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Editor’s Note: Changing Research to Impact Practice

Readers, Scholars, and Members of the JCSHESA Community,

Since the inception of our Journal in early 2015, the central goal was and continues to be a firm commitment to the publication of critical, progressive scholarship in higher education and student affairs. Fortunately over the years, authors, scholars, and community members have chosen time and time again to collaborate with JCSHESA to produce actionable research for practice. Even in the midst of our current socio-political climate, instead of limiting the voice of our Journal, we seek to amplify these voices at the height of what has been a tumultuous time for colleges and universities during the Trump-era Administration. As such, we bring you our timely second special issue: Resilience, Resistance, and Reclamation in the Trump-Era of Higher Education.

In service of our mission and this particular special issue, we choose to highlight stories, narratives, and experiences from the margins of higher education. Specifically, this issue centers on the prevalent areas of policy and practice in higher education impacted by the political actions of the federal, state, and local governments of the United States. Over the last few months, the Editorial Board, reviewers, and myself have worked hard to curate a collection of empirical articles, scholarly essays, and artistic pieces that convey the myriad ways students, faculty, and administrators find ways to resist, persist, and reclaim their right to equity in U.S. colleges and universities.

Furthermore, by including non-traditional modes of “academic knowledge” such as poems, paintings, and drawings, we actively critique hegemonic systems of knowledge production in the academy and hopefully leave room for readers of this special issue to interpret, view, and gain consciousness of these narratives from different angles. Though not all pieces included in this issue are indicative of all the problems faced by higher education, we instead aim to offer a small glimpse into the reality of the many that are rarely seen, heard, or validated.

As the Editor in Chief of this Journal, I cannot be more excited to share the hard work of the authors, reviewers, and board members that went into this issue. I am thankful for their knowledge, efforts, and unshakable commitment to equity and justice for others. If there is one wish I have for readers of this special issue, and JCSHESA as a whole, it is to embrace the beauty and struggle you find between the methods, critical frameworks, and positionalities in this issue. Furthermore, I hope readers find the inspiration to resist, persevere, and reclaim the educational experience you deserve. I thank you again for reading our special issue.

In Solidarity,
Cobretti D. Williams

To

Cobretti D. Williams
Editor In Chief, JCSHESA
Loyola University Chicago

If there is one wish I have for readers of this special issue, and JCSHESA as a whole, it is to embrace the beauty and struggle you find between the methods, critical frameworks, and positionalities in this issue.
I
stitutions of higher education are sites of political and social contestation (Groulx & Groulx, 2004). With a history steeped in exclusion, segregation, political unrest, and glacial-paced progress, it is no surprise that educators within higher education continue to experience and illuminate issues, such as racism, colonization, and identity-based harm. The imperialistic ‘establishment of U.S. higher education is deeply rooted in racism/White supremacy, the vestiges of which remain palatable’ (Patton-Davis, 2016, p. 317), particularly under the diversities of today’s presidential administration. The increasing familiarity of hate crimes, microaggressions, land acquisition, and identity-based violence on today’s college campuses reinforces the pervasive and persistent nature of racism and colonization in educational environments (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2016). These traditions and their systemic counterparts result in an abundance of deleterious effects for students, faculty/staff, and institutions alike (Carnevale & Strohl, 2013; Goldrick-Rab, S., Kelchen, R. & Houle, J., 2014; Hamer & Yang, 2015; Pollock, 2008; Shotton, Lowe, & Waterman, 2013; Solorzano & Yosso, 2000). Knowing this, leaders within higher education must prepare to meet these realities directly should they wish to succeed and serve the communities they lead.

By invoking an applied critical leadership framework among association leaders (Santamaria & Santamaria, 2012), educators stand to oppose status-quo leadership within the field’s professional associations.

Association Leadership and Priorities
To prepare students and staff for navigating diverse challenges, educators often rely on the direction, guidance, and thought leadership produced via professional associations. These associations serve as spaces for professional development, growth, and learning. They also shape the norms and practices within higher education by sponsoring seminal research, informing graduate preparation curricula (e.g., the use of the ACPE & NASPA professional competencies), and defining standards for successful practice (American College Personnel Association & National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 2015; Evans & Reason, 2001; Nuss, 1993). As such, those involved in professional associations play a crucial role in determining the priorities of higher education.

In the field of student affairs, these priorities have historically reflected a commitment to student learning, holistic student development, and student success. Fundamental, association-sponsored publications, including the The Student Personnel Point of View (American Council on Education, 1937; American Council on Education, 1949), The Student Learning Imperative (American College Personnel Association, 1996), and Learning Reconsidered and Learning Reconsidered 2 (Keeling, 2004; Keeling, 2006), enthusiastically support these pragmatic priorities and reinforce the consistent preparation and professionalization of student affairs professionals. While both important and necessary for informed and grounded practice, the priorities of higher education associations must broaden to address the present-day realities of racism and colonization. Without a commitment to racial justice and decolonization, commitments to student learning, development, and success will only serve to perpetuate opportunity gaps and status quo learning environments within the academy.

This work has not been realized within educational practice and scholarship. Veritably, recent scholarship has affirmed the ways in which educational research has actively ignored, subverted, or reinforced the effects of dominant and oppressive ideologies (Harper, 2012; Patel, 2016). It is time to reimagine our commitments within higher education. As educators and scholars seek to meet the needs of an ever-diversifying student body, facing an ever-increasing barrage of settler-logic and racialized harm, it is time for professional associations and those involved in these organizations to adopt a new and critical lens through which to view, sponsor, and advance research, practice, and priorities.

Although few research exists on the role of educators and their involvement in professional associations extending beyond historical accounts or the value involvement plays in socialization and career advancement (Chernow, Cooper, & Winston, 2003; Gardner & Barnes, 2007; Young, 1993), we believe such settings are prime locations from which to explore the experiences and potential for critical association leadership. By invoking an applied critical leadership framework among association leaders (Santamaria & Santamaria, 2012), educators stand to oppose status-quo leadership within the field’s professional associations. Rather than maintain business-as-usual approaches, association leaders can pivot away from passe practices, and instead, boldly advance strategic priorities addressing the exigent and harmful realities racism and colonization impart within campuses.

Purpose
The purpose of this article is to explore what critical association leadership looks like using the authors’ own experience within ACPA-College Student Educators International, as we embarked on employing a Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization within the association beginning in 2016. As members of the association’s governing board and assembly leadership, both authors hold power and opportunity to employ critical leadership initiatives, each through their unique and varying social identities. As both a black, cisgender, straight, able-bodied man, and a white, cisgender, gay, able-bodied woman, our collective positionalities inform our employment as both a faculty member and practitioners, our understanding of critical association leadership.
As educators and scholars seek to meet the needs of an ever-diversifying student body, facing ever-increasing harm, we can no longer view our professional participation through passive, ahistorical, career-serving, or environmentally neutral lenses.

ACPA's Imperative

The release of this statement propelled our commitment forward. With excitement and trepidation, we boldly named this commitment to our members, stakeholders, and the greater public. Little did we know that by doing so, our priorities would give way to an important and critical shift in the very nature of the Imperative. As Governing Board members, we naively believed each of our members had a race, and thus, everyone should see their fit within this Imperative even if race was not a salient identity for some of our members (e.g., white people). Yet, shortly after unveiling this new direction, we received feedback from several Native American members indicating that racial justice did not fully capture or reflect their identities and experiences as Native Peoples.

Given the ways in which Native and First-Peoples have been colonized, these identities more often reflect a more complex, politicized, and liminal space, one that is not necessarily racialized (Brayboy, 2005). As a result of this feedback, we expanded the Imperative to be more inclusive of Native, Aboriginal, and First-People's experiences, thus resulting in our more aptly named, Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization. As educators and scholars we actively seek to inform and reshape higher education. We move forward knowing that all oppressions are linked and that our work requires reflecting on systems of oppression that impact people of color and Native Peoples and move toward racial justice and decolonizing practices that reflect more collaboration, non-hierarchy, and respect of different voices, knowledge, and positionalities. This work requires reflexivity, compassion, and an understanding of our own capacity to learn and grow. These themes, indicative of our own voices and stories as association leaders, are shared below through the form of story as a means to illustrate the type of self-work and shifts that took place during the formation and implementation of ACPA's Imperative.

The below vignettes capture snapshots of the authors' personal reflections and viewpoints from January 2017 to January 2018. These written accounts, while composed for the purposes of this article, represent the most salient individual, summative stories resulting from numerous in-person conversations, emails, conference calls, and text messages regarding ACPA's Imperative and its implementation. Given the nature of these reflections within this piece, each author took turns writing the stories below by journaling, forward-
part of that pain for which I am responsible and the part I extend to so many others in my spheres. Next, I worked myself and extending myself grace, the same grace that so hard on myself, pick myself up, and determine how to the vice president and past president on the Governing shame and self-criticism. I wallowed in self-pity. I blamed harshest critic, and this experience only fomented my to be a President if I made such a blunder. I am often my expert, and yet, I had failed miserably. I did not deserve so many of the feelings I often get frustrated by from my experiences of Native folks. I just didn't know. Didn't this to learn more. I left this conversation so downtrodden. this labor for me. This person painstakingly took time and identity as Native. In an effort to understand, I asked this person shared why racial justice does not reflect his ex-

Our Operational Truths
Following the revision of the Strategic Imperative to be inclusive of decolonization, we determined the need to develop some assumptions to guide our work. Our goal was not to engage in arguments or debates with colleagues about whether racism and coloniza-
tion were real, but instead, to take these as the normal, everyday experiences of people of color and Native Peoples. As such, ACPA (2016) developed the following Operational Truths:

1. All forms of oppression are linked. Racialization are real, present, endur-
ing, intersectional, and systemic forms of oppres-
sion.
2. Racialization and colonization have informed the expe-
rience of all of us in higher education.
3. Advocacy and social change require us to work to dismantle racism and colonization in higher education
4. Our collective education, research and scholar-
shop, advocacy, and capacity will create positive
change in higher education.
5. We believe in and have hope for our individual
capacity, desire, and drive to grow, learn, and change.
6. We believe in and have hope for our individual
capacity, desire, and drive to grow, learn, and change.

These operational truths, our guiding statement, and a unified commitment to advancing our Imperative pushed us forward and shifted our focus toward the enactment of these priorities. The work had only just begun.

Overview of Critical Leadership Perspectives
The above overview of ACPA’s Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization serves to contextual-
ize and situate one example of what we will herefore refer to as applied critical leadership. This work and the theoretical discussion that follows, is an imperfect, yet illustrious, example of the ways in which association leaders can make use of critical perspectives to realize their agency, question taken-for-granted practic-
es, and lead in new ways in order to advance social change within professional associations.

At present, it is unlikely most leaders view their pro-
fessional involvement through a critical perspective. And yet, the majority of educators pursue association involvement in some capacity throughout the course of their careers. As educators and scholars seek to meet the needs of an ever-diversifying student body, facing ever-increasing harm, we can no longer view our professional participation through a passive, ahistori-
cal, career-serving, or environmentally neutral lenses. Consequently, the below discussion offers a different perspective, pushing educators to view their involve-
ment, leadership, and contributions to professional associations critically, and with an eye toward liberato-
ry change.

An increasing number of frameworks exist from which to view leadership from a critical perspective (Dugan, 2017). A review of these frameworks is beyond the scope of this article, however, many characteristics within these frameworks align in the forthcoming discus-

Applied Critical Leadership
Applied critical leadership, as outlined by Santamaria and Santamaria (2012), is an emergent theoretical framework through which leaders can view their invol-

These frameworks, explored in greater detail below, guide and underlie the practice of critical applied leadership. The resulting outcome of adopting this perspective is described more fully by Santamaria and Santamaria (2012).

This conceptualization pushes educational leaders’ thinking about leadership for social justice toward thinking about leadership practice as viewed through the lens of critical race theory. This “thinking” about leadership practice will eventu-
ally result in applied critical leadership. Applied critical leadership is the emancipatory practice of choosing to address educational issues and chal-

To begin our own “thinking” about critical applied leadership and extend these concepts within the
context of ACPA’s Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization, we start by reflecting on our experiences by means of exploring key principles of transformational leadership, critical pedagogy, and CRT/Tribal Crit.

