as industry suggestions: Twitter.

Finding a good fit over a perfect fit

Much like shoe shopping, searching for the “right” social media platform involves compromise. “Nowadays, as technological advancements are found on smaller devices—... educators around the world have been taking advantage of social media-enabled, online professional learning opportunities capable of improving their knowledge and skills in teaching and scholarship without geographical and temporal constraints” (Lou, et. al, p. 1660). (Due to the nature of the platforms, several were excluded from professional development research thus far, i.e. Snapchat, TikTok, Nextdoor, etc.)

Facebook: the most used social media site?

When Wang, et. al., conducted a qualitative study using Facebook as an exclusive LMS for graduate and undergraduate students the data exposed mixed results. Technical issues stemming from institutional firewalls made the course difficult to access (Wang, et. al. 2012). Although fixes could be found to share cloud documents and events could easily be organized, graduate students did not accept Facebook as readily as undergraduate students (Wang, et. al. 2012). Masters students did not like the lack of privacy afforded through Facebook. The automatic notification setting had students concerned that their network could see their responses in a closed group (Wang, et. al. 2012). Pieterse, et. al.’s 2014 research echoed users distrust Facebook’s privacy settings.

Twitter, the microblog?

The preferred communication method of the United States of America’s 45th President Donald J. Trump is regarded by both industries and education as a positive social media device to augment professional development programs.
Accessibility and Privacy

If you remember, by examining options currently available to facilitate professional development, Twitter was shown to be the superior option. Being freely available across multiple devices and platforms decreases access barriers (Pieterse, et. al, 2014). Pieterse and Peled shared a solid option to protect user privacy by offering a pseudonym option (Pieterse, et. al, 2014). Although pseudonyms could be complex on an institutional scale, facilitators could execute this option. Pieterse, et. al elected to create a private group for their cohort that the entire content of their research was private. By utilizing hashtags and responding to a colleague, professional interaction can be analyzed and quickly addressed by the facilitators (Pieterse, et. al, 2014). To the relief of education professionals, “following” and “direct messaging” between students is not required to successfully interact over Twitter (Luo, et. al., 2020).

Advising/mentoring

“Twitter leaves advisers in the difficult position of advising graduate students on how they should navigate yet another professional context” (Searles, et. al., p. 669). By professionally navigating Twitter as users, personnel will be more equipped to advise students of both the benefits and detractors while offering suggestions about publicly sharing their research (Searles, et. al., 2018). In a COVID world, there was lots of internationally published work on e-mentoring but and teachers using tools in specific classes but nothing in between. Although a huge portion of the world has been fully remote or hybrid learning, there is no published research about nothing for tech tools used for mentoring students that are not traditionally e-learners.

Bridging the Digital Divide

As stated at the beginning of this section, fears of expanding the technological gap within the workforce make institutions hesitant to adopt new technology (Conde, et. al, p. 190). The addition of social media as an institutional-wide form of communication and professional development should be a
well-developed plan. “Understanding the usefulness of Twitter and the way it may fit in the broader boundaries of a learning design are vital to the successful adoption of Twitter for educators’ professional learning and development” (Lou, et. al, p. 1674).

Mentorship could ease the anxiety of this major technological change. Since 42% of the Twitter user respondents were from the 18-29 year-old age group (Pew Research Center, 2021), a form of reciprocal mentorship would be most appropriate to introduce faculty to the new technology as well as the new staff/faculty to the institution. In the corporate world, reverse mentorship, “pairing of a junior employee acting as a mentor to share expertise with a senior colleague as the mentee” (Satterly, et. al, p. 446) would be the preferred method to bridge this technical divide. Unfortunately, reverse mentoring leaves the middle-level employees, not the newest but also not the most seasoned, without the benefits of mentorship while constantly burdening the most senior employees with mentorship duties.

Since higher education has a significantly more diverse employee population and student population than traditional corporate America, intergenerational mentorship would be a more appropriate fit. “Predicated upon reverse mentoring, the Intergenerational Mentoring model reflects the positive aspects of reverse mentoring without the hierarchical framework of mentor and mentee; rather, it is based upon the notion that everyone leads, and everyone learns” (Satterly, et. al, p.447). By expanding upon the best parts of reverse mentoring: “knowledge sharing and skill development that build on the generational strengths in the academic environment” (Satterly, et. al, p.443), intergenerational mentorship is designed to be a completely reciprocal process where both parties learn an area of interest together.

Based on the current evidence, Twitter is the most viable option for professional development communication in higher education. Twitter works across devices and platforms so it is more accessible than the alternatives. Twitter is a preexisting tool that is built for communication with multiple privacy options that has been proven easy to use and effective. There are prebuilt training programs for Twitter
that all users can access for training. Intergenerational mentorship would strengthen the entire institutions’ ability to access Twitter while adding another dimension to professional development.

Social media competency is a highly requested job skill that the staff engaging on Twitter will be more capable of including in their classes. Also, in the adjunctification and privatization of education, utilizing Twitter for professional development will be useful to the staff outside of the institution.

Chapter Conclusion

This chapter has connected common themes throughout the American experience to show how the larger American governance system impacts governance in Higher Education. Using my own identity development as an example, I gave context to Love and Miller’s 2003 research finding graduate students are more consistent than undergraduate students in responses to politics suggesting that graduate students could add stability to governance in higher education. Unfortunately, higher education has not yet developed standards for graduate and professional student engagement (Pontius, et. al., 2006). In the next chapter you will explore how I suggest to use mentorship to provide consistent training for graduate students to engage in service learning surrounding shared governance. You will observe how the NASPA/ACPA professional competencies inform More than Just a Seat at the Table.
Chapter 4
Program Design & Implementation

Introduction, Purpose, and Goals

I am proposing a formal intergenerational mentoring program for graduate students facilitated through shared governance. Since higher education has a significantly more diverse population than traditional corporate America, intergenerational mentorship is logical. Intergenerational Mentoring is “predicated upon reverse mentoring, the Intergenerational Mentoring model reflects the positive aspects of reverse mentoring without the hierarchical framework of mentor and mentee; rather, it is based upon the notion that everyone leads, and everyone learns (Satterly, et al., p.447).

Intergenerational mentoring allows both the mentor and the mentee to select areas for individual professional development while leaning into the expertise of the cohort to help achieve those goals. Respecting the expertise of both the mentor and the mentees promotes a more reciprocal mentoring experience as opposed to traditional mentor (expert)/ mentee (novice) relationships (Mansson, et. al., p. 54).

More than Just a Seat at the Table is a year-long formalized mentoring program that aims to help mentoring teams develop their personal and professional skills while they engage in service learning through their shared governance committees. This is no small undertaking. Mentors will volunteer to guide graduate students through committee work, regularly meet with their students, and participate in the six training sessions. The mentee volunteers to engage in service learning through committee work, meet regularly with their mentor, and participate in six training sessions. To build a more connected cohort, the teams will participate in social media communication in between sessions. The teams will work together and across the cohort to find solutions to improve their campus. By working together as partners the mentor and the mentee have the ability to share their expertise as
they leverage their skills. As the teams professionally develop in mentorship, civic engagement, and professionalism, they will practice “netiquette” as they engage with social media. The training sessions, the practical problems of shared governance, and campus life will help bond the teams and/or cohort into intergenerational reciprocal learning. My hope is that the mentoring teams use this opportunity as a launching point for their future aspirations and civic engagement.

**Program Proposal**

**Thematic concern:** American higher education graduates students that are unaware of their civic duty and under-prepared to participate in civic action. Since graduate and doctoral students are electing to further their education, higher education has an increased responsibility to ensure their graduates are equipped to participate and succeed in civic life.

**Program description:** A formalized mentorship program for graduate students through the vehicle of shared governance to equip participants to more fully engage in civic action while improving diversity, equity, and inclusion in governance.

**Program goals:**

1. Create a sustainable program to teach graduate students how to engage in civic action to become lifelong civically engaged students.
2. Increase diversity, equity, and inclusion in governance throughout the institution.
3. Enhance the value of shared governance on campus.

**Program objectives:**

1. Develop interdisciplinary intergenerational mentorship to increase graduate student understanding of civic action.
2. Identify opportunities for student participation in shared governance.
3. Provide leadership and professional development opportunities for university personnel that are well versed in student mentorship to bring new colleagues into their practice.
4. Provide research-based training for university personnel mentors to increase their mentoring skill-set.

**Program learning outcomes:**

Upon completion of this program participants will be able to:

1. Articulate how to participate in governance from entering governance to making changes in governance and multiple signposts within the process.

2. Analyze policies and procedures to identify ways to improve a system.

3. Identify the stakeholders and power structures involved in shared governance related to their area of concern.

4. Describe how to acquire allies to make informed decisions and to enact change.

5. Engage the university community in civic discourse across groups, departments, and generations.

6. Express the impact the mentoring program had on their experience in shared governance.

7. Explain future action participants will take as a result of the program.

To learn more about how these goals and learning objectives are achieved, please refer to (Appendix A) for the program matrix depicting their relationship.

**Program key components:**

1. Shared Governance

2. Mentor/Mentee Program

3. Using Twitter to facilitate professional dialogue

**Component 1: Shared Governance**

As a child of two politically active lawyers, I have been observing and participating in the political process as long as I can remember. As a little girl, I remember watching news coverage of the second woman inducted into the Supreme Court, Ruth Bader Ginsberg, Notorious RBG. As I entered my
final undergraduate program as a post-traditional career switcher from a male-dominated field, I began
to follow RBG’s work more closely. RBG said, “Women belong in all places where decisions are being
made. ... It shouldn't be that women are the exception” (Cary, M. K., 2009). Although RBG was not
perfect, she had a very strong commitment to women’s issues and her interview had me begin to
process, “Why do people speak for others?” My research led me to a famous disabilities rights slogan,
“Nothing About Us Without Us” (Carmel, 2020), and a literary preoccupation with having a “seat at the
table” (St-Victor, M., & Racicot, I. (2020).

Examining the “table” to determine who is missing and then inviting them to a seat is only the
beginning of the change process. While working on my capstone for the Institute for Cultural
Competence & Inclusive Excellence, I had the distinct pleasure of helping move that needle. I beta-
tested year one of my intervention by completing an institutional review, interviewing leaders, and
compiling a report about the current state of student participation in shared governance at my home
institution. I determined that an institutional wide communication plan would have to be implemented
to increase transparency about what the committees do as well as when and where they meet. One of
the crowning achievements of this project was collaborating with the Graduate Student Association
President and Vice President for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion on a survey to include more student
participants in the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committees. I made an adaptation of this survey to
match mentees to committees in Appendix H.