Exploring Principles of Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is driven by key principles relating to a leader’s ability to engage and empower people to go above and beyond within their organizations or institutions. This kind of leadership requires leaders to role model the behaviors they seek among their membership, maintain a focus on the redistribution of power, prioritize transparency in their leadership, and focus on educational change (Bass, 1985; Santamaria & Santamaria, 2012). This approach to leadership is inspiring, collaborative, and supportive. “To this end, transformational leadership has a more strategic imperative wherein leaders aim to destroy old ways of life to make ways for new ways of life, while articulating vision and values to keep empowered followers on a unified path” (Santamaria & Santamaria, 2012, p. 3).

The below dialogue explores principles of transformational leadership within the context of ACPA’s early adoption of the Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization:

ACPA connections (Rachel). After the Governing Board decided to adopt the Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization, I was left with many questions about what came next. What did racial justice and decolonization look like in ACPA? Did we have resources about what came next. What did racial justice and decolonization mean to us? Did we have resources about what came next. What did racial justice and decolonization mean to us? What did racial justice and decolonization mean to us? How did we respond to this new imperative? I felt almost at a loss about how to begin. I just knew that I had to do something. “Doing something” became my mantra as we moved into the first few months of implementing this imperative. I volunteered to craft timelines, joined reading groups, and facilitated focus-groups at our annual convention. I tried to say yes to as much as I could. I knew I couldn’t sit back. I had to do something.

Little did I know this would also become my mantra when working with ACPA members, particularly white members, as they struggled with similar questions about “what to do?” The Imperative urged members to act, and yet, many white members didn’t know (and still don’t know) where to start. They wanted a checklist, a roadmap, a guide, and expectations. I’ll admit, I wanted these, too. Yet, I knew they didn’t exist. If they did, we would have solved racism and colonization a long time ago (or at least I hope so).

As a board, we began to name this tension, remaining transparent in our thinking, communications, and conversations. We needed to be unified and remain clear about our intentions. While a step-by-step guide to racial justice and decolonization didn’t exist, we believed action and progress were possible. The Imperative, as written, called us act, urged us to act, and will us to act. We simply needed to start by doing something. Naming race. Talking about it. Reading about decolonization. Showing up for a webinar. Something.

ACPA connections (Stephen). As vice president and then president of ACPA as we moved this imperative forward, I felt an immense pressure to get it right. I knew that given my blackness, folks would be looking at me for the answers. And I felt this immense pressure to not mess up, knowing that the stakes were high. If I messed up, it would give the resisters evidence to prove that this Imperative was flawed from the beginning. As a community member, I wasn’t the only one struggling with similar questions about “what to do?” The Imperative urged members to act, and yet, many white members didn’t know (and still don’t know) where to start. They wanted a checklist, a roadmap, a guide, and expectations. I’ll admit, I wanted these, too. Yet, I knew they didn’t exist. If they did, we would have solved racism and colonization a long time ago (or at least I hope so).

As a board, we began to name this tension, remaining transparent in our thinking, communications, and conversations. We needed to be unified and remain clear about our intentions. While a step-by-step guide to racial justice and decolonization didn’t exist, we believed action and progress were possible. The Imperative, as written, called us act, urged us to act, and will us to act. We simply needed to start by doing something. Naming race. Talking about it. Reading about decolonization. Showing up for a webinar. Something.

Exploring Practices of Critical Pedagogy

Critical pedagogy is set upon the belief that education can be liberatory and emancipatory. These concepts, reflective of Paulo Freire’s (1970) Pedagogy of the Oppressed, support the idea that education can give rise to a critical consciousness and disrupt structures of power and domination. Within educational settings, Giroux noted: “critical pedagogy is concerned with restructing traditional relationships in learning communities to a point where new knowledge, grounded in collective experiences of teaching and learning community members, is produced through meaningful dialogue” (as cited in Santamaria & Santamaria, 2012, p. 4). Both critical pedagogy and transformational leadership attend to the value of collaborative relationships, social context, and the redistribution of power.

The below dialogue explores practices of critical pedagogy within the context of ACPA’s Governing Board Retreat in November 2016 (during which the Imperative was initially created) and ACPA’s July 2017 Leadership Meeting (during which the Imperative was shared with all ACPA entity leaders):

ACPA connections (Stephen). We began this dialogue at the aforementioned November 2016 retreat. In this space, we engaged fully, authentically, and even sometimes cautiously. We had not built trust with each other yet, and so we stumbled, were silent, and unsure of what to say at times. Some people left the space full of emotion and needing to reflect on their thoughts, and yet we continued in the messiness. Dialogue was such a central component of our process. We had to resist the urge to be right and view others as wrong. We needed to seek new understanding about this imperative and embrace new language. It was risky to announce this new imperative to members, for fear of immediate critiques or getting it “wrong.” And yet, we needed to think differently about...
how we related to each other and model that. We were concerned with fundamentally reshaping society to be more inclusive of people of color and Native Peoples. As such, we needed to engage with each other first and build that trust.

ACPA connections (Rachel). After our November re-treat, I knew that our conversations had only just begun. I felt a bond with those who were present at this retreat, but knew that this group represented only a handful of our total membership. There was a lot of work and trust to be built across our association. Within ACPA, these efforts started at our annual summer leadership meeting. Here, not only our Board, but all ACPA entity leaders would gather to learn about and begin the work associated with our Imperative. To say this was a “make or break” moment would be an understatement. If we had any chance of moving this imperative forward, we needed the full support of all our association leaders.

To begin, we started with dialogue. Rather than create cut-and-paste action plans, talk about assessing our suc-

ccess, or ruminate about whether or not this was the direct or not to adopt a CRT and Tribal Crit lens. And yet, my involvement in ACPA has reminded me of the necessity of making this choice. As such, I know it is critical for me to revisit, reflect, and uplift the stories, voices, and truths re-

ductive to determining what “something” could matter the most.

As a white educator, I have a choice about whether or not to adopt a CRT and Tribal Crit lens. And yet, my involvement in ACPA has reminded me of the necessity of making this choice. As such, I know it is critical for me to revisit, reflect, and uplift the stories, voices, and truths re-

don this work to come. We believed in the endemic nature of racism and colonization, its harmful impact on higher education, and our capacity to enact change.

It was not until later that I realized these truths so closely reflected principles within CRT and Tribal Crit. Despite my naiveté at the time, I’m glad they did. This further grounded my understanding, gave credence to the collective understanding of our organization, and alerted me to the tools available to me as I shifted from “doing something”, to “doing something different”. After our November retreat, I knew that this group represented only a handful of our total membership. There was a lot of work and trust to be built across our association. Within ACPA, these efforts started at our annual summer leadership meeting. Here, not only our Board, but all ACPA entity leaders would gather to learn about and begin the work associated with our Imperative. To say this was a “make or break” moment would be an understatement. If we had any chance of moving this imperative forward, we needed the full support of all our association leaders.

To begin, we started with dialogue. Rather than create cut-and-paste action plans, talk about assessing our suc-

cess, or ruminate about whether or not this was the direct or not to adopt a CRT and Tribal Crit lens. And yet, my involvement in ACPA has reminded me of the necessity of making this choice. As such, I know it is critical for me to revisit, reflect, and uplift the stories, voices, and truths re-

ductive to determining what “something” could matter the most.

As a white educator, I have a choice about whether or not to adopt a CRT and Tribal Crit lens. And yet, my involvement in ACPA has reminded me of the necessity of making this choice. As such, I know it is critical for me to revisit, reflect, and uplift the stories, voices, and truths re-

ductive to determining what “something” could matter the most.

As a white educator, I have a choice about whether or not to adopt a CRT and Tribal Crit lens. And yet, my involvement in ACPA has reminded me of the necessity of making this choice. As such, I know it is critical for me to revisit, reflect, and uplift the stories, voices, and truths re-

ductive to determining what “something” could matter the most.
not to adopt a Tribal Crit lens. I can choose to center only my blackness and not see my other dominant identities as a cisgender, straight, educated, able-bodied person. The times I have done that, though, I have fallen short of what a decolonizing, intersectional lens means. And so, I push myself to move beyond my lack of knowledge and learn. I move from my awareness to action. In the hearing of stories and doing something with those stories, I honor the labor of the storytellers.

ACPA connections (Rachel). What do I do with the stories that others so graciously and bravely shared? Much like Stephen, I also asked myself what I needed to do in order to honor these stories and the unpaid labor that so often accompanied them? Surely, it would be easier to simply listen, nod my head, and then move on, but moving on in this context moving back to the way things always had been done and reinforcing the oppressive forces I sought to resist. As an aspiring critical leader within our association I committed myself to leading differently, speaking differently, behaving differently, and engaging differently in my role.

I wanted to employ an applied critical leadership lens to my work and choose change. So instead of simply nodding and smiling, I chose instead to raise questions, read outside my white-washed bookshelf, investigate new topics within my doctoral research, put forward new policies within my professional practice, and make way for new perspectives in the world. Alongside the work of many others in ACPA, I aim to address what has long been pushed aside in the history of our scholarship and practice. Instead, I aim to center racial justice and decolonization, as a way to advance social justice, equity, and new possibilities for practice. To those of you reading...I ask you to join me. I ask you to join us.

Putting it All Together

The above dialogue offers a deconstructive demonstration of applied critical leadership’s three underly- ing frameworks (Santamaria & Santamaria, 2012). While separated in text for ease of understanding and alignment with the applied critical leadership model, the interplay among transformational leadership principles and critical pedagogy practices as viewed through a CRT/Tribal Crit lens were very much intertwined throughout each of these ex-

periences. As authors, we could have explored any of our stories through all three frameworks, and our hope is that through our conversational progression, readers can also identify the intentionally blurred, co-in-

formed nature of these pieces. The resulting outcome, as seen through our examples, re-emphasize the key characteristics of applied critical leadership, including a willingness to engage in critical conversations, lead in innovative new ways, honor members of their constituency, make empirical contributions, and lead by example through the strengths of our social identities and positionalities (Santamaria & Santamaria, 2012).

Critiques of Applied Critical Leadership

Adopting an applied critical leadership framework necessitates that people maximize opportunities for change and take risks to advance principles of social justice. In addition to the characteristics highlighted above, Santamaria and Santamaria (2012) also encourage leaders to build trust with resistant con-

stituents, engage in interest convergence through consensus-building, and remain conscious of fulfilling identity-based stereotypes. Such recommendations, while not without their merit in particular situations, may lean too heavily on satisfying white constituents and unfairly imply that the impetus for change rests more squarely on the labor and efforts of people of color and Native Peoples. Although Santamaria and Santamaria address this concern by stating that leadership efforts should be shared, perhaps the call for white professionals to enact critical leadership within their work is not strong enough. Thus, our assumption is that such efforts for critical applied leadership be enacted, in full, by all professional association leaders. We provide implications and recommendations for practice for doing so below.

Implications for Practice and Conclusion

As noted within this article, it is impossible to compile a step-by-step guide that wholly captures the work of racial justice and decolon-

ization in professional associations, and yet, this work is needed now more than ever. The effects of racism and colonization continue to persist and the meaningful impacts are impressed upon students, faculty, and staff mem-

bers. ACPA’s Strategic Imperative for Racial Jus-
tice and Decolonization represents a powerful call to reframe and recognize the centrality of racism and settler colonialism in higher education, and to work toward restorative and transformative justice in the ways we affect the future profession” (Poon, 2018, p. 18). As leaders in higher education, and involved members of higher education associations, we must prepare to address these realities and demon-

strate applied critical leadership.

The work of racial justice and decolonization is broad, ongoing, multifaceted, and situated amid the over-
lapping spheres of our sociopolitical contexts and identities. While numerous opportunities exist for future education and to work toward restorative and transformative justice in the ways we affect the future profession,” (Poon, 2018, p. 18). As leaders in higher education, and involved members of higher education associations, we must prepare to address these realities and demonstrate applied critical leadership.