Having a “seat” and using the “seat” are two distinctly different actions. It does not matter if
there is a person in a “seat” if they do not have the means or ability to use their seat. During my beta
test, interviews yielded two conflicting views of student participation. Students complained that they did
not know what to do when they were there. Faculty/Staff complained that the lack of continuity and
consistency in student participation resulted in a hesitancy to invite student participation. My
mentorship intervention was designed to ensure that students will gain both confidence in their abilities
and the means to use their seats at the proverbial table. *More than Just a Seat at the Table* was born from my commitment to ensuring that students have the means, opportunity, and motive to become successfully civically engaged.

**Why use shared governance?**

In chapter 1, shared governance was defined, in its simplest form, as a way to provide everyone the means and opportunity to affect the structures that rule their lives. It leverages the expertise of professionals while combining the expertise of the people impacted into culturally relevant policies. Currently, students have the potential but seldom the means or opportunity to participate. It has real-world applications outside of school besides running for office. In its most basic form, interview panels use shared governance to make hiring decisions, essential services use shared governance to apply for grants, train volunteers, etc., and volunteer organizations use it to inform most operating decisions. Since shared governance is used in so many areas vital to our communities, people need practice.

This mentorship program was selected for the shared governance model for three reasons: (1) breadth of areas of interest; (2) diversity of committee representation; (3) connection to the mission of higher education of preparing students to be successful members of their community. Higher education committees run the gamut of functions from public safety to strategic planning and almost everything in-between. Traditionally, mentors are assigned to mentees based on their area of research however, this program will allow mentors and mentees to connect through an area of mutual interest. Because committees are responsible for such a wide berth of governance, participation on the committees is not exclusive to one type of stakeholder. This mentorship program encourages anyone from a committee to mentor so faculty, staff, and community members can gain mentoring professional development. Since committees are not exclusive to higher education, student mentees will be participating in both an area of community service while developing employability skills.

**Component 2: The Mentor Team**
The genesis of this intervention is a blended approach from best practices in civics education and mentorship development. Many of the mentor tasks and responsibilities are adapted from the PA K-12 Teacher Induction Program (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2019). After beginning Induction in multiple districts, I discovered positive attributes to carry into this program i.e. mentor/mentee task list, training sessions around central themes, surveys to inform future sessions, etc. Although I specifically applied this model to graduate students and their mentors, the same program tenets could be applied to multiple facets of higher education.

Building upon, NASPA/ACPA professional competencies, this mentorship program is designed to identify and cultivate skills in participants to become more skilled civically engaged leaders. Influential group members with group support that are well informed, seek others’ opinions, and initiate new ideas, can be invaluable to a leader (Northouse, p. 8). Some people expect their leader or boss to be a mentor however, not all leaders/bosses are mentors but not all mentors are leaders, and that is okay. By engaging volunteers in governance that seek feedback and are willing to develop as stronger mentors, an institution increases its pool of intermediate leaders.

From an institutional standpoint, this intervention is designed to combat a lack of succession planning in higher education. Although higher education requires professional development the development is utilized unevenly. Often, faculty and staff participate in either institutional-sponsored training or expensive national training without any connection to promotion (Cavanaugh, 2017). Cavanaugh rightly explains that lack of planning results in staff discerning the institution’s training is inferior and/or no amount of job experience is enough to satisfy the board. In the anthesis of logic, staff move-out to move-up in higher education leaving the developing institution with a dearth of leaders (Cavanaugh, 2017). As mentoring teams grow their skills and network throughout this program, they will become more appealing leaders.

Pre-Program Planning (Year 1)
“In truth, whatever is worth doing at all, is worth doing well…”
(Stanhope, 1746)

This pre-program year is vital to a successful program kickoff. Each step in the review process is designed to get a complete picture of the institutional governance program. From finding committees, speaking to committee leaders, and sharing information, this pre-programming year is full of research and politicking to attract groups, committee members, and mentors to the program.

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) plan is optional however there is very little existing research on graduate student mentorships outside of the medical fields. I have found zero research about graduate students and shared governance or intergenerational mentoring in higher education. Also, I have found zero research about mixed mentoring groups and graduate students, meaning drawing mentors from multiple fields and/or positions (faculty, staff, professional staff, etc.). Completing the IRB process to publish/present findings from this program to add to a dearth in literature. The *More than Just a Seat at the Table* Staff Guide Book (Appendix D) details the pre-programming year fully as well as explains what the leadership does during the implementation year (Program Year 2).

*More than Just a Seat at the Table (Program Year 2)*

This full-year mentorship training program for graduate student leaders and institutional members participating in shared governance. This length of time is necessary to build relationships and show growth. In my experience, mentoring is most successful with regular and consistent contact but committees meet at irregular intervals and the cohort only meets six times total. Through two training sessions a semester, the teams will leave with skills to practice. Mentors and mentees will naturally meet at their committee meetings and for committee functions. Each semester will culminate with a social celebration where they share their knowledge with the community. These social celebrations are designed to increase awareness of shared governance as well as provide the teams with the momentum
to continue. Throughout these meetings, the mentors/mentees will demonstrate their learnings so that the steering committee can assess growth and/or redirect future sessions.

There are two manuals referenced in this component. The More than Just a Seat at the Table Staff Guide Book (Appendix D) explains what the Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention and the Graduate Assistant do behind the scenes during year 2. The More than Just a Seat at the Table Mentoring Team Plan (Appendix E) explains what the team learns and completes during the program. Below, I have included explanations of some of the program highlights but each appendix is broken down by semester to help with facilitation.

**Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention and the Graduate Assistant Fall Year 2: Data**

This pilot year is the first data year. This first cohort will set the tone for all future cohorts. It is important to evaluate all feedback to improve the experience for this cohort and recruit future cohorts. The IRB process requires data collection and data analysis to follow a strict code of ethics. It is vital that this first real set of data be evaluated thoroughly to determine survey effectiveness and to meet the IRB protocol. The data must also be evaluated to determine its value in order to make adjustments in future plans for training. The future of this program hinges on its ability to provide value added training for its mentoring pairs.

**Mentor/ Mentee Fall Social (Presidential Gala) Program Year 2:**

Most institutions have a fancy major donor event before the end of the tax year. These major events are designed to bring influential partners together in a festive setting to garner extra donations from wealthy people/organizations that may have under-forecasted their income. These events bring everyone from prestigious alumni and wealthy landowners to prominent business people and leading politicians together for a night of merriment.
More than Just a Seat at the Table will be in attendance for two reasons: displayed commitment to the mentoring program and recruitment. As a key feature at the gala, the entire community will see your institution’s commitment to More than Just a Seat at the Table. For institutional partners, this novel idea can be the impetus to get these partners more involved. Whether they decide to volunteer as mentors, participate in committees, commit to future planning, etc. more involvement is the goal of these events. As the highlight of an institution’s social calendar, this is free unbridled access to many of the most influential stakeholders in the institution for the mentoring teams. A free invitation with prime seating at this event is a valuable networking opportunity. The teams will be leaving for Winter Break on a high excited about what they have done and what is yet to come, the teams will be enthusiastic about finishing up the year.

Mentor/ Mentee Spring Social (Poster Presentation and Graduation) Program Year 2:

This social has multiple purposes. The poster presentation is an opportunity for the mentoring teams to demonstrate their knowledge as well as help the community understands what they have learned and completed. This presentation will give the mentoring teams experience with thesis, dissertation, and/or conference style presentations with cohort support. This practice will be invaluable for graduate students as they prepare for graduation.

The social and celebratory component is the Graduation Ceremony. The ceremony brings together campus leadership, students/ staff/ faculty/ administrators/deans/ trustees/ supervisors and the teams’ families to celebrate their accomplishments. After spending a year together, the mentor teams receive swag, network with leaders, and introduce their families to the work that they have been doing together. It is not often in higher education that mentors and mentees get to bring their personal and professional lives together to celebrate their accomplishments. This graduation is meant to celebrate the participant for the whole person that they are and the growth that they have demonstrated throughout this program.
Component 3: Using Twitter to Facilitate Professional Dialogue

Due to the diverse nature of the participants, there are both in-person and online components to the program. The mentor teams will formally meet three times a semester with their cohort and meet their committee as scheduled. Six total meetings with the cohort are not enough to build a strong sense of community but six meetings are a lot to incorporate into a graduate student’s life. Being respectful of practical life constraints, technology has the ability to help bridge the gap in time and space.

I have reviewed multiple communication options weighing the pros and cons for ease of use, cost, time to learn, etc. Faculty and staff do not always use the same Learning Management Systems, LMS, and community partners do not have access to the LMS. Since committee mentors draw from a diverse pool, granting them access and training them to use an LMS is a major undertaking. This training has a limited return on investment because the mentor pool is unlikely to use the LMS again. Plus, LMS are not designed for social interaction, they are designed as learning platforms.

After extensive consideration of various LMS, I propose that the social media site, Twitter be used to facilitate communication between the cohort. Students and faculty prefer Twitter over other social media platforms due to ease of use, mobility across devices/platforms, and perceived safety of the platform (Bista, 2015) (Luo, et al, 2020) (Pieterse, et al., 2014). Effectively utilizing and managing technology is a professional competency required of all higher education professionals that is ubiquitous in other fields (ACPA & NASPA, 2015, pg 33). Industries are requesting that applicants have developed more social media skills (Freberg, et al, 2018).

Professional Competencies Most Valuable Player: Social Justice Competency (ACPA/NASPA)

Social Justice and Inclusion is the competency that birthed this thematic concern. “... (S)ocial justice is defined as both a process and a goal that includes the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to create learning environments that foster equitable participation of all groups and seeks to address issues of oppression, privilege, and power “(ACPA & NASPA, 2015, p. 30).
Despite my best efforts through an institutional review, hours of interviews, dozens of emails, and public comments in multiple open forums, I really struggled to find a path to participate in governance at my institution. This intervention is structured to help others combat this injustice at every level of their institution. After students are included, guided mentorship is imperative to ensure that students can successfully combat a formalized educational career of disenfranchisement.

It is imperative to note that your institutional review will inform if inclusion in this context equals diversity. If your institution had uneven or unempowered wallflower graduate student participation in committees, this program may equal diversity because a previously excluded population is included and active in the process. However, including all parties in decisions that affect their lives should be the bare-bones minimum of any inclusion plan. No education body should ever be satisfied with achieving the lowest attainment because education is a cyclical process of reflection and growth. My intervention builds upon this growth process through three other ACPA/NASPA Competencies: Student Learning and Development Competency, Leadership, and Technology. Appendix B is a table that I have created to further explain how these ACPA/NASPA competencies affect my intervention.

**Service Learning Challenges**

As discussed in chapter three, there are ethical concerns about power dynamics in service learning. These power struggles are not isolated incidents and therefore implementors need to be mindful to avoid common missteps from service learning that negatively impact their community. Burton, et. al., (2019) suggested one method that I will investigate further in the future from the institutional end, “complex systems theory can be of benefit to service-learning practice in a conceptual, operational, and strategic capacity.” When discussing systems, there is a danger in replication and commodification of a process.

Taking a prepackaged approach to a community partnership and community issue, can lose a vital component to the solution, the community. Wollschleger, et al. (2020) expressed their concerns
with “traditional service learning models” while working to combat what they viewed as flaws in their universities’ systems (p. 7). Wollschleger, et al. (2020) were concerned that the unequal power dynamics of the student/university/community organization was “diminishing the capacity of local organizations” (p. 7). Wollschleger, et al. explained how they restructured their singular service learning class to address the power imbalance for the 2017-2018 school year (Wollschleger, et al. 2020). Although the Wollschleger case study is a positive example of a large change made in a small place, schools would need to orchestrate a major rehaul of their community engagement protocols to build the capacity for service learning that students are requesting.

There are serious ethical concerns about power dynamics in service learning. These power struggles are not isolated incidents Compano, et al. decided to use, “community-based research: research alongside, rather than merely on, community members that take seriously their own questions, forms of knowledge, and interests” (Compano, p.30). By taking the community based research approach, Compano and his team at UPenn were able to forge a more than five-year partnership with Saint Thomas Aquinas Parish/School in South Philadelphia. The team had to work with many of the parish committees in multiple languages to build a mutually enriching partnership. Without the communication with multiple stakeholders in the parish, there would have been a fragile university partnership, less parish participation, and ultimately less robust outcomes. Despite the celebrated work of the Compano, et al, See found in his research from the same university five years earlier, even mega institutions like UPenn, have not grown large enough service learning/community engagement departments to meet the student demand (See, 2010).

**Valid Twitter Concerns**

Using Twitter to facilitate cohort communication poses significant challenges. Between staff challenges to build the private list and training the cohort to use this function, your team will need to become seasoned Twitter users to assist the mentoring teams. Adding a social media component to this
program is a lofty goal intended for institutions to add to a strong shared governance mentorship program that wants to expand into marketable technology skills. Using Twitter could be incorporated into a fledgling program if the program was specifically governing a program or pulling from a program that uses Twitter in their field, i.e. medical, nursing, marketing, etc.

Although Twitter seems the easiest to navigate for the users, my setup experience was very challenging. After watching multiple tutorials and receiving technical assistance, I was able to set up a “list” to create a closed group. The personal privacy settings required to ensure private posts demand that the list members follow each other to hold private chats. Another wrinkle with the privacy settings is that it is unclear if list members can still Tweet the outside world to network as intended. Once the user opens up their privacy settings their Tweets within the list might become public. To ensure participant privacy, the program sponsors need to beta test the list function to create their private group. Currently, all social media platforms undergo regular updates. It is impossible to say if the Twitter challenges that exist while I publish this will exist when you attempt to run this program. You will need to work with your Advisory Committee to simulate the same process that the mentor/mentees will use so that you can assess if this is the best program for your team.

Also, there are limits to the current research. Most social media research in professional development encompasses Facebook and Twitter with limited mention of WhatsApp. Most professional development research in higher education surrounds in-person models or LMS challenges. I found absolutely zero research about how higher education uses social media for professional development in spite of the large body of research conducted by professors about social media applications in their classes. Also, I found no research in higher education about reverse mentoring and/or intergenerational mentoring despite the touted positive influences in higher education. Hopefully, some of the currently “in-process” scholarship surrounds these major gaps in the research due to the Pandemic shift to online life.
Chapter conclusions

In this chapter, I have discussed how the ACPA/NASPA professional competencies are woven throughout More than Just a Seat at the Table. I have reviewed how the program components combine to meet the program goals, objectives and learning outcomes. In the next chapter, I will explore More than Just a Seat at the Table’s budget, leadership requirements, limitations, and future considerations.
Chapter 5
Implementation & Evaluation

Implementation

This intervention is a complex program with multiple stakeholders that need to participate along their own tracks to implement this program. (For more information review Appendix D and E). There is at least an entire year of preplanning that needs to occur before this program is launched. During this planning year, the team needs to utilize Backward Design to ensure that their recruitment and training match their Program Goals and Outcomes (Appendix A) (Bowen, 2017). By keeping the end in mind, the leadership team will more effectively hire faculty experts to lead training, locate community partners for value-added discussions, and recruit mentoring teams.

Year 1 Pre-Programming

Implementation of this program will not be quick or easy. I am explaining one path to building your leadership team. As you speak to your colleagues, recruit them to join a preliminary Steering Committee. The Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention (AD of GSR), Graduate Student Association and Student Government Association advisors would be ideal candidates to join your journey to building this program. The Steering Committee is going to help you gather support to hire staff to run this program. If an institution does not currently have an AD of GSR, it would behoove the institution to consider creating this position. (Appendix C is an example of an AD of GSR job posting adapted from Emerson College and the University of Illinois at Chicago). Since they will become the face of the steering committee, recruitment, and training, they should be onboarded in enough time to affect the programming. In the absence of an AD of GSR, another advisor could begin this program but the Steering Committee will have to assist this advisor in negotiating release time.
The staff member launching this program will need a Graduate Assistant (GA) as the Programming Assistant for this pre-planning year. From learning to build with the school's web platform to providing a student perspective in the Steering Committee, the GA will need to be trained to ensure that the program remembers its ideals. As orientation draws closer, the GA credit hours should be increased to six or nine to match the increased workload. This team is responsible for constructing all of the details/infrastructure of the program before the "launch" of the program. Ideally, this GA will be able to work from Fall year one through at least Fall year two to provide the GA with the most experience with shared governance.

Below I have explained some of the implementation components that require Backwards Design before the program launch in year 2 (Bowen, 2017). There are more program highlights in chapter 4 as well as outlined guidebooks in Appendix D and E. Chapters 4 and 5 must be read in conjunction with Appendix D and E to gain a fuller understanding of the program.

**Graduate Assistant (GA) Transition Plan**

This GA is the assistant to running this program. In year one the GA is the lead researcher, web developer, program planner, and student voice to the Steering Committee. As each year progresses the GA gains more visibility and responsibility for program implementation, recruitment, and data management for publication. Having the current GA assist in recruiting and interviewing their replacement search committee style would give the GA another opportunity to develop a shared governance skill.

To ensure the long term success of this program, the Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention, AD of GSR, and the current GA need to regularly update the GA job description, Guide Books, cloud storage of presentations, etc. It is imperative to agree on a file structure and naming convention that has its own explanation document so that other people can find files during their transition. It is suggested that the first GA be hired for a least a year and a half term so that they can experience both
the pre-planning year and program implementation. Since GAs are a transient workforce, I can not stress the importance of constantly updating the staff files and transition plan to ensure success from year to year.

**Cohort Retention Plan**

Once cohort 1 graduates, retention is key. The Steering Committee needs to work with the staff to develop a plan that makes sense for your institution. You have invested time, money, and talent into developing them, so you do not want them to wander away. Your team needs to decide how difficult it was to gather release time for the participants in order to decide the best course of action. You definitely want to invite them to join this steering committee and the alumni association committees but what are other options that you can provide? At a bare minimum, the team needs to develop a semester newsletter that showcases alumni action, current cohort work, and opportunities to continue their governance work. During Summer 2 the staff must send them two emails this summer, a post-graduation email with photos and a Fall involvement email. It is imperative to follow up with the cohorts to retain their talent and enthusiasm after they complete the program.

**Marketing More than Just a Seat at the Table**

Marketing is a multiphase process. There is marketing necessary to get this program approved. A needs assessment and allies will help you strategize to pitch this program to leaders. Your allies will be instrumental to proving community interest from committees, faculty/staff, etc. to bolster your pitch. Your institution’s governance structure will determine your best course but can use many of the same ideas in Marketing (Appendix F) that you are using to attract mentors and mentees.

After *More than Just a Seat at the Table* is approved and budgeted, the community wide marketing begins. The *More than Just a Seat at the Table* Staff Guide Book (Appendix D) lists committee/ potential mentor information sessions in Fall year 1 to gauge current interest in hosting this program. The Steering Committee will help refine the ideas in Marketing (Appendix F) to persuade
committees/ mentors to commit. The Spring year 1 information sessions are more targeted to the most likely committees/mentors that have not committed to the program yet. These commitments before Spring Break year 1 are vital so that the Graduate Assistant (GA) can update the website and update the student interest forms. A special marketing plan will need to be developed to reach the staff/faculty that are not obliged to committee work to join *More than Just a Seat at the Table* to meet Program Outcome 2-3 (Appendix A).

After Spring Break year 1, the graduate student recruitment begins. Through an email blast from the Graduate School and posts on relevant social media feeds students will learn about the student information sessions for *More than Just a Seat at the Table*. The Graduate Student Association and the Steering Committee will help funnel information sessions to target programs that are most likely to commit. Your Steering Committee is going to help you determine appropriate recruitment goals.

Graduate programs and graduate students are diverse. They have a complex set of needs that need to be calculated into the recruitment goals. If half of your graduate student population works full time or a third of your graduate students participate in clinical rotations your recruitment goals need to consider your population. For additional marketing advice review Appendix F.

**More than Just a Seat at the Table’s Budget:**

Talent and skills never come cheaply. The largest expense on the budget is staffing. Part of the needs assessment should include an evaluation of your graduate student attrition. If your institution is an outlier for the national average of 50% attrition, finds population trends in the attrition rates, and/or your graduate student population is a sizable portion of your total population, you may need to hire an AD of GSR (Cassuto, 2013). If your institution already has an AD of GSR, changing the scope of their work could require a redistribution of duties within the office. As the leadership roles are negotiated, a Graduate Assistant should be onboarded to complete the research and administrative tasks for *More
than Just a Seat at the Table. Employing a GA will embody many of the program ideals. All of the budget items are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>Cost:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention</td>
<td>Salary. Review Appendix C for job position details.</td>
<td>$67-83,000k (commensurate with experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>Serves as the program assistant to make this intervention run.</td>
<td>Year 1: $7K per semester Year 2: $15K per semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation food</td>
<td>Box lunches &amp; drinks</td>
<td>$15 per participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation team building activities</td>
<td>By using campus facilities and resources this cost will be the negotiated “program fee.”</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art supplies</td>
<td>Poster board, markers, scissors, etc</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty facilitators</td>
<td>Drawing on local expertise faculty will lead training</td>
<td>8x $300 stipends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall/Spring meeting snacks</td>
<td>Drinks &amp; snacks</td>
<td>$10 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Service Activity</td>
<td>Cost to cover building supplies and/or transportation</td>
<td>$300 ish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation food</td>
<td>Appetizer type food (Pita, veggie tray, cookie/ brownie tray, drinks)</td>
<td>$15 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation swag</td>
<td>Certificates in folders; School pennants to hang in office; Program Nalgene; Alumni Association extras</td>
<td>Pennants= $11.99; Customized Nalgenes= $25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>printed signs/ flyers</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**More than Just a Seat at the Table’s potential extra costs:**