Thus, our hope is that the initial work of ACPA and our individual reflections within this article make visible new pathways for the utilization of Santamaria and Santamaria’s (2012) applied critical leadership frame-

work. With hope, these pathways prompt educational leaders to enact their association involvement differ-

ently. Our professional associations are “sites of opportunity” whereby possibility exists to “alter human probabili-

ties” (Katznelson, 2017, p. 184). Whether involvement takes place as a conference attendee, committee member, fundraiser, volunteer, presenter, discussant, or board member, each role affords professionals with some agency for change. The unique and diverse ways in which association involvement takes place allows for leaders to advance racial justice and decolon-

ization through a variety of pathways, to alter probabilities, and advance justice.

While power and domi-
nance undoubtedly show up in professional associ-

ation work, we assert the belief that each person has power to recognize their agency via applied critical leadership in some way. Whether done by choosing to engage in critical dialogue, name racism and colonization when it appears in assoc-

iation practices, revisit conference keynote plans to lift up new voices, submit a program that views practice through a CRT/ Tribal Crit lens, secure funding to sponsor scholarship around racial justice and decolonization, or advance board level conver-

sations to center racial justice and decolonization at the association-wide level, we urge professionals to choose something. Do something that matters, do something that disrupts the status quo, do something that realigns the priorities of our field with the realities of our world, and that gives way to new and more just practices. Do that kind of something.

*References: Can be found at the end of this special issue.
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Late January 2017, never once having talked about anything other than mundane daily activities and the weather, my mother sheepishly asked about American xenophobia and racism. My mother heard a news segment about Donald Trump’s ascendance to the presidency; she wants to know how much he actually does not like immigrants and whether he actually “makes racism happen.” I sent her for asking, eight years too late, after investing most of my family’s income to make sure that I have the right to be here requires proof of worthiness and deservingness. In his State of the Union Address on January 2018, President Donald Trump announced his “immigration reform package.” The goal was to end “the visa lottery” and to “begin moving toward a merit-based immigration system—one that admits people who are skilled, who want to work, who will contribute to our society, and who will love and respect our country” (State of the Union, 2018, para. 87). Implied is the assumption that the visa lottery has brought in undeserving—unskilled, lazy, noncontributing, and unpatriotic—immigrants. To the President, because America should be a meritocracy, having such a system is un-American: the merit-based system is clearly a solution to the American immigration problem.

A frame “imposes a structure on the current situation, defines a set of ‘problems’ with that situation, and circumscribes the possibility for ‘solutions’” (Lakoff & Ferguson, 2006, p. 1). “Lottery,” a loaded word, as a frame, conveys a random, skill-less, and risk-taking process. A luck-based fortune, such as the visa lottery, is neither deserving nor worthy. Tellingly, the visa lottery Trump attacked in his speech is “The Diversity Immigrant Visa Program.” Diversity is a threat to the President. For me and many other international students and workers on this land, the process that landed me here is a merit-based process, proving every step of the way that we can speak English well, are financially self-sustainable, and are either academically well-prepared for school or especially skilled for “specialty” jobs.

The most accurate frame to describe my American positionality is that I am a “temporary worker,” formally known as a “guest worker,” who “come to America for a short time, work for low wages, do not vote, have few rights and services, and then go home so that a new wave of workers without rights, or the possibility of citizenship and voting, can come in” (Lakoff & Ferguson, 2006, pp. 8–9). Paying tax and without suffrage, international students and workers by definition do not have representation, yet debates about our lives happen daily, always in reference to something or somebody else. Will temporary workers take American jobs? Are the foreign students studying bioengineering secretly creating biological weapons? Even when I proved my deservingness of the visa, the rule of the game changed arbitrarily; nobody is safe.

Systemic disempowerment could continue to hit until people have nothing left to fight with. In March 2017, one month before the opening date of the H-1B visa petition and four months before the end of my legal status, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) announced that starting April 3, it would suspend premium processing for all H-1B petitions, creating a backlog in processing time and potentially pushing me into illegal status. Without my department’s financial and legal support, I could not have been here. In April 2017, Donald
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While I continually manipulate my assets and resources in a supposed meritocracy to get to the American dream, I painfully live and learn the reality that such meritocracy is a myth.
Trump signed an executive order titled “Buy American and Hire American” that instructed federal agencies to closely regulate policies that granted work authorization such as the H-1B visa, which is the visa I am on. Multiple different American institutions—the university international offices, the U.S. consulate providing the visa, the Department of Homeland Security at the airport, and USCIS approving my legal status—exist to check for my deservingness to come and be here. The underlying assumption is that my legality is intimately dependent on my deservingness of and productivity within the American economy. As a student affairs professional, I still feel like a liar when affirming many international students and domestic students of the beauty of diversity and their inherent worthiness of belonging and success.

One reason that many college officials use to convince international students and domestic students of the value of international students on campus is cultural diversity. That is, these international students will bring their cultures and contribute to the larger campus. I cringe at questions about “my culture” because the story is complicated. My Vietnamese story is not of an ideologically distant exotic land with a strange culture stuck in the past. My mother wholeheartedly believed in the “land of the superior” (in her words) so strongly that she started my ideological preparation as far back as I could remember. For most of the 1980s, my mother lived in a German rural town as an immigrant worker. Although she almost met the requirements, she blamed the Vietnamese government for not normalizing its relationship with the United States sooner so she could access Western goods and live its “advanced” values. “The bitterness and humiliations of the [imperialized] experience […] nevertheless delivered benefits—liberal ideas, national self-consciousness, and technological goods—that over time seem to have made imperialism much less unpleasant” (Said, 1994, p. 18). Along with bribing my teachers to excuse me from “unnecessary classes” so I could focus on the SAT and driving for hours a day to get me from school to my volunteer site to my test-prep class all at different corners of the city, we paid US$2,000 (40% of my family’s annual income) upfront to a Vietnamese study abroad agency to get professional help with my college application. I would not have been here, and my deservingness will not be recognized without my mother’s unyielding faith and investment in White imperial supremacy.

Ruminating over worthiness and deservingness does not change my reality, and I have the ability to act on this reality. Part of my reality includes facing questions of responsibility. Specifically, responsibility to whom? Upon which social and political conditions am I responsible to act? Spivak’s (1993) warning is not destiny because of my ambivalent position in relation to Western imperialism. Speaking English without a strong accent, fluent in popular cultural references, praised as the embodiment of exemplary working ethics, confident in my capabilities, and committed to democracy, my existence is a mimicry of the colonizer’s production: “translated” copies of the colonizer’s cultural habits, assumptions, institutions, and values” (Andreotti, 2011, p. 26). Bhabha’s (1984) conceptualization of the “mimic men” and Frantz Fanon’s (1968) “native intellectual” both have a potential path to transformative colonial resistance (McLeod, 2000). Fanon’s (1968) three-phase process—unqualified assimilation, just-before-the-battle, and fighting—for the native intellectuals is helpful; yet, just as any theory is an imperfect reflection of reality, I am not sure it is applicable to me. My responsibility is to define this path for myself. I am not yet at the fighting phase where I am with my people reimagining, reinterpreting, and transforming the Vietnamese culture. That is where I would like to go.
Since taking office President Trump has been leading America into a downward spiral. Instead of uniting everyone, he has divided us as a country. It feels as if we’re back in the 50s with racial segregation and discrimination. An example of this is the Charlottesville Rally where white supremacists went to protest the city’s plan to take down Confederate monuments. The event turned violent after protesters clashed with counter-protesters. After seeing this play out on CNN I was inspired to make an abstract representation of the event that took place during the rally as the counter-protester was attacked.
Cultivating Resilience and Resistance in Trump’s America: Embracing Critical Hope as a Framework in LGBTQ+ Centers

Resident Donald Trump’s infamous tweets have become almost commonplace in our current era. Every day, we wonder who he will offend, what human rights he will attempt to compromise, or who he might further marginalize.

Nowhere is this as prevalent as for LGBTQ+ populations, who have been oppressed historically and whose status remains precarious. For example, in July 2017, Trump (2017) tweeted, “victory cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would entail.” As the leader of the most powerful nation in the world, Trump has the upper hand. Under his administration, the Department of Justice is protecting taxpayer-funded federal agencies, government employees, and government contractors who legally discriminate against LGBTQ+ employees for religious reasons, and the Department of Health and Human Services is eliminating LGBTQ+ communities’ health needs from strategic plan for 2018-2022.

These actions are harsh and unsettling, especially since Trump’s rhetoric and such policies give license to others to oppress and to continue to uphold a legacy of homophobia and transphobia in the United States. Since his election, we have seen a rise in hate crimes; the Southern Poverty Law Center, for example, “found 867 cases of hateful harassment or intimidation in the 10 days after the Nov. 8 election” (Southern Poverty Law Center, 2016). To be clear, is not solely Trump himself that is the problem we identify. Rather, his taking office has leveraged an ideology that oppresses LGBTQ+ peoples and other marginalized bodies. His presence has awakened, catalyzed, and most importantly legitimized a host of negativity in social spaces. The visibility of White Nationalists, for instance, has dominated the media in the last year, reflected in instances such as Charlottesville, Virginia or the appearance of swastikas across college campuses. This is surely not a coincidence.

It might seem then, that in such a political context, resistance and resilience would be futile. We believe, however, that just the opposite is true. This milieu necessitates response, on all fronts, now more than ever. In the space where we work, higher education, there are numerous opportunities for such efforts. One such arena is through LGBTQ+ centers on college campuses. As places that, by their very existence, disrupt the status quo, campus LGBTQ+ centers validate marginalized students and provide opportunities for their growth and support (Marine, 2011). Our current political climate, which resists diverse bodies, makes the need for such centers and their work of cultivating hope, and thereby a commitment to struggle and change, even more urgent. Such centers and those who work within them offer tools for students to respond to and navigate these uncertain times.

Resilience is a term operationalized in multiple fields; however, we employ Niccolazzo’s (2017) reconceptualization of它 as “not necessarily something that one has or does (e.g., an ability) but a practice” (p. 88). Formulating resilience as an action helps us to construct how LGBTQ+ centers can themselves (and can assist students) employ strategies “to overcome individual enactments of trans* oppression,” (Niccolazzo, 2017, p. 88) and determine “where and with whom one can best be successful and, thus, best navigate the collegiate environment” (Niccolazzo, 2017, p. 89).

And, just as we expand resilience, we also note that the manner in which one resists can vary. We recognize resistance broadly because we wish to validate each person’s agency in resisting in this tumultuous political climate on their own terms. Resistance, then, could be voting or protesting, or it could be writing to a Congressperson, or it could be sharing factual news on social media. It could also encompass a combination of these or even something different. Resistance cannot have a size fit all definition because people must be able to resist within their given social contexts. Furthermore, individuals must be able to step back when they need a break, when they feel overwhelmed by emotion, exhaustion, or frustration. Resistance means they still return to the cause, but it understands that battle fatigue exist as a result of a host of oppressions, such as racism, cisgenderism, or sexism. Additionally, resistance cannot be left to those who find it convenient or, conversely, to who are most affected. It should be assumed by anyone who wants to fight against the dangerous rhetoric of Trump and his supporters and who wants to hope for a better world.

In this article, we posit that a critical hope framework (Duncan-Andrade, 2009) employed by campus centers can help foster resistance and resilience with LGBTQ+ students. While we focus on LGBTQ+ centers, this framework could be adapted to other centers that serve marginalized students. Additionally, LGBTQ+
hope, and offer five areas for critical praxis that allow for the disruption of the systemic oppression which we are witnessing today. It is our goal to demonstrate tangible ways that concerned citizens, staff, and faculty can better support university students and be agents of change in what may seem like dismal times.

**LGBTQ+ centers**

LGBTQ+ centers emerged after the Stonewall riots to support gay and lesbian students, and later shifted to include all diverse gender identities, expressions, and sexual orientations. The first center opened in 1971 at the University of Michigan, and today there are nearly 200 centers located at all types of institutions nationwide (Consortium of Higher Education LGBT Professionals, n.d.; Marine, 2011). The opening of many of these centers occurred as the LGBTQ+ rights movement had begun, but the LGBTQ+ community splintered into individual identities, which continued through the 1990s (Styker, 2008). In the 1980s and 1990s, more centers opened nationwide, mainly due to student activists (Marine, 2011). Now most centers focus on all diverse gender identities/expressions and sexual orientations. These changes signify that centers and their staff recognize that as times and political climates change, the centers must change to adapt and meet the needs of the campus community.