It is impossible to plan for every eventuality, but I have included some extra costs below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>Cost:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gala wear and/or transportation</td>
<td>Each Presidential Gala has a unique theme and location. The mentoring teams may need assistance with both variables. (i.e. Few people keep prom dresses and/or tuxedos. Campus shuttles may not reach the location, etc.)</td>
<td>This needs to be negotiated with your campus clothing bank, President’s Office, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release time</td>
<td>Program goal 2 is to increase diversity, equity, and inclusion in institutional governance. Program Outcome 2-3 (Appendix A) has clear mentor recruiting goals from outside the traditional tenure track faculty and the staff roles with committee work in their job descriptions. The goal is to offer professional development and governance skills to the non-traditional participants in the campus</td>
<td>For year 1, I suggest you take the highest hourly pay rate at your institution, like a boiler plant operator or HVAC leader, and multiply it by 20 hours times three employees. I.e. $37.50 x 20 x 3 = $2,250.00. Then increase it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
community. Due to employment constraints, “substitutes” may need to be hired so that mentors can attend their committee meetings and **More than Just a Seat at the Table** training. You should consider a no overtime policy for this training so that the program is not paying double overtime for participants due to snow removal on holidays in the same week. ***Even as this issue is addressed there is a quandary for committee work since some of the committee members will be paid for their time/work while others are not. This will need creative problem solving to address equity issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Space</th>
<th>A new physical space will have to be carved out within the Graduate School or in Academic Affairs next to Undergraduate Student Retention so that this position can collaborate with related programs/offices.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff reclassification</td>
<td>If you already have an Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention, adding this program to their responsibilities will require them to offload responsibilities elsewhere. This work redistribution results in the reevaluation of another staff position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Funding More than Just a Seat at the Table:** |

My GA positions have taught me that funding in higher education can seem more like creative math than real math. The seemingly obvious answer to funding this intervention would be the Graduate School and graduate student fees but the answer depends on each institution. Every part of this program budget may need to come out of different pools of money.

Since this is a graduate student program, program supplies could be split between graduate student fees and human resources. For example, the cost for supplies based on 30 participants is $4,095 pre-tax. Also, the Steering Committee could solicit alumni donations earmarked for this program to offset the program supplies. As the program grows, it will be able to leverage economies of scale to order a larger quantity of items for a cheaper per unit price. If your department has a good relationship with your bookstore, you may be able to leverage their purchasing power to get better rates on your swag.
Funding the staffing is going to be more difficult. Personnel budgets may be separate from student employee budgets and with separate funds for each department, college, and office. Adding a new staff position can require a petition, temporary status until funding is proven, etc. It might be necessary to add *More than Just a Seat at the Table* to a similar undergraduate role and go through the staff reclassification process in the meantime. Funding for the GA will be easier because you can gather GA funding through multiple pools. For example, Student Success could split costs with the Graduate School or Institutional Research could split costs with the graduate program that loses the most students for graduation. Alumni may be willing to make earmarked donations for graduate student positions that relate to critical action research, data analysis, government leadership, etc.

**Leading More than Just a Seat at the Table:**

My multigenerational family provided me with a wealth of experiences to develop my understanding of leaders versus leadership. My father’s father, Carl, was an ornery and gruff war hero that was misunderstood by the people closest to him. During his conscription, Carl’s ingenuity, determination, and acquired skills saved both his life and the lives of his unit regularly. Carl returned to the war front after all three of his Purple Hearts and his Silver Star because he did not want to leave his men with a cowardly or incompetent leader. There is no doubt in my mind that everything that I value and recognize in leaders, i.e distrust of authoritarianism, decisive in emergencies, competency, vision, courageousness, problem-solving, thriftiness, etc. is due to what he has taught me.

Leadership is an extremely complex and nuanced idea. Regardless of the type of leadership, all leaders move a group of people to complete a goal/task. Also, the most appropriate leadership models can be situationally and culturally dependent. The most successful leaders are able to navigate the situational, social, and environmental conditions to select the most appropriate leadership model to suit the situation.
Transformational leaders need to complete the same managerial duties as effective leaders but they need to do so much more. Effective leaders have, “the ability to influence overall group effectiveness” (Northouse, p. 4). These leaders do what is necessary to keep the program and team on track. These leaders accept input and change things immediately related to current goals so that they can “do the right thing” (Northouse, p. 13). Burns is cited as explaining transformational leadership as, “when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (Northouse, p. 4). This is the leadership style that would be most effective for my mentorship program because it will require an institution-wide commitment to the program to flourish.

Effective and Transactional leaders will be some of the largest opponents of my mentoring intervention. Effective leaders will require the most data and personal anecdotes to convince them to adopt a new mode of communication and professional development program because it does not immediately impact the realm of their work. Transactional leaders prefer to set their own goals and have their teams reach their predetermined goals (Mohajeri, 2021). Blurring the lines of responsibility for student mentorship and department-specific professional development will be challenging for transactional leaders to accept. Transactional leaders may appreciate the data from related fields about the effectiveness of social media for professional development and learning communities. Autocratic leaders were automatically excluded from consideration because they exert their will across all decisions with little if any input (Mohajeri, 2021).

I see much of myself and Carl reflected in Kouzes and Posner’s The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership (1983). By “Modeling the Way,” I will never ask someone to do something that I am unwilling to do (1983). I “Challenge the Process” by constantly seeking new areas to improve myself, others, and my community (1983). Part of leadership is knowing when to stand up verses when to stand beside someone. Despite my many strong points as a transformational leader, I am aware that I am not the right
person to be the face of this program. This level of transformation requires a charismatic leader that enjoys the political dance required to gain support from so many affected parties.

Although I am not the right spokesperson for this program, I am a relational leader (Mohajeri, 2021). In the budget “potential extra costs”, I would be ideal for “staff reclassification.” I would love to work alongside the AD of GSR to facilitate this program. The AD of GSR would be the official spokesperson for this program but I could be the engine that makes most of this program happen. I can gather the initial Steering Committee to conduct the needs assessment and build a case for this program. I could mentor the GA through their intense task list. I have strong skills in administrative tasks like website design and survey data interpretation that help prepare the GA for future roles in executing a program. I can help the GA with marketing the program, cofacilitating inquiry sessions, and onboarding participants in orientation to prepare the GA for future human resource management. I would be proud to support this program by leading this program from behind the scenes instead of directly out in front.

Assessment & Evaluation of More than Just a Seat at the Table

In shared governance, assessment and evaluation are crucial to planning and making improvements to the program. By surveying the mentoring teams at the end of every session, the teams can express what they would like to learn about leadership, goal setting, and other forms of governance participation. Through responsive planning, the information is used to gather partners for the next training session. From a critical action research viewpoint, responsive planning helps the mentoring teams feel more engaged with the research because their input is reflected in the program design.

Evaluation of Service Learning

Evaluation is a tool used to see how well the program did what it set out to do. Evaluating service-learning success/engagement is more nuanced than traditional learning and programming
because there are no final exams or grades. The final poster presentation at graduation is a synthesis of the mentoring teams’ experiences throughout the program. The poster presentation will inform how well the teams met their learning objectives. Due to scientific bias discussed in chapter 3, the artifacts created for evaluation may be subject to additional scrutiny. Artifacts like the surveys and the poster presentations will be combined to determine if you met Program Goals 1 and 3 in the short term (Appendix A). The team composition will determine if you are on track to meet Program Goal 2, Increase diversity, equity, and inclusion in shared governance throughout the institution (Appendix A). The retention plan for the cohort is vital to discover the longitudinal data necessary to determine if the graduates meet Program Outcome 3-3: Explain future action participants will take as a result of the program (Appendix A). The retention plan’s newsletter and additional areas for participation will help the staff locate the cohort years out from their participation to administer surveys to gather longitudinal data.

**Limitations & Looking Ahead**

As with any program there are limitations to More than Just a Seat at the Table. Students can only participate if mentors agree to serve. Even as this program builds capacity, there will always be more students than committees limiting who can experience this program. For further details about additional limitations, please see Appendix K.

Given more time, a deeper dive into South African research on shared governance could be valuable background knowledge. South Africa has imposed legal mandates for student participation in higher education’s shared governance. There is some research about staff/faculty attitudes about their and/or undergraduate student participation in shared governance. I found anecdotal comments about undergraduate attitudes regarding their participation in shared governance but no longitudinal studies about their continued civic engagement. I could not locate any data about mentorship for shared governance nor graduate student participation in shared governance. A future collaboration for
research could be comparing student participation in shared governance between the U.S. and South Africa to learn from each other. This would inform how to strengthen this mentoring program.

**Conclusion**

Governance is a complicated beast further convoluted by higher education processes. Each institution has to decide on limits to impose on its implementation plan to mitigate some of the challenges your team will face during your inaugural implementation years. Despite the challenges, the implications for diversity, equity, and inclusion, graduate student persistence, and civic engagement are worth the endeavor.

As with any change in governance, there is a possibility that this program could be implemented as a placation attempt by people in power. If students are only admitted to low level committees with low level mentors, it is possible that they will be completely shielded from the real inner workings of government. On the surface, participants might be able to practice governance roles and effect low level change. However, the process may not have enough meaning to have long term impacts on participant behavior and/or attract new participants to the program. This is a concern that the entire *More than Just a Seat at the Table* community must be vigilant to protect against.
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### More than Just a Seat at the Table’s Program Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goal 1:</th>
<th>Create a sustainable program to teach graduate students how to engage in civic action to become lifelong civically engaged students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Outcome 1-1:</td>
<td>Articulate how to participate in governance from entering governance to making changes in governance and multiple signposts within the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Outcome 1-2:</td>
<td>Analyze policies and procedures to identify ways to improve a system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Outcome 1-3:</td>
<td>Identify the stakeholders and power structures involved in shared governance related to their area of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Outcome 1-4:</td>
<td>Describe how to acquire allies to make informed decisions and to enact change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome:</th>
<th>Participant Demonstration:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LO 1: Participants will examine the current committee bylaws and rules related to their committee to propose at least one change to the current process.</td>
<td>This will be measured during the poster presentations before their graduation ceremony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO 2: Participants will be able to explain at what point in community life would be affected by their proposal and how it would affect shared governance.</td>
<td>This will be measured during the poster presentations before their graduation ceremony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO 3: Students will be able to explain the stakeholders and power structures related to their committee.</td>
<td>Students will present these in a mentee session in order to see which stakeholders and power structures overlap with other people’s committee work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO 4: Participants will be able to identify at least one new campus ally not currently serving on the committee to gain input on their committee work.</td>
<td>An online survey for the interviewer and the interviewee will confirm this work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Goal 2: Increase diversity, equity, and inclusion in shared governance throughout the institution.

Program Outcome 2-1: The mentoring program will graduate mentor/mentee pairs from 50% of university committees in year 1, 55% by year 2, and 60% by year 3 with incremental increases thereafter.

Program Outcome 2-2: The mentoring program will field student applicants from 20% of the graduate programs in year 1, 25% in year 2, and 30% in year 3 with incremental increases thereafter.