LGBTQ+ centers assess campus climate for LGBTQ+ students, faculty, and staff (Damschroder, 2013; Marine, 2011). These assessments can then be used to argue for more resources, such as staff, funds, or space. Additionally, these assessments can offer evidence about harassment or microaggressions that students, staff, and faculty experience with the goal of targeting the cause and location of these issues in order to eliminate them. Centers also conduct assessments to assist with telling their story (Damschroder, 2013). This storytelling is imperative when most institutions do not track LGBTQ+ student retention through quantitative methods like other student services units. Therefore, LGBTQ+ centers cannot show impact easily from already collected information, which impacts the ability to demonstrate their benefit to students.

LGBTQ+ centers offer support to students who are experiencing turmoil or who need community (Damschroder, 2013; Marine, 2011). LGBTQ+ center staff are experienced in helping students in their coming out processes and navigating the institutional bureaucracy. Students who frequent the centers also offer support to their peers, sharing strategies that have worked for them and empowering students to live. These interactions create and cultivate community amongst LGBTQ+ students and their allies. This community is important as many students, especially those from more rural areas, may not have had this type of community in their hometown.

Therefore, LGBTQ+ centers cannot show impact easily from already collected information, which impacts the ability to demonstrate their benefit to students.

**Critical Hope**

Attributed to the work of Duncan-Andrade (2009), the concept of “critical hope” denotes cautious optimism and progressive action in the face of structural oppression. Duncan-Andrade outlined several forms of hope that he does not wish to forward, offering instead more realistic and achievable styles. Those that he admonished begin with hokey hope, “an individualistic up-by-your-strapboots hyperbole that suggests if . . . youth just work hard, pay attention, and play by the rules, then they will . . . live out the ‘American dream’” (p. 182). The burden this places on a singular person is unfair, given that forces at work in institutional structures, much larger than any individual, often exist as obstacles precluding a person from reaching their potential at no fault of their own.

Mythical hope is the second form against which Duncan-Andrade (2009) warned, explaining this as the type that results when an opportunity for a certain population is won or a person from a marginalized group achieves success. This, he stated, is a “false narrative of equal opportunity emptied of its historical and political exigencies” (p. 183) and “depends on luck and the law of averages to produce individual exceptions to the tyranny of injustice” (p. 184). Grand erasures of history cannot occur simply because one person ‘makes it’. Finally, the third type of impractical hope, hope deferred, is an extreme opposite of hokey hope. Rather than solely seeing the individual, hope deferred instead is paralyzed by systemic oppression,
Audacious hope, therefore, keenly discerns a challenging and potentially discouraging situation, such as living in the era of Trump and being a member of LGBTQ+ communities and strives for change.

Audacious hope, therefore, keenly discerns a challenging and potentially discouraging situation, such as living in the era of Trump and being a member of LGBTQ+ communities and strives for change. We now turn to specific examples of current policies and marginalized structures and explain how LGBTQ+ centers can employ the forms of critical hope that Duncan-Andrade theorized.

**Critical Praxis**

In this section, we posit a host of issues and actions reflective of Duncan-Andrade’s (2009) critical hope in order to facilitate students better capable of responding to their immediate local, national, and global contexts. We begin by focusing on one instance of an LGBTQ+ center that is under attack. We then explore Title IX, immigration, bathroom bills, women’s rights, and healthcare while recognizing that this list is neither exhaustive of the issues and rights targeted within this current administration nor are they completely separate. For each issue, we highlight its history and how it impacts students in LGBTQ+ centers. We then discuss how critical hope can be embodied or otherwise ignored within this current administration and the ways that oppression works and a commitment to changing it is vital in cultivating resilience in LGBTQ+ communities and strives for change. We now discuss critical praxis: it can be easy to get trapped in what Duncan-Andrade (2009) labeled as hope deferred, described above. For some, especially those with privilege, telling others to wait it out or that it will get better is a sound solution. Practitioners might recognize that things will change in the next president’s administration. However, those who are not immediately affected cannot tell students, who are experiencing tremendous pain or concern for their safety or immigration status, that it will get better. This deferred hope is neither helpful, useful, or socially just, nor does this approach instill critical hope in LGBTQ+ students. The mere existence of centers, as in the case of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is considered radical by some. The existence of centers is therefore a form of audacious hope. Space on campus is important for those students who need to feel heard and to share their pain with others. This LGBTQ+ community is just as important to those who need to process the hurt and struggles they may experience in the world as it is for those who are in the midst of their coming out. Therefore, this space should include those in who are angry or “disobedient” because they often need the space the most (Duncan-Andrade, 2009).

Center Existence

As centers continue to perform their daily functions in our current political era, at least one has already come under attack. In 2016, the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UT) had the funding for its Office for Diversity and Inclusion, which included its LGBTQ+ center, rerouted to minority engineering scholarships by the state legislature for one year (Ohm, 2017b). Then in 2017, then state senator, Beverly Davenport, decided to hire a coordinator to lead the UT Pride Center (Ohm, 2017b). Several state lawmakers criticized this decision. Mae Beavers, a Republican gubernatorial candidate and former state senator, released a statement in which she said: It is disappointing that the new Chancellor has decided to ignore the clear intent and legitimate concerns of the Tennessee Legislature which defunded the Office for Diversity and Inclusion after it became evident that Title IX funds were being used to promote a radical agenda that did not reflect the values of the State and our citizens. (Ohm, 2017a, para. 2)

Beavers disagreed with the diversity office’s shift to inclusive holiday parties that did not mention Santa Claus or Christmas (Ohm, 2017a). While this is one example of an LGBTQ+ center under attack, the brazen condemnation on support services in one conservative state could create a ripple effect and impact other states.

The functions of an LGBTQ+ center have long been considered vital in cultivating resilience in LGBTQ+ students. The mere existence of centers, as in the case of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, is considered radical by some. The existence of centers is therefore a form of audacious hope. Space on campus is important for those students who need to feel heard and to share their pain with others. This LGBTQ+ community is just as important to those who need to process the hurt and struggles they may experience in the world as it is for those who are in the midst of their coming out. Therefore, this space should include those in who are angry or “disobedient” because they often need the space the most (Duncan-Andrade, 2009).

Prior to this Obama-era clarification, the University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown expelled Seamus Johnston, a trans* man, because he used the men’s bathrooms and locker rooms (Jaschik, 2015). The judge did not believe that Title IX prohibited discrimination based on gender identity or failure to conform to stereotypes of masculinity or femininity and OCR accepts such complaints for investigation” (Lhamon, 2014, p. 5). This clarification allowed for trans* students to file complaints with the OCR for investigation on whether or not an institution was in violation of Title IX.

Title IX

Title IX was enacted by the federal government in the 1970s to assert that no one would be excluded due to their sex in any education program or activity that received federal funding (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). Title IX has long been employed to ensure athletics in equity, but, more recently, policymakers issued clarifications to the policy, including how to respond to sexual assault and how to support students who are pregnant and/or are parents. In April 2014, the United States Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights (OCR) issued the statement: “Title IX’s sex discrimination prohibition extends to claims of discrimination based on gender identity or failure to conform to stereotypical notions of masculinity or femininity and OCR accepts such complaints for investigation” (Lhamon, 2014, p. 5). This clarification allowed for trans* students to file complaints with the OCR for investigation on whether or not an institution was in violation of Title IX.
Immigration

Immigration, often viewed as a social justice issue facing members of the LGBTQ+ community, is no longer in place. Policies by finding local solutions when federal protections are no longer in place. This cultivates resistance to Trump’s other LGBQ+ students’ rights in education. It is a perilous beginning to ignoring trans* (and other transsexuals) as Samar (2016) wrote, “use of a bathroom or locker room isn’t only about exclusion or changing clothes. Both involve the individuals’ intersection with the dominant culture and the ways that culture reflects on either supports or rejects the deeply felt identity of the user” (p. 38). Thus, there are broad scale issues at play in this controversy about who society values and how they communicate those values. Media and national attention to the HB2 debate soared, and in the “2017 legislative session, legislators in 15 states introduced HB2-type bills” (Journell, 2017, p. 340).

Given the political precedent of Title IX, it seems that these bills are in violation of the federal government’s stance. However, as noted above, the landscape was complicated by the fact that in 2016 the “Trump administration rescinded the Obama administration’s stance. However, as noted above, the landscape was complicated by the fact that in 2016 “the Trump administration rescinded the Obama administration’s guidelines that Title IX’s sex discrimination should be interpreted to include gender identity discrimination” (Davis, 2017, p. 2). This decision led the Supreme Court to declare that a trans man, whose birth certificate did not correspond to the sex on his birth certificate as truth be told, “secured the right to use bathroom facilities consistent with their gender identities” (Rushin & Carroll, 2017, p. 8-9). A backlash occurred, evidenced by thirteen states filing suits against the federal government for its ruling, feeling that their rights were compromised and, eventually, proposals for bathroom bills emerged.

Perhaps the most well-publicized of such legislation is North Carolina’s House Bill 2 (HB2) passed in 2016, which “required individuals to use the bathroom that corresponded to the sex on their birth certificate as opposed to the gender with which they identified” (Journell, 2017, p. 339). Proponents advocated that the bill would serve to protect women and children from sexual predators while opponents argued that such a policy was a violation of human rights, that “equal access to public restrooms is a fundamental right that predicates democratic participation of any kind” (Davis, 2017, p. 3). Others have noted that such laws “criminalize the trans* community” by “explicitly establishing a new criminal offense category for trans individuals who use bathrooms consistent with their gender identities” (Rushin & Carroll, 2017, p. 16). Opening the door for public and private policing and creating difficulty in implementing such policies, pun- dits have noted how dangerous the bill could be. And, as Sarah (2016) wrote, “use of a bathroom or locker room isn’t only about exclusion or changing clothes. Both involve the individuals’ intersection with the dominant culture and the ways that culture reflects on either supports or rejects the deeply felt identity of the user” (p. 38). Thus, there are broad scale issues at play in this controversy about who society values and how they communicate those values. Media and national attention to the HB2 debate soared, and in the “2017 legislative session, legislators in 15 states introduced HB2-type bills” (Journell, 2017, p. 340).

Given the political precedent of Title IX, it seems that these bills are in violation of the federal government’s stance. However, as noted above, the landscape was complicated by the fact that in 2016 “the Trump administration rescinded the Obama administration’s guidelines that Title IX’s sex discrimination should be interpreted to include gender identity discrimination” (Davis, 2017, p. 2). This decision led the Supreme Court to declare that a trans man, whose birth certificate did not correspond to the sex on his birth certificate as truth be told, “secured the right to use bathroom facilities consistent with their gender identities” (Rushin & Carroll, 2017, p. 8-9). A backlash occurred, evidenced by thirteen states filing suits against the federal government for its ruling, feeling that their rights were compromised and, eventually, proposals for bathroom bills emerged.

Perhaps the most well-publicized of such legislation is North Carolina’s House Bill 2 (HB2) passed in 2016, which “required individuals to use the bathroom that corresponded to the sex on their birth certificate as opposed to the gender with which they identified” (Journell, 2017, p. 339). Proponents advocated that the bill would serve to protect women and children from sexual predators while opponents argued that such a policy was a violation of human rights, that “equal access to public restrooms is a fundamental right that predicates democratic participation of any kind” (Davis, 2017, p. 3). Others have noted that such laws “criminalize the trans* community” by “explicitly establishing a new criminal offense category for trans individuals who use bathrooms consistent with their gender identities” (Rushin & Carroll, 2017, p. 16). Opening the door for public and private policing and creating difficulty in implementing such policies, pun- dits have noted how dangerous the bill could be. And, as Sarah (2016) wrote, “use of a bathroom or locker room isn’t only about exclusion or changing clothes. Both involve the individuals’ intersection with the dominant culture and the ways that culture reflects on either supports or rejects the deeply felt identity of the user” (p. 38). Thus, there are broad scale issues at play in this controversy about who society values and how they communicate those values. Media and national attention to the HB2 debate soared, and in the “2017 legislative session, legislators in 15 states introduced HB2-type bills” (Journell, 2017, p. 340).
has shown that trans* people may avoid using the bathroom while in public, causing serious health problems (Herman, 2013). Neither of these consequences is what we should want for our university students.