Program Outcome 2-3: The mentoring program will field mentor applicants from 15% of institutional employees/stakeholders outside of tenure track faculty and managers in year 1, 20% in year 2, and 25% in year 3 with incremental increases thereafter. This goal is vital to ensure that mentors herald from multiple job classifications, i.e. facilities, campus safety, administrative assistants, etc. and to ensure diverse representation in governance.
Program Goal 3: Enhance the value of shared governance on campus.

Program Outcome 3-1: Engage the university community in civic discourse across groups, departments, and generations.

Program Outcome 3-2: Express the impact the mentoring program had on their experience in shared governance.

Program Outcome 3-3: Explain future action participants will take as a result of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives:</th>
<th>Participant demonstration:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LO 1: Participants will evaluate program material, governance committee, their faculty/ staff/ classmate interactions and community partners in order to identify holes in the program and find new partners/ participants. | ● Participants will evaluate every session to provide feedback and propose changes to the session. They will also propose new content and community partners for future sessions.  
● Their final reflective evaluation will include an option to provide staff/ faculty/ student recommendations for the next cohort. |
| LO 2: Participants will reflect on their shared governance experience to identify personal growth and opportunities for the program to improve. | ● An online survey will gather this information.  
● This information will also be shared during the poster presentations. |
| LO 3: Participants will predict their future levels of civic engagement. They will share if they will continue with the committee they were working with and/or how they want to engage civically outside of the institution. | ● A one-year, two-year, and five-year survey will be sent to the university email addresses to see if participants’ civic engagement changes over time.  
● The reflective online survey will gather the initial information.  
● This information will also be shared during the poster presentations. |
Appendix B: More than Just a Seat at the Table’s Professional ACPA/ NASPA Competencies
### ACPA/ NASPA Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning and Development</td>
<td>This competency is the one that speaks to my reflective nature. Critical Participatory Action Research is a two-way street, participants and researchers learn from each other. To improve this program and to fill a major void in research, this is a data driven team effort. In my twenty plus years in traditional and non-traditional education settings, I never thought that I would say that I want data. I am used to citing the exact standards that I was using to justify every lesson and provide proof of student learning at the end of every lesson. I struggled with finding the “why” for programs in my graduate assistant positions. I was proud to reform the capstone projects for The Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion to explicitly share what students will learn and how they will display that learning. Reminiscent of my K-12 experience, I have included a table about program goals, objectives, and learning outcomes in my program proposal in Appendix A. I use surveys for every session to collect data to determine how close we are to meeting learning outcomes, what learners want to know, and what learners want to be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“... includes the ability to apply theory to improve and inform student affairs and teaching practice” (ACPA &amp; NASPA, 2015, p 32).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leadership (Mentorship is mentioned in three competencies however “leadership” most accurately describes the experiences designed for the More than Just a Seat at the Table teams.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“... the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required of a leader, with or without positional authority. Leadership involves both the individual role of a leader and the leadership process of individuals working together to envision, plan, and affect change in organizations and respond to broad based constituencies and issues” (ACPA &amp; NASPA, 2015, p. 27).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intermediate levels of this competency speak to the disposition participants would have to be successful in this program. As mentoring teams reconsider what leadership means to them, they are examining and advocating to remove obstacles to change. Through their service learning in shared governance, they are developing their mentoring and leadership skills. As they engage in cohort community building they are continuing their learning when they receive feedback about their mentoring teams and/or committee work. The hope is that More than Just a Seat at the Table propels emerging leaders into advanced levels of action specified in this competency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hope is that More than Just a Seat at the Table propels emerging leaders into advanced levels of action specified in this competency.
| Technology | “Included within this area are knowledge, skills, and dispositions that lead to the generation of digital literacy and digital citizenship within communities of students, student affairs professionals, faculty members, and colleges and universities” (ACPA & NASPA, 2015, p. 33). |
| In a COVID world, it is impossible to divorce education from technology. Digital literacy and digital citizenry should be in the back if not the forefront of educators' minds when they are designing their plans. Technology must be thoughtfully integrated into programs to augment or improve an experience lest it becomes a hindrance to the program. *More than Just a Seat at the Table* uses a proven social media tool, Twitter, to build community within the cohort and to provide training for an in demand job skill. |
Appendix C

_More than Just a Seat at the Table’s_ AD of GSR job posting

Title: Assistant Director for Graduate Student Retention

Salary Range: $67-83,000k (commensurate with experience)

Description:

The Graduate College at the (your institution) is seeking an Assistant Director for Graduate Student Retention who will be responsible for assisting with the planning, implementation, and evaluation of recruitment and retention strategies for the Graduate College (GC). The Assistant Director recommends and implements targeted outreach strategies to internally recruit potential students by building upon and maintaining relationships. The Assistant Director is responsible for the coordination of retention activities and services by assisting with the design and delivery of comprehensive support services to ensure academic success as measured by: retention, time-to-degree, and graduate student graduation rates.

Essential Responsibilities:

- Coordinate and track student success once they matriculate through retention programs and inform campus leadership regarding needed changes to mitigate any retention declines.
- Identify attrition trends to guide the holistic approach to support services for students at risk of not graduating. Report on underrepresented minority graduate student retention issues that may lead to or contribute to attrition and propose changes.
- Develop measurable retention strategies and action plans for key student cohorts across Graduate programs. Identify priorities, strategic goals, and action plans to enhance student progress to degree completion. Collect, analyze, and report student persistence/learning/satisfaction data and compare it to internal/national/peer institution data.
- Collaborate with the (insert the name of your institution’s position here) to provide resources and case management, when needed, for students with complex needs that impact retention.
This includes active participation with the college's behavior intervention team, as well as collaborating on campus-wide education initiatives for supporting students with complex needs.

- Actively engage with students through 1:1 support meetings, small groups, and/or programming geared toward students at varying levels of experience, that impact student retention. Help students explore solutions and leverage resources by encouraging students to take an active role in their learning.

- Serve on the Student Employment Committee to evaluate new opportunities for Graduate Assistants, the GA training/evaluation program, and manage student employment issues.

- Lead the More than Just a Seat at the Table Mentoring program, serve as the leader of the steering committee, train the GA, develop and facilitate the training program.

- Perform other related duties and participate in special projects as assigned.

Essential Qualifications:

- Bachelor's degree or equivalent experience plus a minimum of 3+ years of experience in retention experience at a university.

- Passion for working with college students and the ability to work skillfully and sensitively with students who may be experiencing challenges or seeking additional support in a culturally and socio-economically diverse learning environment.

- Strong written and oral communication skills that include comfort with public speaking and an ability to discuss difficult topics with students in one-on-one settings. Must be able to generate enthusiasm among students and colleagues for programs and initiatives.

- Work collaboratively across areas to create conditions for student success, the successful candidate must have the ability to work successfully with an array of partners and stakeholders.

- Ability as a self-directed, adaptive independent thinker with problem-solving abilities; a high level of interpersonal skills and professionalism.
Preferred Qualifications:

- Master's Degree. Progressively responsible experience in higher education working directly with students.
- Experience developing, leading or supporting retention programs for college-aged students.

***This job posting is adapted from Emerson College and the University of Illinois at Chicago. (Emerson College, 2022) (University of Illinois at Chicago, 2021).
Appendix D

More than Just a Seat at the Table
Staff Guidebook***

Year 1 is a complete preplanning year. Staffing will need to increase as workload increases to manage the multiple facets of this program. Between web design, social media management, committee meetings, interest meetings, and program design, the staff has a lot of exciting things happening this year!

***This manual is a work in progress that must be edited to fit the needs of your institution.

GA/AD of GSR Fall Year 1:

1. Institutional Review: A GA will complete an institutional wide review to locate the committees, working groups, and leadership bylaws to include student representation when applicable.
   a. The GA must comb the school website to locate all of the committees and working groups with a web presence. A document must be compiled of the name of the group, their web link, the name of their chair/leaders.
   b. This review is necessary to ensure that all applicable groups are included in the outreach to build a steering committee as well as to identify which committees are open to mentoring graduate students. This review is vital as it will inform the scale to which a school will attempt to implement this intervention.

2. The Graduate Assistant Committee Cross-Check:
   a. Next, the GA will cross-check their findings with the campus calendar to see which committees/groups meet.
   b. Work with the Graduate Student Association, GSA, to double-check which committees already have graduate student representation. They will discuss how to best approach those committees to participate in the mentoring program.
c. Work with the Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention to identify if there are any gaps in the governance list.

d. Provide the list to the webmaster so that the webmaster can double-check the contact information listed on the website for each committee.

3. **The Governance Group Pitch:** (For additional marketing advice review Appendix F.)

   a. The Graduate Assistant will work with the Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention to create marketing materials and presentation materials for the program to pitch to committees, deans, etc.

   b. During the presentations, people will volunteer their committee to participate in the steering committee and/or commit to being a mentor.

4. **The Steering Committee:** (Includes the Graduate Assistant and Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention plus volunteers)

   a. Will meet to:

      i. Identify partner committees

      ii. Review the proposed curriculum

      iii. Provide feedback for the Institutional Review Board (IRB) plan

      iv. Identify trainers for the mentee/mentor training sessions

5. **Web Shell:**

   a. The GA and AD of GSR will take the school’s web design training program and schedule follow up sessions for troubleshooting while building the shell.

   b. The GA will gather relevant committee information blurbs and web links to build the website shell for this mentoring program.

   c. The GA never publishes anything live until it has been reviewed by the AD of GSR.
GA/AD of GSR Spring Year 1:

1. **Steering Committee:** (Includes the Graduate Assistant and Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention plus volunteers)
   
   a. Secure IRB
   
   b. Review marketing ideas for mentors & mentees
   
   c. Review matching process:
      
      i. Mentor’s committee is listed on the website and the student application
      
      ii. Students apply to committees hoping for a match
      
      iii. If there are multiple students interested in a committee, we will reach out to the committee looking for additional mentors.
      
      iv. If no additional mentors can be found and the students did not apply to more than one committee, the students will be interviewed to determine which student will enter the program.
   
   d. Review orientation sessions to find leads for faculty to run training

2. **Final Mentor Marketing Push:** (Three weeks before Spring Break)
   
   a. Hold new information sessions to gain mentors and training leads.
   
   b. Send mentors “Thank you for your commitment emails”

3. **Web Shell:** (must go live one week after Spring Break)
   
   a. Fill in the website with additional committee bios/links
   
   b. Open mentee graduate student application (close after two weeks)

4. **Mentee Marketing:** (Appendix F)
   
   a. Meet with GSA, other graduate student organizations, and offices beginning week two of the semester to gauge interest in co-sponsoring events
   
   b. Host info sessions for graduate students (during the week before the application opens and the first week that the application is open.)
5. **Mentor/Mentee Match:** (two weeks after applications close)
   
a. Compare student answers to the committed mentor list to determine mentor matches.
   