How then, can LGBTQ+ centers and practitioners who work within the confines of this wider discourse spread debate and against the backdrop of Trump’s legislative move? First, LGBTQ+ centers can offer all-gender bathrooms if possible, and they can help students locate across campus, mapping out where they are in relation to students’ classes. In 2016, Time magazine reported that more than 150 U.S. colleges and universities have gender inclusive restrooms on their campuses (Steinmetz, 2016), This is a positive move, and staff in centers can advocate for more all gender bathrooms on their campuses, since “schools are obligated to protect the safety, both physical and emotional, of all their students” (Watkins & Moreno, 2017, p. 170). This is, in essence, the cultivation of material hope—students are being provided with tangible resources they need to live productively and healthfully.

As Watkins and Moreno (2017), noted, however, “Almost every school has no specific policy in place, relying on state legislative language, which in many cases does not protect the rights of transgender students. Schools will be better served by crafting policy using a comprehensive policy model that safeguards all students.” (p. 169) Therefore, staff in LGBTQ+ centers should familiarize students’ voices and challenge institutional policies, or lack thereof, that marginalize LGBTQ+ students, working to ensure their rights and safety are guaranteed. When it comes to bathrooms, centers can be the force that push for those facilities, rather than placing the burden entirely on students to secure their needs. As a form of audacious hope, then, centers can be assisted in navigating the complex bureaucracy often associated with those facilities, rather than placing the burden entirely on students to secure their needs.

An all-gender restroom could be the leader on those, consulting with students and utilizing their feedback to inform recommended policy and construction. Such actions would be the epitome of ending Socratic hope because they listen to the voices of those affected, empathize, and develop appropriate responses.

Healthcare

Healthcare, deemed by many to be a human right, is constantly under siege by the Trump administration and Republican Congresspersons. While there are myriad issues in healthcare that impact LGBTQ+ communities, HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment is one of the most salient. HIV/AIDS has long been coupled with the LGBTQ+ community. In the early 1980s, President Reagan did not acknowledge the burgeoning epidemic, and his press secretary infamously disregarded the disease in the audio documentary. When AIDS was funny (Calonic, 2015). The earliest cases were linked to gay men, and thus were deemed not worthy of public concern (Calonic, 2015). HIV/AIDS did not only affect gay men, which was recognized later, but it nonetheless still greatly impacts the LGBTQ+ community.

At the end of 2017, the Trump administration dismissed the remaining members of the HIV and AIDS Council (Guarino, 2017). This Council has advised the White House on HIV/AIDS policy since its inception under President Clinton in 1995 (Guarino, 2017). Additionally, Trump’s administration has threatened the Affordable Care Act (ACA), which is imperative for those who receive coverage and are living with HIV/AIDS. Under ACA, individuals cannot be dropped or denied coverage because of a pre-existing health condition, such as HIV or AIDS (n.d.). Admittedly, the ACA required most plans to cover certain preventive services, such as HIV testing for those between the ages of 15 and 65 (HIV/gov, n.d.). According to UNAIDS (2014), worldwide trans women are more likely to contract HIV. In the United States, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2017) estimate that 70% of new HIV infections were among gay and bisexual men.

These statistics clearly demonstrate that HIV/AIDS is very much a LGBTQ+ issue. The Trump administration’s desire to change the ACA and dismantle the HIV and AIDS Council are direct attacks on the LGBTQ+ community. Currently, only 34 states and the District of Columbia mandate HIV education, but there is not a requirement for all of these states to be medically accurate (Guttmacher Institute, n.d.). In addition, few states require conversations around sexual orientation, and of these states, three allow for only negative information on sexual orientation (Guttmacher Institute, n.d.). Thus, with, limited, and, sometimes false, information being taught in K-12 schools, college students may be misinformed about the necessity for HIV/AIDS testing or how HIV is contracted.

Due to this misinformation or lack of information, LGBTQ+ centers can provide education, and if necessary, work with other groups to offer preventative services. These entities should be based in audacious hope because the history of AIDS in the United States is rife with oppression and injustice. HIV/AIDS is a painful reminder of the past and how little elected officials cared about LGBTQ+ communities as they were dying. Practitioners can demonstrate audacious hope by talking about this painful memory by using the numerous documentaries that either foreground HIV/AIDS or have HIV/AIDS as an important plot component. Additionally, Duncan-Andrade (2009) wrote, “Audacious hope stares down the painful path; and despite the overwhelming odds against us making it that down that path to change, we make the journey again and again” (p. 191). While the perilous path is eerily similar to that of years ago, there is significantly more information and medical interventions to help prevent and treat HIV/AIDS. Therefore, LGBTQ+ centers, as reflective of critical hope, can also employ material hope working when initiating new programs around safe sex, advocating for HIV testing, pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP), and post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) at campus health centers, and hosting events that explain the past of HIV/AIDS. PrEP is a daily prescription medication for those who are at high risk for contracting HIV. PrEP can prevent an HIV infection. PEP is also an antiretroviral medication that one can take if they have potentially been exposed to HIV. The Trump administration’s threat to medical education by helping students learn more about health and wellbeing than they, most likely, would have learned in high school. They also promote resistance and resilience by allowing for the right to have an LGBTQ+ history and how resilient, and how often resistent, LGBTQ+ revolutionaries were when they originally faced the HIV/AIDS crisis.

Gender-Based Violence

As illustrated with our focus on immigration, LGBTQ+ students’ identities overlap with multiple others that warrant support and advocacy. These intersectionalities also involves women’s identities. President Trump’s notorious and sexually explicit comments about his lewd treatment of women are now well known, having been publicized just before the election in 2016. As the year unfolded, a number of related movements took flight, including the #MeToo campaign, which surfaced after multiple Hollywood actresses shared their harrowing accounts of sexual harassment by film mogul Harvey Weinstein. Although begun in 2007 by Tarana Burke, a Black female, the movement gained attention particularly through White feminists. Thus rightly critiqued by women of color, #MeToo nonetheless became an awareness movement that came forward with their own stories of sexual assault. Acknowledging “it has actually been simmering for years, decades, centuries, and many women and girls in leadership roles took on the charge, avowing they ‘have had it with...”
bosses and co-workers who not only cross boundaries but don’t even seem to know that boundaries exist. … They’ve had it with men who use their power to take what they want from women” (Zacharek, Docter, & Edwards, 2017, para. 8). Now, the “Time’s Up” campaign, led by over 300 women in film, television, and theater, is a commitment to supporting women’s rights and has an established legal defense fund housed by the National Women’s Law Center to subsidize legal costs associated with sexual harassment suits. The initial open letter published from participants read: Too many centers of power—from legislatures to boardrooms to executive suites and management to academia—lack gender parity and women do not have equal decision-making authority. This systemic gender-inequality and imbalance of power fosters an environment that is ripe for abuse and harassment against women. Therefore, we call for a significant increase of women in positions of leadership and power across industries. In addition, we seek equal representation, opportunities, benefits, and pay for all women workers, not to mention greater representation of women of color, immigrant women, disabled women, and lesbian, bisexual, and transgender women, whose experiences in the workforce are often significantly worse than their white, cisgender, straight peers. The struggle for women to break in, to rise up the ranks and to simply be heard and acknowledged in male-dominant workplaces must end, and time’s up on this impenetrable monopoly. (“Dear sisters,” 2018). Recognizing the ways that women’s identities intersect with other facets of positionality and how those create inequitable access to power, the movement seeks to address such injustices.

In these turbulent times, LGBTQ+ centers are more vital to cultivating students’ resilience from hate and resistance to oppressive systems. As practitioners, we can employ critical hope as a framework to help cultivate students’ resilience and resistance to Trump’s omnipresent oppressive regime. Case after case of sexual assault and harassment continues to emerge. Matt Lauer was fired from his twenty-year run on the Today show upon evidence of sexual misconduct and Dr. Larry Nassar, Michigan State University and USA gymnastics physician was sentenced to up to 175 years in prison for his crimes against women. Students on university campuses, as part of the general public, are witness to these atrocious stories and the movements that are ensuing as a result. Many college women are also part of the response, taking part in protests and marches. And, many have stories of their own to tell. The Bureau of Justice Statistics found in a 2016 study of nine campuses that 21% of students reported experiencing sexual assault since the beginning of their college careers, with higher rates reported by non-heterosexual college women (Krebs, et al, 2016). Every school, under Title IX, should have a coordinator responsible for acting to ensure the safety of the student if sexual misconduct or discrimination occurs. Yet, we know that “because the great majority of sexual assaults are not reported to campus or law enforcement personnel, formal crime statistics grossly underestimate the scope of the problem” (Gray, Hassija, & Steinmetz, 2017, p. 5). Thus, more needs to be done on university campuses to address women’s rights, especially as they pertain to the problems of sexual misconduct.

In this cultural moment, LGBTQ+ centers can be spaces of support for women’s intersecting identities. First, they can provide an opportunity for women to share their experiences on campuses with sexual harassment or assault. Witnessing and validating students’ hurt is a form of Socratic hope, and through listening to those who are surviving sexual assault, centers can embody this form. Exhibiting Socratic hope also means understanding the anger a survivor might feel and affirming those feelings. Second, staff at LGBTQ+ centers can assist students in documenting and reporting any instances that may arise, accompanying them to the proper authorities if desired. In one sense, the staff member is also a form of material hope simply by being with a student. As a resource, having another human to believe a person’s testimony and facilitate reporting is invaluable. In another sense, the act of support also reflects audacious hope. It helps the student navigate the system, one which often oppresses women and silences their voices in situations of sexual misconduct, especially when the perpetrator is in a position of power.

Conclusion

Almost daily, the media reports new policy implementations or rollbacks that target the most vulnerable populations, in particular, LGBTQ+ individuals. In these turbulent times, LGBTQ+ centers are more vital to cultivating students’ resilience from hate and resistance to oppressive systems. As practitioners, we can employ critical hope as a framework to help cultivate students’ resilience and resistance to Trump’s omnipresent oppressive regime. By amplifying student voices, building relationships, and assisting with material needs, LGBTQ+ center staff have the ability to instill hope when the world becomes more precarious every day.

*References: Can be found at the end of this special issue.
The Personal is Still Political:

A Feminist Critical Policy Analysis of the Title IX Rollback
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In November 2016, Republican candidate Donald Trump won the presidential election with 304 electoral votes over Democrat Hillary Clinton’s 227, despite the difference of 2.9 million in the popular vote in favor of Clinton. The discriminatory and hate-filled rhetoric of the Trump campaign raised concerns that the advancements of rights for “sexual and gender minorities made under President Barack Obama’s administration would be limited or rescinded” (Veldhuis, Drabble, Riggie, Wootton & Hughes, 2018, p. 27). The fate of Title IX of the Education Amendments was of concern due to the calamitous appointment of Trump’s nominee, Betsy DeVos as Secretary of Education. DeVos signaled no commitment to upholding the previous policies of Title IX because sex is a variable in the policy. Or perhaps DeVos believed that the Obama-era guidance was heralded as successful in bringing national attention to campus sexual violence, and mobilized universities to update practices to address the issue (Collins, 2016). The current administration, however, has left many worried about the legitimization of messages of exclusion, hate and violence (Veldhuis et al., 2018). The discussion of campus sexual violence from the current administration reflects dominant narratives of rape that “blame the victim, question the victim’s credibility, imply that the victim deserved being raped, denigrate the victim, and trivialize the rape experience” (Ward, 1988 as cited in Nagal, Matsuo, McIntyre, & Morrison, 2005, p. 726).

Negative attitudes toward rape victims are exacerbated by perceptions of race, culture, and gender (Collins, 2016; Crenshaw, 1989; Nagal et al., 2005). Feminist analysis using a critical lens recognizes intersections of identities and the impact these have on marginalized groups (Biklen, Marshall & Pollard, 2008; Shaw, 2004). Utilizing feminist critical analysis, I aim to expose the prevailing power relations in Title IX policy for a more complete understanding of its implementation from the perspectives of both the policymakers and those affected by the policy (Shaw, 2004, p. 57).

Feminist critical analysis can be applied to the spectrum of sex-based discrimination defined by Title IX. However, for this analysis, I will focus specifically on regulations regarding sexual violence and rape. According to the Office of Civil Rights, sexual violence refers to “physical sexual acts perpetrated against a person’s will or where a person is incapable of giving consent,” including rape, sexual assault, sexual battery, sexual abuse, and sexual coercion (United States Department of Education, 2011, p. 1). In this article, I begin with an overview feminist critical policy analysis and explain its use to analyze Title IX guidance. Next, with the intent to expose the intersections of sexism with other forms of oppression and further marginalization, I will use critical feminist thought to (a) examine rape; (b) review the implementation and responses to the 2011 DCL; and (c) examine the five significant changes in the most recent Title IX guidance. Finally, I will provide discussion points to facilitate future considerations for Title IX implementation.

Feminist Critical Policy Analysis

Feminist critical analysis problematizes policies to reveal sexism and discrimination, including racial, sexual, and social class biases, inherent in commonly accepted theories, constructs, and concepts (Bensimon & Marshall, 2003; Marshall, 1999). According to Marshall (1997 as cited in Shaw, 2004), White, well-educated males dominate approaches to policy analysis; therefore, the worldview of this group is valued and widely accepted. Feminist critical analysis reveals androcentrism (centered on male or masculine interests) in the ways policies exclude women or proclaim neutrality, essentially disenfranchising or denying women opportunity, agency, or power (Biklen, Marshall & Pollard, 2008). Simply adding sex, or women, as a protected class is not in itself transformative (Bensimon & Marshall, 2003; Shaw, 2004). The key tenets of feminist critical theory are the analysis of the intersectionality of privilege and oppression and it’s socially constructed nature (Bensimon & Marshall, 2003; Marshall, 1999).

Using Feminist Critical Analysis with Title IX

One could assume that a feminist critical policy analysis framework was applied at all levels of amending Title IX because sex is a variable in the policy. Or per-

“Feminist critical analysis problematizes policies to reveal sexism and discrimination, including racial, sexual, and social class biases, inherent in commonly accepted theories, constructs, and concepts.”
haps because sex is embedded in the policy, gender biases are not a concern. Conventional policy analysts would argue that because sex is the basis of this anti-discrimination policy, it is not necessary to analyze its potential for gender bias toward males. A close examination of perceptions of rape is paramount in the analysis of the current status and direction of Title IX. The current administration's approach in repealing previous Title IX guidance mirrors patriarchal and racist relations toward sexual violence and exposes the prevalence of an un-written threat to power (Crenshaw, 1991; Harris & Linder, 2017; Nagal et al., 2005). DeVos and critics of the Obama-era guidance have focused much of their attention on the negative impact these changes have had on students accused of sexual violence. Many of the examples used support this claim follow the dominant narrative of sexual violence. Implementing Title IX provides a venue for false reporting against innocent White male students (Joyce, 2017; Taylor & Johnson, 2015; Yoffee, 2017). Employing feminist critical analysis has the potential to fully realize the spirit of Title IX by revealing the group that are not being excluded by the policy (Collins, 2016; Crenshaw, 1991; Marshall, 1999; Shaw, 2004). Feminist critical scholarship is limited in regards to Title IX because of the policy's prevailing ambiguous status. However, the basis of gender in Title IX and the complexities of sexual violence fortify how the per- nance of gender remains political; hence, a feminist critical approach is exceptionally appropriate.

An area of contention in using feminist critical anal- ysis on Title IX is that the policy is inherently gen- der-charged, whereas the literature on this method is typically applied to seemingly neutral structures. Instead of focusing on gender in this policy, feminist critical analysis problematizes the policymakers and the political processes that govern gender. Activism to implement firm Title IX guidelines was led by policymakers who may identify as feminist and advocate for women's rights. In her article “Trading the Megaphone for the Gavel in Title IX Enforcement,” Halley (2015) called out feminists within the govern- ment that pushed for the Obama-era Title IX regula- tions (p. 103). These “strategic feminists” (Bensimon & Marshall, 2003, p. 347) or “femocrats” (Franzvanz, Court, & Connell, 1989 and Watson, 1990 as cited in Marshall, 1999, p. 66) perhaps neutralized the discourse of campus sexual violence as all-inclusive to remain at the table for governmental power over Title IX regulation (Collins, 2016; Halley, 2015). Although this tactic conflicts with critical feminism, the use of heterocen- trism (assumption that all people are heterosexual), traditional policy analysis believes in a single truth and assumes objectivity is achievable and desirable (Shaw, 2004), contrary to critical analysis. Critical fem- inism threatens power structures by revealing the pot- tential flaws in practices and decisions that would other- wise be normalized and accepted. Bensimon and Marshall (2003) explain that traditional analytic posi- tions gender as an environmental variable referring “only to those areas both structural and ideological involving sex and gender” (p. 344). Positioning gender as a category of analysis instead of an environmental variable shifts interpretation away from problematizing women “blame-the-victim or change-the-victim approach” (Bensimon and Marshall, 2003, p. 344). Consequently, reframing questions using this approach changes the focus of the solution. I hope to disrupt the discourse of victimization by reforming the analysis of Title IX reform, and provide critical discourse for professionals in higher education.

**Title IX Analysis**

**Rape**

Interestingly, much of the literature used to examine Title IX in this article does not include a definition of rape, nor an exploration of how to understand its complexities as an essential component in analyz- ing Title IX policy. The common denominators in the various legal and civil definitions of rape are sexual penetration and the absence of consent (Estrich, 1986; Hickman & Muehlenhard, 1999 as cited in Jozkowski, 2017). Rape laws have been adjusted over the years to include forms of sexual violence other than penile penetration of the vagina (Conigan, 2013). For example, some statutes vary in recognizing anal penetra- tion, stipulations around statutory rape, oral penetra- tion by a sex organ, digital penetration, penetration with foreign objects, rape between married individu- als, and so forth.

Conceptualization of rape follows the dominant narrative in which White cisgender women are victims of rape by straight, cisgender men of color (Crenshaw, 1991; Davis & Hudson, 2017). This patriarchal and racist perception constructs stereotypical attitudes toward victims (Crenshaw, 1991; Davies & Hudson, 2017). Nagal et al., 2005) and disregards the experiences of survivors of color; transgender and male survivors; lesbian, gay, bisexual and queer survivors; and survi- vors with disabilities (Crenshaw, 1991, Harris & Linder, 2017). In rape law, “the male standard defines a crime committed against women, and male standards are used not only to judge the conduct of women” (Estrich, 1986, p. 1091). The widely accepted patriarchal view of women’s sexuality places property-like aspects on sexuality, while women’s sexuality and even sexual aggression is celebrat- ed (Crenshaw, 1991). Additionally, traditional gender roles shape attributes of rape victimization. Conse- quently, victims that deviate from socially accepted gender roles (i.e. transgender, lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer) experience higher rates of sexual violence, but the stigmatization of their identities pushes them further to the margins, limiting access to services and justice (Davies & Hudson, 2011; Grubb & Turner; 2012; Veldhuuis et al., 2018). Racism ascertains who is ca- pable of committing rape and who can be raped. The stereotype that perpetrators of rape are usually men of color is upheld by the sensationalized focus on savage or animalistic representations of Black men (Crenshaw, 1991). The hypersexualization of Black women, and commodification of Asian women, narrows the per- ceptron of “true victims” to White females, eliminating the experiences of sexual violence in communities of color (Crenshaw, 1989; Crenshaw, 1991; Harris, 2017; Harris & Linder, 2017). These patriarchal and racist views reinforce misconceptions of what constitutes “real” (Estrich, 1986, p. 1088) rape versus, for lack of a better term, non-traditional rape.

At the forefront, the combination of sexual penetra- tion and the absence of consent criminalize rape, yet the vast majority of rape cases are not reported for prosecution (RAINN, 2018). Due to this skewed system, sexual vio- lence remains a highly underreported crime. Federal statistics show that though 310 are reported to law enforcement, 11 of those are referred for prosecution, and seven lead to felony con- victions (RAINN, 2018). RAINN (2018) indicates women and girls experience sexual violence at high rates; one in six American women being victims of attempted or completed rape.

Through a critical feminist lens, the disproportion- ate number of offenders convicted of rape versus the number of women assaulted by sexual violence reveals a prejudiced system governed and privileged by men. Despite updates in rape laws to expand the discourse of sexual violence to look beyond the act of intercourse and include dynamics of power and control, the burden to prove victimization continues to fall on the survivors. Drawing from the dominant narrative of rape questions everything about the survivor’s behavior (prior and current) and...
identities that contributed to the act of sexual viola-
tion. Ultimately, the policies and statutes associated with
determining whether a crime of rape occurred, not to
to mention guilt, to rape, to Title IX policy and institu-
tional responses to sexual violence.

As anticipated, the potential to hold men and colleges
accountable roused opposition of this united federal
front. Critics neglected any focus on campus sexual vi-
olence, instead immediately investigating female
sexual behavior. Early carnal knowledge statutes and
rape laws understood within this discourse to illustrate
that the objective of rape statutes traditionally has not been to protect women from coercive intimacy but to protect and maintain a
property-like interest in female chastity (Cren-

Campus Sexual Violence and the 2011
Dear Colleague Letter
Despite heightened attention to campus sexual
violence recently, rape on college campuses is not a
new concept. Sexual violence in postsecondary
institutions has remained consistent, with 20–25% of
college women experiencing rape or attempted rape
(Jussup-Anger & Edwards, 2015). In addition, male col-
lege students are approximately five times more likely
to rape their non-student counterparts than to rape a
woman in a dating relationship (Bahn, 2018). In the light
of what is now known as Title IX reform, I ask you to think
back to the landscape of sexual violence education and
adjudication on college campuses before 2011. Sexual violence was adjudicated on a case-by-case basis and school policies described what behaviors
did not amount to consent versus what it is and how it is
attained (Childs, 2017; Zajkowski, 2015). Additional factors
contributed to how IHE responded to reports of rape:
the clout of the accused rapist, the victim’s alcohol
consumption, the victim’s reputation, and so forth.

Motivation to establish a standardized approach
for campuses to investigate and eliminate sexual vio-
lence derived from an increasing number of student
narratives that claimed their universities refused to
investigate reports of sexual violence, “sweeping issues
under the rug” (Childs, 2017). Additionally, there were a
growing number of universities being investigated by
the Office of Civil Rights for egregious mishandling of
sexual misconduct cases which university admin-
istrators were aware of, but failed to do anything, i.e.,
Penn State, Michigan State University and University
of Missouri.

The hypersexualization of Black women, and
commodification of Asian women, narrows the
perception of “true victims” to White females, eliminating
the experiences of sexual violence in communities of color.

The Department of Justice (DOJ) reinforced the re-
peal of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) under
the Trump administration. Under VAWA, institutions are required to:
1. conduct campus climate surveys to
understand the extent of the problem;
2. prevention education and engaging men to change attitudes,
behavior and culture;
3. effective response to reports of sexual violence; and
4. increase transparency and
improve enforcement of Title IX at the federal and
institutional levels (Task Force, 2014).

For the first time, universities were provided tangible
procedures that standardized how to address campus
sexual violence. Institutions examined their sexual
misconduct policies to find outdated, ineffective and
irrelevant procedures. IHE designated individual Title
IX coordinators to receive all reports of sexual violence
and coordinate services and investigations accordingly.
State agencies dedicated more resources to imple-
ment the new policies and, with increasing national
attention on campus rape, institutions could no longer
sweep the issues under the rug. Female students were
provided options to report rape and figure out what
they could do to take back control in their lives. Going
beyond the legal requirements, a handful of institu-
tions allocated resources establishing support services
for accused students. The discourse on campus rape
began to shift the focus from females making false
reports of rape, to Title IX policy and institutional
responses to sexual violence.