   (Follow the matching process if multiple students apply to the same committee).

   b. Send out welcome emails to mentee students. This email will include the orientation date and committee match.

6. **Faculty Facilitator Meetings:** (Includes the Graduate Assistant, Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention, the people suggested by the steering committee, and/or had expressed interest in the information sessions)

   a. Review the mission of the program and proposed sessions for feedback and gain presenters.

   b. Submit a request for hire paperwork to human resources as soon as the steering committee approves so that each presenter can be locked in with their contract.

**GA/AD of GSR Summer Year 1:**
During the Summer II/Summer Post-Session, the Graduate Assistant work load will dramatically increase. Between creating session presentations and building website shells the GA will be reserving rooms, ordering food, attending meetings, etc. Ideally, this GA will be contracted for fifteen credit hours so that they can help the Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention launch the first cohort strongly.

1. **Orientation Build:**

   a. Build the actual schedule:

      i. Reserve spaces for orientation

      ii. Confirm partners for team building during orientation: When choosing activities make sure that they are handicap accessible so that everyone can participate. (i.e. do not pick the high ropes course experience or swimming relays. Pick
something like the low ropes course, team jigsaws, scavenger hunts, etc.) Look at what your rec center and student union have to rent/borrow as options, i.e. mega Jenga, lawn bowling, pool noodle building sets, etc.

iii. Order food for orientation

iv. Create digital orientation schedules for participants: orientation packets, faculty trainer emails, food service confirmations, etc.

b. Create the mentor/mentee:

i. responsibilities contracts in survey format to ease the data collection process.

ii. orientation RSVP form that includes common dietary restrictions: veg, gf, nut free, dairy free, pork free

iii. orientation feedback surveys

c. Finalize pre-orientation Star Wars Bitmoji module: Participants will complete to build enthusiasm and deliver expectations before the formal training session. This module will help people prepare for the tech requirements of the program and act as a resource to refer back to throughout the entire program.

d. Build the Twitter List and beta test it with the Steering Committee

e. Create session presentations for GA and the AD of GSR to facilitate orientation.

i. Buy/collection relevant supplies for sessions

2. Fall Skeleton Build:

a. Compile list of Fall sessions: Include what presenters have been confirmed and which still need to be acquired.

b. Reserve Fall rooms.
c. Contact potential partners for Fall sessions (Alumni association, campus bank, career center, graduate school for doctoral programs, and group for social, i.e. coffee with the cops, brunch with the (fire) brigade, nosh with the interfaith community alliance, etc.)

3. **Steering Committee:** (Includes the Graduate Assistant and Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention plus volunteers)
   
   a. Give final updates before orientation
   
   b. Ask for feedback about secured Fall sessions

4. **Website Update:**
   
   a. List committees with mentor/mentee matches. Make sure that the hyper-links to the committees are active.
   
   b. Build shell for: resources suggested in programs, photos of events, and community partners

5. **Orientation Kick-Off:**
   
   a. Introduce mentors and mentees via email. Inform them of the pre-orientation module. Include the orientation RSVP. (One month before orientation.)
   
   b. Send orientation email packet. This packet has a link to the itinerary, their mentor/mentee contract, and their program contract. Remind them to make contact with their mentor/mentee, complete the pre-orientation module, and RSVP.
   
   c. Execute orientation (see Mentor/ Mentee Fall Orientation (Program Year 2) for details)

**GA/AD of GSR Fall Year 2:**

This first cohort will set the tone for all future cohorts. It is important to evaluate all feedback to improve the experience for this cohort and recruit future cohorts. The data must also be evaluated to determine its value in order to make adjustments in future plans. This gets complicated with so many groups of people to manage. At the end of this guidebook, I have included a grid so that you can see
how the parts intertwine.

1. **Orientation Data for responsive planning:**
   
a.  This data should be evaluated for:
   
i.  Response content: This program is designed to improve confidence in civic action. If their feedback is not seriously considered, it undermines the program.
   
   1.  Suggestions for the next meeting, program partners, and interested parties should be organized and brought to the steering committee.
   
   2.  Suggestions to improve orientation need to be filed with orientation plans so that the next planning team can consider it.

   ii.  Formatting of responses: Is this survey method easy to use for participants and read results for the data team?

   iii.  Response quality: Did the questions yield the quality of results that the team requires?

   iv.  Data storage/display: This is the first test of your data organizational system. It is important that naming conventions and organization be established so that the rest of the year’s data can follow the same conventions.

2. **Steering Committee:** (Includes the Graduate Assistant and Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention plus volunteers; during programing it meets monthly)

   a.  Give data updates and highlights from orientation

   b.  Review Twitter with committee and gather feedback

   c.  Review the proposed Spring curriculum

   d.  Ask for feedback about Gala plan and graduation plan

   e.  Identify trainers for the mentee/mentor training sessions

   f.  Review Spring marketing ideas for mentors & mentees
3. **Finish and Execute Fall training:**
   
   a. Create session presentations for GA and the AD of GSR to facilitate orientation.
      
      i. Buy/ collect relevant supplies for sessions
      ii. Order food
      iii. Create feedback surveys for remaining sessions
   
   b. Determine if a pre-Gala meeting is needed to:
      
      i. Practice elevators speeches about this program
      ii. Find appropriate attire for the event
      iii. Share photos and biographies of confirmed attendees so that the pairs can best utilize their time.

4. **Faculty Facilitator Meetings:** (Includes the Graduate Assistant, Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention, the people suggested by the steering committee, and/or had expressed interest in the information sessions)
   
   a. Review the mission of the program and proposed sessions for feedback and gain presenters.
   
   b. Submit a request for hire paperwork to human resources as soon as the steering committee approves so that each presenter can be locked in with their contract.

5. **Spring Skeleton Build:**
   
   a. Compile list of Spring sessions: Include what presenters have been confirmed and which still need to be acquired.
   
   b. Reserve Spring rooms.
   
   c. Contact potential partners for Spring sessions (financial planner, life insurance, mortgage, alumni association, etc.) and group for social, i.e. snacks with your State Rep, etc.)
d. Work with the Office of Service Learning to identify community service sites for the Spring Orientation. The site should be somewhere local that accommodates multiple ability levels and regularly needs help. This Spring opportunity should be something that the teams can repeat if they wish.

6. **Website updates:**
   a. Publish shells built in summer (resources suggested in programs, photos of events, and community partners)
   b. Open following year’s committee/mentor forms.
   c. Update site with committee/mentor information session dates, graduate student information session dates

7. **Year 3 committee recruitment:** (It is important to be as visible as possible in shared governance)
   a. The AD of GSR, GA, and Steering Committee should be visiting the mentor/mentee committee meetings as well as prospective committees
   b. The GA should:
      i. attending the Council of Trustee Meetings and the GSA Town Halls to maintain visibility
      ii. Meet with the GSA to provide them updates about this program

8. **Presidential Gala:**
   a. Collaborate with the team to ensure both sides know what to expect from the mentor teams at cocktail hour
   b. Provide Feedback to the planning team about which mentor teams should sit at tables based on the table’s interests
   c. Devise a plan for students and staff that need financial assistance for appropriate attire
   d. During this process it is important to evaluate if the mentor teams might need an extra
training session. (if the mentor teams need to make displays, man tables, or participate in specific cultural rituals, extra training will be required to ensure their success).

9. **Transition Plan:** (As Graduation dates loom closer, plans need to be updated to facilitate a smooth transition. These updates should be completed every semester to ensure accuracy.)
   a. Update this planning manual in your shared drive with specifics of who/how to contact for: catering, web site help, GSA meetings, room reservations, technical equipment for those reservations, etc.
   b. Update the Mentor/Mentee Planning manual and presentations based on this cohorts’ feedback
   c. Update the GA job description based on current duties
   d. Explain how to access the Steering Committee notes

**GA/AD of GSR Spring Year 2:** (This is a repeat of Spring year 1 and Fall year 2 except graduation)

1. **Graduation:** *(This is not a small project and should be started as soon as possible)*
   a. Reserve half of a ballroom and screens/projectors for each mentor team
   b. Send invitations to:
      i. Mentors’ managers
      ii. Mentees’ managers and program directors
      iii. The school President
      iv. The GSA President
      v. The Steering Committee
      vi. Community members that came to the snack events
   c. Order Swag and Certificates for the mentor teams
   d. Order catering
   e. Create _______ for mentor pairs:
i. Template for slide to be displayed before/during graduation

ii. Directions for pairs to understand what should be on slides

iii. Program evaluation survey

### Abbreviated timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Fall** | Staff | This year is facilitation, networking, data analysis, website updates, and planning. The staff needs to evaluate what they have built based on participant feedback.  
- Coordinating community partners for the training sessions will help prepare the GA to work with the Gala committee.  
- Facilitating participation in the Presidential Gala will require significant attention to detail and an understanding of the cohorts’ needs. An additional training session may need to be built for the mentoring teams to successfully navigate this high profile and formal event. Staff must be prepared for students to need assistance to get formal wear.  
- Transition planning to onboard the new Graduate Assistant is vital to Spring Success and the next cohort. |
| Steering committee | Between their own committee work, supporting the mentoring teams, and building a visible presence for the program, the Steering Committee are ambassadors at large for this program. |
| Mentoring teams** | This is the building phase of their relationships. Between meeting each other, team building with their cohort, and building relationships with their committees, this is a growth semester. |
| **Spring** | Staff* | Between updating the website, hosting this semester’s training, transitioning a new GA, gathering a new cohort, executing graduation, and data crunching, there is no downtime in this semester. |
| Steering Committee | This is when they really gain traction. Networking at the Spring Service, marketing to new mentors, organizing new faculty trainers, and graduation shows the fruits of their labor. New people might join! |
| Mentoring teams** | It is an exciting time as they network at their Spring Service and demonstrates their knowledge at graduation! |
| **Summer** | Staff | This might be the busiest season for the team.  
- Data crunching and synthesis for adjusting cohort 2’s training plus publication is in full effect.  
- Confirming Fall orientation and the Fall programing schedule with facilities and faculty trainers takes endless emails.  
- Updating the website with graduation details and connecting the alumni to your retention plan might be the easiest part of the summer workload. |
| Steering Committee | The steering committee has several roles this summer.  
- Working with the GA to write narrative pieces of the data for the alumni magazine.  
- Reforming the surveys to gather data for conference presentation and publication. |
Cohort 2 meets their teammates, complete their Star Wars pre-orientation module (Appendix I), and attends orientation! Cohort 1 has graduated but the retention plan must be implemented.

**The More than Just a Seat at the Table** Mentoring Team Plan (Appendix E) explains what the team learns and completes during the program.
Appendix E

More than Just a Seat at the Table
Mentoring Team Plan/Guidebook***

This is the moment the team has been building towards. The mentors and mentees are finally getting to work! It is imperative to monitor the teams and provide support as they work through this transition. No amount of planning can create something perfect. The mark of a great experience is how those imperfections are transformed into opportunities.

***This manual is a work in progress that must be edited to fit the needs of your institution.

Mentor/ Mentee Fall Orientation (Program Year 2):
1. **Pre orientation:** They will receive their “match letter” in August so that they connect before orientation if they choose. They will complete their Star Wars pre-orientation module (Appendix I) to build enthusiasm and knowledge before they meet in person.

2. **Faculty orientation/ mentor training:** The last Thursday in Summer Post-Session (Most institutions have “energy days” in the Summer and close their offices. Orientation should happen when the full resources of the institution are available.)
   a. Mentorship training sessions 1.0 and 2.0: are participants selected based on prior knowledge
   b. Basics of the responsibilities for mentoring: expectations and documentation explanation
   c. Team building session: randomly assigned mentors working to get to know other mentors from across the institution
   d. Workshop sessions (playlist to choose from): pairs will select Items from the “playlist” to practice and model mentor/mentee relationship-building activities
   e. Break-out sessions of similar committee mentors to build action plans for mentees.
f. Committee info survey: Mentors will share the specifics about their committees so that the GA and Assistant Director of Graduate Student Retention can troubleshoot and/or attend with their teams.

3. **Mentee orientation: Fall**

   a. Basics of institutional governance/shared governance session: this will give a brief background of what shared governance is and a brief history of the institution. This session will include some of the top organizational charts and give the students a chance to search for their ones related to the GA positions and/or programs.

   b. Team building session: randomly assigned mentees working to get to know other mentees from across the institution

   c. Mentee basics: Learn about their expectations, responsibilities, and documentation

   "--------From this point on, the mentors and mentees are together-------------

   d. Meet their mentors:

   e. Break-out sessions of similar committee mentees to learn more about their committees

   f. Twitter 411: Session to walk mentors/mentee pairs through remaining Twitter set up.

   Double check privacy settings. Practice how to direct message and group message.

**Mentor/ Mentee Fall Midsemester Check-in (Program Year 2):**

For the Fall Midsemester check-in, the mentors and mentees meet on the same day at the same time in different places. They are brought together at the end of the evening to meet some of the community partners, socialize, and snack. Snack/social session proposals: coffee with the cops, brunch with the (fire) brigade, nosh with the interfaith community alliance, snacks with state reps, etc.
Mentees Meeting:
- Vision session: Guided training about how to set goals for their spot on their committee
- Life vision break-out session: Meet with community partners like: alumni foundation, career center, campus bank, and/or doctoral programs
- Wins and Ops session: have mentees share what is going well and problem solve what they think could go better.

Mentors Meeting:
- Big picture planning: mentorship training about how to help mentees with future planning, committee, graduation, life, etc.
  - Mentee Big Picture: Mentors will create a resource file to help their mentee identify and plan a big picture SMART Goal.
  - Personal Big Picture: Mentors will spend time reflecting to create a plan for an area that they want to grow (Explore their alumni foundation, career center, and professional organizations for tips.)
- Wins and Ops session: have mentors share what is going well and problem solve what they think could go better.

Mentor/ Mentee Fall Social (Presidential Gala) Program Year 2:
Winter social event for mentors and mentees to build community while networking with interested institutional partners
- Feature mentorship intuitive in the invitation so that institutional stakeholders are aware that they will be exposed to the new mentoring program
- Station mentoring teams throughout the cocktail hour so that institutional stakeholders can easily identify who to meet
• Seat mentoring teams at every (10/8 top table) so that there is as much commingling as possible.

Try to match teams with their areas of governance or professional interests to aid in discussion.

Mentor/ Mentee Spring Orientation (Program Year 2):

This orientation is combined to increase the collegiality in the intergenerational teams. The teams will be joined by Steering Committee members during the service project for networking. The Steering Committee will have the opportunity to directly interact with the participants as they work to help their community.

a. Mentorship training sessions 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0: are participants selected based on prior knowledge

b. Breakout sessions for mentors and mentees to go over new Spring expectations, responsibilities, and documentation

c. Protected versus unprotected speech session: This session will help participants thoroughly understand the school’s Free Speech Policy and how to use the policy to review their community norms/standards.

d. Committee Goals session: Similar committee groups will meet with their mentors/mentees to update their Fall goals. They will help each other find solutions to meet their goals.

e. Team building session: Similar committee groups will work on a community service project together. This project was chosen because it is a regular opportunity to serve the campus community. Participants can choose a convenient time to repeat this service if they are interested.

Spring Mid-Semester check-in (Program Year 2):

For the Spring Midsemester check-in, the mentors and mentees meet on the same day at the same time in different places. They are brought together at the end of the evening to meet some of the community partners, socialize, and snack. Snack/social session proposals: coffee with the cops, brunch with the (fire) brigade, nosh with the interfaith community alliance, snacks with state reps, etc.
Mentees Meeting:
- Advocacy session: Guided training about how to advocate for their goals outside of an institution (civics, community partners, professors, etc.)
  - Mentees will fill in a template to leave with action steps to advocate for a change that they want to see/need
- Life vision break-out session: Take feedback from the last session and invite new groups to share (financial planner, life insurance, mortgage, alumni association, etc.)
- Wins and Ops session: have mentees share what is going well and problem solve what they think could go better.

Mentors Meeting:
- Advocacy training: mentorship training about how to help mentees identify community partners, build relationships with partners, etc.
  - Mentee transfer: Identify strategies that the mentor thinks would work for their team
  - Career transfer: Identify strategies that could help mentor with current job duties
- Life vision break-out session: Take feedback from the last session and invite new groups to share (financial planner, life insurance, mortgage, alumni association, etc.)
- Wins and Ops session: have mentors share what is going well and problem solve what they think could go better.

Spring Debrief/ Graduate Celebration (Program Year 2):
1. Reflection project/session
   - Show slide show of mentor/mentee and committee progress
   - Have round table discussions for mentors/mentees to talk about progress.
2. Graduation Celebration: Invite all supervisors, deans, the President, and the Board of Trustees to celebrate the cohort’s work.
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*More than Just a Seat at the Table’s* Marketing Appendix

Marketing Ideas to help you build your pitch

Before the pitch:

Governance is a confusing and frustrating process. The larger the government the more layers of bureaucracy and redundancy an individual will encounter. Between negative experiences with governance and little previous education about participating in governance, recruitment will be a challenge. Building relationships with key leaders will be vital to recruitment.

Shared Governance is not a new concept. It is vital that you are prepared to address preconceived notions about shared governance before you market this program. Prior experience from other higher education institutions, non-profits, and or businesses will color how committees and potential mentors respond to the information sessions and committee presentations. It is difficult to let the reigns go to accept other ideas into a power process. Be sure to illustrate both institution commitment and the pedagogy that informs the structured mentorship program. Also, explain the intent behind graduate student mentorship.

To demonstrate institutional commitment, share highlights like the Presidential Gala and the Graduation Ceremony with potential recruits. Sharing high profile committees that have already committed will help demonstrate that institutional leaders back this program.

This responsive mentorship program is designed to employ shared governance principles to help mentors/mentees through an entire year of practice. As the Steering Committee reflects on the mentor/mentee and facilitator data, future sessions will be adjusted accordingly. Students are a semi-transient population on a fixed timetable. They only participate for a single year of service to grow their skills as they move on to other opportunities. There is no “year two” program because this program is not designed to rely on student labor. Student labor is a learning tool to facilitate their praxis in governance and their mentorship relationship. If a graduate student and/or a mentor decide to continue
their committee work, it is outside of the scope of the program, but they can request assistance from

*More than Just a Seat at the Table.* If a committee chooses to participate for a second year, it is beholden to the committee and the new mentor to acculturate the next mentee. There is no expectation that the graduated mentoring team will train the new mentoring team.

***Institutions should expect that the first several cohorts of mentees are students interested in political action.***

Potential marketing angles to attract:

- *Professional development:* Due to the complex hierarchy that exists in higher education professional development opportunities and dollars are split unevenly throughout institutions. Professional staff and faculty more easily access these opportunities than the rest of the institution leaving a potential missed opportunity. Mentorship is an opportunity, not a right or duty as assigned. Not all managers are leaders. Not all leaders are mentors.

- *Board of Trustees/ Deans/ Department Heads/ Managers:* Leading by example of their commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, and mentorship. As mega leaders of an institution, all of the manager concerns apply with an additional level of privilege. Being that high in the “food chain” gives you the opportunity to set the tone and/or culture for your employees. Give leaders multiple opportunities to lead by example and flex their skills in this mentorship program by: committing to a year of mentorship, recruiting mentors, attending the graduation ceremony, visiting with the cohort at socials, joining their steering committee, sharing funding for the program, etc. Sustained direct student engagement. The novelty of the program to promote the institution.

- *Tenure track faculty and staff buy-in:* Add this to one of the pathways to gain tenure/ staff advancement. Sustained contact with students in an area of mutual interest. Publication opportunities. Leadership opportunities. Growing potential colleagues.
● **Other employees:** There is a definite imbalance of power in their relationship with their institution at large as well as students. These disenfranchised employees may be questioning what value they can bring to governance and/or a mentee. These staff are so often left out that there may be some resentment towards the institution preventing them from participating.

● **Student buy-in:** Access to people in power. Advocacy and governance experience. Letter of recommendation for job applications. Networking opportunities.

● **No skills necessary to apply:** *More than Just a Seat at the Table* will provide your mentoring team training to improve your skills in governance and mentoring. As your mentoring team works together, you set the limits. It is not limited to the skills and lessons from the program, it can be expanded to suit your unique relationship. Entering this with the intention of learning and growing is a good start. Providing constructive and actionable feedback will improve the next group session for everyone.

Incentives to use in sales pitch:

● **Twitter:** Learn an in-demand skill to use personally, professionally, and/or both.

● **Access to power:** There are multiple opportunities built into this program to interact with influential people.

● **Cohort:** Build a greater sense of belonging in this learning community.

● **Leadership/Political/Social Justice interest:** Participants have an interest in civics and/or leadership to register to participate. They already are interested in some areas of the program and want to do more.

● **Novelty:** This is something new to your campus. This is definitely new to the students. You can be a part of a new tradition.

● **Self-motivated learners:** This is an opportunity to learn something new/do something new with a support network behind you.
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*More than Just a Seat at the Table’s* Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committees, Councils, & Commissions Interest Survey

Q1 Annual 2022 Interest Survey - Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committees, Councils, and Commissions

As part of the shared governance structure at *(name of your institution)*, there are a host of University committees, commissions, and councils related to diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts. The Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion is facilitating this "call of interest" for graduate students to indicate their desire to join *More than Just a Seat at the Table* and receive mentorship to meaningfully engage with these standing committees. Selected applicants will be matched with mentors from each of these committees to work with throughout the year in *More than Just a Seat at the Table* events as well as on their committees. Appointments are limited to the number of mentors and last from August to May of *(insert year).* If you do not have an interest, there is no need to respond.

- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Committee
- Council for Diversity, Inclusion, and Academic Excellence
- Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Planning Committee
- President’s Commission on the Status of Women
- University Military Veterans Coordinating Committee

---

1 With Dr. Tracey Robinson’s blessing I adapted her interest survey for my mentor/mentee matching process. Dr. Robinson’s survey was in line with my project as she worked to gather more representation for the committees under her umbrella. While working with Dr. Robinson, Chief Diversity & Inclusion Officer, at West Chester University, I was privileged to help her administer this survey, collate the results, and distribute the responses to the committees. I hope that this effort gains traction across the university to include more student representation.
Descriptions: (Include descriptions of each committee and the hyperlinks so that students can explore which committee they want to apply to.)

Q1 Preferred First Name: ______________________________________________

Q2 Last Name: __________________________________________________

Q3 Institutional Email Address: _________________________________________________

Q4 What is your campus role?
   o Masters Student
   o Doctoral Student
   o Other ________________________________

Q5 What is your major/program of study? ________________________________

Q6 Select your college: (List each college/ school title)
   o (Insert College 1)    o (Insert College 2)    o (Insert College 3)    o (Insert College 4)

Q7 I will be available for More than a Seat at the Table’s training on: (select all that apply)
   o Universal Orientation (insert date)              o Spring workday (insert date)
   o Fall Semester’s Refueling Station (insert date)    o Spring Semester’s Recharging Station (insert date)
   o Presidential Gala (insert date)                  o Graduation Gallery (insert date)

Q8 Indicate the committee, commission, or council that you would be interested in serving on for the Fall 2022- Spring 2023 academic year.
   □ Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Committee
   □ Council for Diversity, Inclusion, and Academic Excellence
   □ Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Planning Committee
   □ President’s Commission on the Status of Women
   □ University Military Veterans Coordinating Committee
Display This Question: If Q8 = Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Committee

Q14 Why are you interested in the ADA Committee? Describe your knowledge, expertise, or personal experience with ADA. How might you apply this knowledge or experience to the work of the committee?

Display This Question: If Q8 = Council for Diversity, Inclusion, and Academic Excellence

Q24 Why are you interested in the Council for Diversity, Inclusion, and Academic Excellence? How might you apply your knowledge or experience to the work of the committee?

Display This Question: If Q8 = Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Planning Committee

Q26 Why are you interested in the Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Planning Committee? How might you apply your knowledge or experience to the work of the committee?

Display This Question: If Q8 = President's Commission on the Status of Women

Q27 Why are you interested in the President's Commission on the Status of Women? How might you apply your knowledge or experience to the work of the committee?

Display This Question: If Q8 = University Military Veterans Coordinating Committee

Q25 Why are you interested in the University Military Veterans Coordinating Committee? Describe your knowledge, expertise, or personal experience with Military Veterans. How might you apply this knowledge or experience to the work of the committee?
This is my example data set from the Qualtrics survey I adapted above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred First Name</th>
<th>WCU Email Address</th>
<th>Indicate the reason: Why are you interested in the ADA Committee? Be specific.</th>
<th>Select your college or major:</th>
<th>Select your role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kane</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kr766200@wvupg.edu">kr766200@wvupg.edu</a></td>
<td>I am interested in the ADA Committee because it expands the role of a faculty member and contributes to student diversity and inclusion.</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Higher Education, College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is an often forgotten area of ODE. Currently, the committee is very narrow in its department participation and the described action: identifying as a student with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have teaching experience across multiple settings, giving me multiple lenses to apply to the work of the committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I know that I can use my WCU institutional knowledge in conjunction with my ADA experience to enhance the work of the committee.
Appendix I

More than Just a Seat at the Table’s Bitmoji Pre-Orientation Module

Identity development theories suggest that transition periods cause significant anxiety. High anxiety results in a high affective filter that prevents people from learning (Chametzky, 2017). To lower that affective filter and prepare mentoring teams for the program, I have created a Star Wars Bitmoji classroom. This training is something that they complete at their own pace and refer back to review Twitter basics, the calendar, etc. Employing Egan’s mythic understanding, I took a beloved mentoring pair to explain the content (1997). Employing well known characters to lower their filters, the teams will gain new knowledge. Mentoring 101 (Appendix J) employs quick informational videos between pop culture examples to help teams understand the basics of the program. The whimsy of the Star Wars experience plus pop culture references build enthusiasm for orientation and help the teams retain knowledge.
Our mentoring problem:

In a land not so far away, in the middle of a disaster, there was an Imperial Army determined to run their peers.

They didn't care about anyone but themselves and spreading their evil empire. With their backstabbing ways, they were determined to trample anyone in the path of their publications, presentations, and/or promotions.

Our mentor: Darth Vader

- Authoritarian, he rules by decree and ignores his army
- He harshly punishes or eliminates any of his loyal dissidents
- Obsessed with this renunciation, Darth eliminate opponents to maintain his power
- Does not work well with others

Our mentee: Anakin Skywalker

- Impetuous, often in trouble/divergent
- Has a strong moral compass but preoccupied by "fairness"
- Skates by with skills but won't practice to refine them
- Leads chosen team on his projects, does not take input or help with other projects

Our help: Intergenerational Mentoring

- Darth Vader & Anakin both have: determination, loyalty, conviction, etc.
- Both want betterworld
- Need to build on each other's strengths to learn from each other.

It's not a short journey (six movies later) but both decide to embrace the Dark Side!

Reminders:

- Orientation is Aug 25th from 8:30AM-4PM. (Yes we will feed you)
- Tweet weekly in our closed group so that we keep up with the whole cohort.
  - Share your classes, meetings with us so that we can Zoom in
  - Celebrate your successes, vices, and failures and give us good tips to share
- Complete your chat log every two weeks
Appendix J

More than Just a Seat at the Table’s Mentoring 101 (the book icon in the Bitmoji module on the Imperial Destroyer)

Mentoring 101:
Building on tradition

Traditional a.k.a. Old School
Traditional mentoring is a communication relationship in which a senior person (i.e., mentor) supports, tutors, guides, and facilitates a junior person’s (i.e., protégé’s) career development (Mansson, et al., p. 54).

Newer: Reverse mentoring
Re-defined as the pairing of a junior employee acting as mentor to share expertise with a senior colleague as the mentee. This is distinctly different from traditional mentoring where learning is dispensed hierarchically from an older mentor to a younger protégé (Satterly, et al., p. 44).

We want you! Intergenerational mentoring
Predicated upon reverse mentoring, the Intergenerational Mentoring model reflects the positive aspects of reverse mentoring without the hierarchical framework of mentor and mentee. Rather, it is based upon the notion that everyone learns and everyone teaches (Satterly, et al., p. 44).

No one left out!
- Just like our committees, more representation—diversity in perspectives.
- Faculty, staff, retirees, and community partners are mentors.
- Graduates and Ph.D. candidates are memmbers.
- You volunteered to develop your skills and help others do the same.

How?
- Attend committee meetings together
- Meet twice a month to discuss progress and complete the meeting log.
- Tweet once a week in our closed group so that you can keep connected our community.
How?

- Mentoring Community:
  - Respond to a community member's Tweet once a week.
  - Attend Mentor and Mentee specific sessions developed by your peers to help everyone grow.
  - Complete our evaluation surveys to inform share your ideas for our next meeting topic.
  - Join our steering committee.

Want to learn more?


Citations:

All pictures, videos, and photos are not original creations. They were borrowed to improve your viewing catalogue.


Appendix J

More than Just a Seat at the Table’s Additional Considerations for Implementation

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, DEI, in Shared Governance:

This program researches two distinct populations, the mentors and the graduate students. Each group has its own specific challenges that limited the scope of this work. More people does not automatically equal an improvement in DEI, but pulling from underrepresented subsets of the community does improve DEI. Further research can be done to add a mechanism to target both underrepresented “job/student positions” and specific affinity groups.

Mentor population:

Higher education tends to have an “Ivory Tower” mystic of elitism. Deploying a long-term strategy to recruit employees as mentors from the lowest pay grades to the highest pay grades ensures that a broad swath of socio-economic, professionalism, and expertise will be represented in governance. Mentor recruitment is designed to form outside the traditional tenure track faculty and the staff roles with committee work in their job descriptions to meet Program Goal 2 (Appendix A). Target goals for non-tenure track mentor participation are intended to engage job positions typically underrepresented in governance and provide professional development to encourage prolonged participation. Tenure-track faculty, Managers, and The Board of Trustees have a professional obligation and/or financial incentive to engage in institutional governance. Adjunct professors, professional-staff positions, and general employees are lower-income job classifications than the governing bodies and have no specific incentive to participate in governance resulting in their underrepresentation. The sheer economic position of these job classifications can add diversity to governing bodies. These people are no less worthy of representation and no less valuable as mentors.
Specifying percentages for non-traditional committee members in mentor recruitment in Program Outcome 2-3 (Appendix A) creates implementation challenges. While researching options I discovered that some institutions lump cross-institutional positions into classes while others keep each individual position separate. If your institution has classes, meaning everyone with the same designation receives the same pay rate and promotion schedule, it will be less complicated to set recruitment targets because you can decide to set incremental recruitment goals for a specific class. Deciding if the mentors from that class are diverse enough is a data evaluation that will need to be incrementally determined to course correct mentor marketing. If your institution labels every job individually and you have to recruit by office/college, recruitment and evaluation is going to be more complex. You will have to evaluate the composition of each office/college to determine appropriate recruitment goals. For example, if Public Safety has five full-time staff and fifteen part-time staff with an average turnover rate of two years, the recruitment goal might be one mentor without committee job requirements every five years.

This complex charge limited the scope of research on attracting specific traditionally marginalized groups or traditionally marginalized jobs into mentorship. After the program is established, you will have mentor data about job classification, years of employment at the institution, and gender identity. Similarly, you will have graduate student data about major, years of attendance at your institution, and gender identity. You can choose to include disability status, sexual orientation, race, first-generation status, parental status, and/or religious identity exit survey questions to gather more specific demographics. With this data you can decide on future recruitment goals, areas of research, and potential prospective to add to the steering committee.
Mentees population:

Your institutional review will inform how your institutions' inclusion from DEI will be impacted by graduate student mentees participating in shared governance. Dividing the sheer number of committees that directly or indirectly affect graduate students by the number of regularly active graduate participants will inform you how much implementing this program will impact your inclusion.

There is meagerness in research into both graduate student mentorship and graduate student participation in shared governance, any new research would strengthen the field. There is very specific data about industry-specific mentorship in certifying occupations like law, nursing, and doctors but it was challenging to find information that was transferable outside of that specific skill. Unlike youth mentorship or undergraduate mentorship, there is extremely limited data about programs targeting specific minority populations and/or areas of interest. This program could easily be adjusted to target specific student populations however, this shift must be careful to include the larger community to achieve the spirit of Program Goal 2.