In anticipation of Title IX reform under the Trump
administration, state and institutions initiated proce-
dures to codify campus sex assault policies established
under the previous administration. Since her confir-
mation hearings in early 2017, Secretary DeVos hinted at changes to the previous
Title IX guidance. In July 2017, concerns arose when she held meetings with
questionable stakeholders regarding policy change (Kreighbaum, 2017).
In her announcement of repeal two months later, she said, “One rape is one
too many, one assault is one too many, one sexual assault is one too
many. One person denied due process is one too many” emphasizing the
last point (Kreighbaum, 2017). Citing atypical Title IX cases mishandling
reports of rape, DeVos announced her intent to review the Obama-era guidance
and criticized IHE with running “kangaroo courts” (Rothman, 2017).

Though it does not require campuses to alter current policies, the new OCR Ques-
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Appeals of outcome of campus investigations. Appeals in the current guidance are under conditions: by the accused, or (b) by both parties if voluntarily agreed upon. The previous guidance allowed for either party to file an appeal, where institutions indicated two conditions in which one could be filed: (a) introduction of new evidence, or (b) a due process violation. The current guidance limits an appeal to the responding party, citing the accused individual is the one who risks penalty and therefore should not be tried twice for the same allegation. Contra-dictory to the guidance’s commitment to equitable procedures for all parties, the option for a complainant to file an appeal was removed. The OCR now permits “participation” of either party’s attorney or support advisor, contrary to previous guidance. The debate regarding support advisors and their role in the proceedings is not new. In Cincinnati Determination Letter (2006) that indicates no requirement to provide a victim’s right of appeal (United States Department of Education, 2017).

Set time frame for investigation and resolution. The OCR no longer requires a set time frame for campus investigations and leaves it up to the institutions to determine how long an investigation runs. Institutions would be evaluated instead on their good faith effort to provide fair and impartial investigations (United States Department of Education, 2017). Campus administrators acknowledge the 60-day timeframe was too short, however supported their guideline because it placed responsibility on the institution to prevent violence and further harassment. The ratio nale for removing the timeline would allow for parties, particularly the accused, time to respond to the allegations, gather evidence, and round up witnesses (Joyce, 2017). “Absence of a timeline risks leaving both students in perpetually states of limbo awaiting jurisdic-tion” (Kruger, 2017, para. 2).

Informal resolutions. Inconsistent with the 2001 Guidance, the OCR adds mediation as an option for resolution, previously unmentioned in campus sexual violence adjudications. The irony is that the same administration granting institutions permission to mediate sexual misconduct also condemned university investiga-tions as “kangaroo courts” (Kreighbaum, 2017). In the master narrative, mediation protects accused male students by eliminating a conduct violation on their education record while the female accuser remains responsible for determining if and how her raped will be held accountable.

Support persons. “Any process made available to one party in the adjudication procedure should be made equally available to the other party (for example, the right to have an attorney or other advisor present and/or participate in an interview or hearing; the right to cross-examine parties and witnesses or to submit questions to be asked of parties and witnesses)” (United States Department of Education, 2017). Though ambiguously positioned in the Q & A document, the OCR now permits either party to have a support advisor that can participate at the same degree as the other party. Based on my own experiences, it is typical for the accused to hire an attorney, while the reporting party is usually unrepresented. A due process guide lines – often why they prefer university-like proceedings – are why they prefer university adjudications. The irony is that the same administration granting institutions permission to mediate sexual misconduct also condemned university legal-like proceedings – often why they prefer university-like proceedings – are why they prefer to file an appeal was removed, citing the accused individual is the one who risks penalty and therefore should not be tried twice for the same allegation. Contra-dictory to the guidance’s commitment to equitable procedures for all parties, the option for a complainant to file an appeal was removed. The OCR now permits “participation” of either party’s attorney or support advisor, contrary to previous guidance. The debate regarding support advisors and their role in the proceedings is not new. In Cincinnati Determination Letter (2006) that indicates no requirement to provide a victim’s right of appeal (United States Department of Education, 2017).
the assumptions and ideals of said group, specifically President Donald Trump, Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos and Acting Assistant Secretary of Civil Rights Candice Jackson. I believe the bigotries of the 45th President of the United States are common knowledge internationally. For examples of his prejudices, please refer to the 2005 recording (Fahrenthold, 2016) of our current president bragging about “grabbing them [women] by the pussy” and follow his Twitter account @realDonaldTrump.

The same day the Office of Civil Rights released the interim guidance, Democratic National Jess O’Connell tweeted “banner day when Republicans can find women to do their dirty work against other women” (Rothman, 2017). Bensimon and Marshall (2003) refer to the 2005 recording (Fahrenthold, 2016) of our current president bragging about “grabbing them [women] by the pussy” and follow his Twitter account @realDonaldTrump.

So far, descriptions of the gatekeepers of power are very political and personal lives for their careers. The “instigators” of the 1960s and 1970s were women who were against the grain in their time, but gender restrictions forced them to sacrifice their fits of patriarchal privilege” (p. 348). DeVos and Jackson are inheritors and have been indoctrinated into patriarchy. DeVos’ first official conversation about Title IX was a meeting with Georgia State Representative Earl Ehrhart, who characterizes the law as “enabling rampant false allegations” (Joyce, 2017). In a Title IX Summit in July 2017, she spent a significant amount of time with men’s rights organizations fueling skepticism among advocates for survivors (Kreighbaum, 2017). Not much is known about the Acting Secretary of Civil Rights, however in one of her initial public interviews, she claimed that ninety percent of campus assault allegations “fall into the category of ‘we were both drunk,’ we broke up, and six months later I found myself under a Title IX investigation because she decided that our last sleeping together was not quite right” (Kreighbaum, 2017, para. 6). I will be bold and agree with O’Connell to say that DeVos and Jackson are token women to do dirty work against women. The present power structures challenge student affairs practitioners and educators to reignite our activism toward social justice. At the center of our efforts are our students’ right to safety and protection of their access to education.

**Conclusion**

This feminist critical policy analysis of Title IX only hit the tip of the iceberg, revealing the further sub-ordination of women and other oppressed groups through policies and structures governed by ideals and assumptions that view women as less-than. For true transformation, there is a need to reframe all steps of policy development, implementation, and analysis. Of utmost importance, is a reminder that the personal is still political, especially when addressing sexual violence.

**For true transformation, there is a need to reframe all steps of policy development, implementation, and analysis. Of utmost importance, is a reminder that the personal is still political, especially when addressing sexual violence.**
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Of Florence and Honea Path
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I think about the Gullah people
Unlearning a loaded canon
Daughters of the Dust
Ancestors from the depths
of the Lowlands
Resilient as the seashore with clothes of white foam

My pride has been mis-placed into things
That shine me up
Doves
To shake off the sand from a hundred and seventy-five mile
stretch of road
And indigo
To heal the scars of being

It is a reason to take lovers
From far away places
Finding freedom on the shores of glitz
It is the reason for the world’s infatuation
With forty-four
Whose redness is unridden
by revolt
And the stench of those ships

While the night sky
for hours
hides beyond the clouds
Holding up the moon
and every story she knows
Abandoned and wrapped in same-colored flags
She persists
To beckon with tidesong
The steadfast light of her truth burns through

I am already home.
I, too, am this land.
I am
descended of miracles.

Suggested Citation:
O
n November 9, 2016, many White1 progressive liberal Americans woke up with a sense of dread and disillusionment that Donald Trump was the President-elect of the United States (Mei, 2016). “How could this be? How could this be happening to our country?” they wondered. After all, “Make America Great Again,” a phrase whose ‘great,’ widely heard as ‘White,’ was not some-

thing White liberals supported” (Irvin Painter, 2016). As the news circulated social media, ‘progressive’ Whites broadcasted their trepidation and their shock became evident. Voices from marginalized communities were far less surprised, given their everyday lived experiences in a heteropatriarchal White supremacist society (Chang, 2016; Parker West, 2016). Critics of White liberal dismay escalated even further when it was discovered that the culprits responsible for electing Trump were not just working-class, uneducated White men, as was sold by the liberal media. A total of 53% of the vote for Trump came from White women.

These figures led some progressives to believe that White women had ‘sold out’ by negating an allegiance to feminism (with Women of Color) and aligning with the patriarchy (behind White men) (Lett, 2016). This is not to suggest White women acted alone, as 62% of Trump’s votes came from White male supporters. The common denominator among these voters was their Whiteness (Coates, 2017). And while many White liber-

al rapidly began labeling Trump supporters as ‘racists’ in an effort to demonstrate their own racial piety, critical race scholars remind us that all White people are complicit in perpetuating White supremacy, regardless of their political affiliation, awareness, or intentions (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Mills, 2007).

It didn’t take long after Donald Trump’s election for edu-
cators to see the backlash of a newly (re)empowered White America. For example, in P-20 spaces there was terrifying evidence of Whiteness being re-centered and racism moving from the covert to the overt (e.g., the “Make America White Again” dugout with swastika symbol (Wallace, 2016) and the banning of courses teaching ‘White privilege’ (Saxena, 2017)). Alt-right leaders, like Richard Spencer and Milo Yiannopoulos, descended upon colleges and universities across the country, challenging campus free speech policies and recruiting students for their cause (Arriaga, 2017). Emboldened movements of White supremacy and White nationalism have swept college campuses since Trump’s inauguration, including a horrific display of hatred, violence, and death in August 2017 at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, Virginia.

Despite the rise in overt White supremacist move-

ments after the election, Whiteness is and has always been embedded within the fabric of education in the United States. Indeed, all educators must consider how teaching practices, both subtle and overt, might influence people susceptible to racist ideologies (Chat-
elain, 2017). As racialized White educators and schol-

ars, the authors of this essay belong to the population that they critique. Aronson is a racially White, ethni-
cally Latina, cis-gender, heterosexual, female teacher educator. Her students are predominantly White female preservice teachers with whom she shares many similarities and experiences. Ashlee is a White, cis-gender, heterosexual, male, doctoral candidate who teaches master’s level student affairs courses. His students are predominantly White student affairs graduate students. While Aronson and Ashlee come from teacher education and student affairs back-
grounds respectively, they are both charged with the task of preparing future educators who work directly with students in P-20 settings. Through their teaching, they also strive to work against the systems that have historically established and continue to perpetuate White dominance in education.
ing overtly racist discourse from the highest elected officials in government, must compel White educators to take responsibility for dismantling White supremacy now more than ever. Using their own experiences of teaching Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS) in the classroom as sites of generative possibility, the authors juxtapose the ideas of dread—acknowledging Derrick Bell’s (1992) argument that racism is permanent; with the need to address students’ escalating dread about the campus political climate and perceptions of safety. Additionally, they felt a responsibility to remain positive, orienting students toward effective strategies for taking action, resisting, and moving forward. Guided by a theoretical lens of Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS), the authors use their own critical autoethnographic narratives of teaching to illuminate the need for educators to critically engage with the insidious form of White supremacy (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).

Within education, CWS emphasizes that “whiteness, acknowledged or not, has been a norm against which other races are judged” (Delgado & Stefancic, 1997, p. 1) and works to equalize that power. CWS as an educational approach examines the ways in which history, law, culture, and pseudoscience have contributed to the construction of Whiteness, racism, and White supremacy in the United States. The establishment of these systemic mechanisms result in several privileges for White people, including the ability to achieve upward social mobility despite class disparities. Ultimately CWS offers an educational imperative, namely that “whites may – and should – study race, including their own” (Delgado & Stefancic, 1997, p. 605).

Literature Review

In addition to serving as a theoretical framework guiding pedagogy, many scholars have used CWS to interrogate Whiteness in the classroom. For example, researchers such as Christine Sleeter (1992) and Alice McIntyre (1997) examined how White pre-service teachers avoided conversations on race and racism, which contributes to the oppressive influence of Whiteness within education. Although scholars have begun to address the need for educators to critically examine Whiteness, there is a dearth of research related to CWS in higher education (Cabreza, Franklin, & Watson, 2017). Much of the CWS analysis in higher education has looked at the ways White college students make meaning of Whiteness. For example, a national study which surveyed over 1,500 college students, found that most White students ultimately held underlying racist beliefs and attitudes (Pica & Feagin, 2007). Reason and Evans (2007) found White college students...
who strive to be racial justice allies, on the other hand, must continuously and critically examine their Whiteness. Both these findings suggest that educators must or should bring college students ‘race’/racial interactions to the forefront and create an environment where White students can hold each other accountable for racist behavior.

Ultimately, the most insidious form of White privilege that can easily escape any classroom is the ability not to have to think or talk about race (Reason & Evans, 2007). Colorblind racism is commonplace among White students at predominantly White institutions (Bonilla-Silva, 2006), but even more alarming are White higher education instructors who either choose not to engage in the topic of racism with students or do not feel they know how. For both White students and White instructors, White fragility leads to White silence, White comfort, and White supremacy in the classroom (DiAngelo, 2011). On the contrary, White educators might also reinforce White supremacy through discourses encompassing ‘morality’ (Applebaum, 2005). By situating moral responsibility as an ‘action’ that focuses on the individual, this relieves a [White] educator from ever acknowledging how they are situated and complicit in the system of White supremacy.

CWS requires that White educators reflect on the hegemonic control Whiteness holds on the imagination and study the ways White people ‘deflect, ignore, or dismiss’ their role in the permanence of racism (Mias, Viesca, Garrison-Wade, Tandon, & Galindo, 2014, p. 291). Indeed, simply acknowledging individual White privilege not enough for educators to be anti-racist and socially just. Educational conversations about race, racism, and White supremacy in the classroom are not easy. Higher education instructors who employ CWS may find themselves and their students steeped in feelings of guilt, shame, and dread. Aronson and Ashlee intended to ‘collaboratively cope with the ambiguities, uncertainties, and contradictions’ in their work (Ellis, Adams, and Bochner 2011, para. 23).

In writing critical autoethnographic narratives, Aronson and Ashlee focused on the individual, this relieves a [White] educator from ever acknowledging how they are situated and complicit in the system of White supremacy. In their narrative of their teaching during the 2016 U.S. Presidential election, it was through the development of this relationship that they began to trust one another and share their goals for deconstructing Whiteness in the classroom.

In writing critical autoethnographic narratives, Aronson and Ashlee intended to ‘collaboratively cope with the ambiguities, uncertainties, and contradictions’ in their work (Ellis, Adams, and Bochner, 2011, para. 23). At the end of the Fall 2016 semester, they each wrote a narrative account of their teaching experiences. They shared these narratives with one another and provided questions as well as feedback. These narratives engaged the authors’ overarching argument for CWS as an essential tool for higher education instructors in preparing racially just educators. It is through personal reflections, memories, and dialogue with each other that the authors present their data in the form of autoethnographic narratives, which ask readers to enter the world of the researcher and join in this process of reflexivity.

Brittany’s Narrative

Fall 2016 was a contentious time to be in any classroom, especially one that was centered on justice-oriented ideologies, pedagogies, and frameworks. For three consecutive years, I taught an undergraduate course for preservice teachers required under the U.S. Department of Education’s Teacher Quality Enhancement Act. To explicate, this course was designed to challenge and shape each student’s conceptions of school organization, school culture, professional development, teaching, curriculum, and school leadership for teachers committed to social justice (EDL 318 Course Syllabus, Fall 2016).

More than ever, the work for racial justice and radical love (hooks, 2000) was needed, and as a privileged racially White woman I had to shake myself out of my misery and regain perspective as to my role in this battle we would inherently face these next four years.

I had heard feedback like this before. But, for some reason, I took this feedback extremely personally. As I read these words, I felt like I had been punched in the stomach. Perhaps it was the climate. This was right before the election in late October. Perhaps it was also me. I got overconfident in my abilities to reach the privileged. I had grown to know enlighten...
we note that often when you are not feeling “safe” really this means “uncomfortable.” I gave them some additional resources and they went through their way. I felt depleted. I felt like I had failed. Then the election happened.

I was one of those people we wrote about in our introduction. As I sat in my small apartment watching the live coverage of the election on November 8, 2016, I was not too worried about it. But as the hours passed and state by state turned red, I was in disbelief. I woke up the next morning feeling a dread I had never experienced before. I didn’t know this feeling as I had lived in the “safe space” mentioned above that I critiqued my students for craving. I walked with a colleague to go to the National Association of Multicultural Educators of America’s conference hosted in Cleveland (which sickeningly was held in the newly constructed Hilton Hotel that had been built for the Republican National Convention the summer before). I had hoped this would be a space for rejuvenation, for inspiration, for comfort. But I imagine everyone was feeling this way. I felt little hope at that moment. Some of my previous students from both K-12 and former college students reached out to me. They were coming to me for some sort of comfort, but I felt I had so little to give them. This made me feel even worse. I sifted through my Facebook page torturing myself by de-cluttering. I gave them some additional resources and they went through my Facebook page torturing myself by detoxifying what I had written. This made me feel even worse. I sifted through my Facebook page torturing myself by detoxifying what I had written. I felt defeated. I felt like I had failed. Then the election happened.

Two weeks flew by and I was about to see my current students again. I was anxious and nervous. I wasn’t sure what I was going to say to them. I decided that because we had so much to do end semester, I would write them a letter telling them how I felt and what I had learned these past two weeks. I shared with them the story of my former student who had jolted me back to life and actions from that former 5th grade class. I told them how she reminded me of the need to center love and that this is always where I come from in the work that I do with them. My pushing them into discomfort comes from a place of love not only for them, but their future students. I shared my fears in what had been happening in times this past week. Another shared how their cooperating teacher was very pro-Trump and saying derogatory things about Hilary Clinton, such as now we can lock her up. I sat there disabled as I had realized I had been mulling in my own shock and they were out in schools witnessing these realities. We never got to our lesson.

What was needed in that space was an opportunity for healing in the best way I knew how at that moment. Students listened. I talked. They listened. Those who felt comfortable shared their political views. No one explicitly stated that they voted for Donald Trump, although they talked about how their families had. I related as I had family members who did as well. We worked through our confusion about this. They asked me what to do, how to handle what they were seeing happening in schools. I didn’t have answers as I sat there vulnerable with them in this moment. The only thing I could muster up was don’t stay silent. I did ask the class to be aware of what was happening on our campus. I sent them several emails the next few days about events organized by students’ who had been and will continue to be marginalized under the Trump Administration (and their allies). None of these dialogues or lessons that we had the last day of class was a part of my syllabus or my objectives. I was very aware that I could have easily offended a student or been scrutinized on my end-of-semester evaluations for these political conversations (which I was not). But when the personal is political, this doesn’t always matter.”

Kyle’s Narrative

In the fall semester of 2016, on the cusp of one of the most divisive presidential elections in recent history, I began co-teaching the first ever graduate-level course at my institution on the topic of critical Whiteness. Located in the heart of “Trump Country,” the Mid-West universities where this class was held is home to mostly White, upper-middle class students. Through exploring the literature and observing race dynamics on my campus, I discovered that White students were ill-equipped for conversations about race in the classroom and as a result, students of Color are often forced to put their own learning aside to teach about race (Linder, 2015; Reason, 2015). As a Ph.D. student, I designed the Whiteness course alongside a faculty mentor with the hopes of engaging future educators in critical conversations about race and racism in the United States. The goal of the course was “to explore individual, historical, and systemic conceptions of ‘Whiteness’,” and “consider how critical perspectives on Whiteness impact the development of equitable communities within higher education and student affairs” (EDL660 Course Syllabus, Fall 2016). Despite the content and timing of the course, I can only recall one instance during the semester when Donald Trump’s name entered the class discussion, and it was brief. The topic for the week was related to the historical construction of Whiteness in the United States. One of the readings for this class was Bacon’s Rebellion and The Advent of Whiteness by Terrance MacMullen (2009). In this chapter from his book, MacMullen outlines the exact time and place in history when race and White supremacy were established in America. Jumping back to 1676, MacMullen (2009) describes a scene in colonial Virginia when Nathaniel Bacon, a newly-arrived settler, led a small resistance effort against the English bourgeoisie.

Before I could even open my mouth, others started sharing the many hateful events happening in schools all across the country. And then, the ones they had witnessed in their school buildings the past week.

Sitting around a large oak wooden table, nearly all fourteen students in my Whiteness class were buzzing with excitement about this reading. They had never heard the story of Bacon’s Rebellion and were unaware of the specific ways in which Whiteness and race were created out of thin air. Many commented that having this historical context finally explained what is meant by the “social construction of race,” which was vague...
and confusing for them before the reading. Additionally, they said, it demonstrates how White privilege does not result from intentionally oppressing People of Color, but rather from granting special opportunities to White people. Still early in the semester and unsure about how the White students in the class would react to a class on critical Whiteness, my co-instructor and I were thrilled that the students were making the connections from the reading that we’d hoped they would.

Taking the conversation a step further, my co-instructor drew a parallel between the divide-and-conquer tactics used by the wealthy European colonists during Bacon’s Rebellion and the political strategy used by Donald Trump to pit poor southern White people against Mexican immigrants. In his presidential announcement speech on June 16, 2015, Trump said, “When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending you and your best. They’re not sending you… They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists.” (Ye He Lee, July 8, 2015). Despite the lack of any factual evidence for this claim, Trump leveraged White peoples’ fear of immigrants to effectively capture the allegiance of many White people when posing to racial discomfort (DiAngelo, 2011). When in a state of White fragility, White people often react with defensiveness, silence, or minimization.

Given the volatility of the political climate in our country at the time and the very real potential for any conversation about the presidential election to result in conflict, our students chose to remain silent. Assuming that the political is indeed personal, my co-instructor’s comment about Trump’s racist campaign rhetoric likely hit close to home for many of our students. Indeed, on numerous occasions throughout the semester, our students commented about how they struggled to talk with their family members about White privilege and racism because they held differing political views. Whether embarrassed to realize their relatives held beliefs that resembled White supremacist strategies of colonialization or simply afraid to say the “wrong thing” and appear racist, White fragility acted like a constraint, binding our students to their White comfort zones.

Critical Whiteness Revisited

Aronson and Ashlee’s understandings of CWS aided them not only in their curriculum development, but also in analyzing their experiences. In teaching, they both emphasized the importance of starting any conversation on Whiteness and White supremacy through a sociocultural historical lens and discussing how this impacts the material benefits and privileges White people still maintain (e.g., generational wealth through housing loans, Witt, 2017). Importantly, they also analyzed their own roles in complicating the individual from the systemic. As White people doing anti-racist work, it can be easy to fall into complicity.

Lessons Learned: Implications for Future Educators

The idea that hope alone will transform the world, and action undertaken in that kind of naivety, is an excellent lous illusion. (Freire, 1997, p. 8, as cited in Duncan-Anne, 2009, p. 181)
Reflecting on the authors’ narratives, which of course come from the perspective of racially-White educators, reveals the important tension between dread and hope. Aronson was left with a somber feeling about her role as an educator, actively working to refuel her reservoir amidst feelings of hopelessness after the election. Ashlee on the other hand, expressed learning from moments that ‘fell flat’ in the classroom, fostering optimism about engaging students in political reflection and transformative action. The opposing realities of these two narratives demonstrate the complexity of being an educator in today’s turbulent political climate.

On the one hand, there may be an overwhelming sense of dread about the realities of racism and White supremacy, which White educators perpetuate despite their best efforts. On the other hand, it can be empowering to leverage the privilege White educators hold to dismantle systemic oppression through an active critical examination of Whiteness. Rather than feeling immobilized by these disparate truths, White educators can no longer feign neutrality, pretend-willing ignorance and support of White nationalistic efforts (as evidenced by his selection of Steve Bannon and Jeff Sessions), along with his unwillingness to name the events in Charlottesville as acts of White supremacy, violence and rage, educators can no longer feign neutrality, pretending these conversations hold no place in classrooms. Nicole Truesdell (2017), the Director of Academic Diversity and Inclusiveness at Beloit College, recently argued there is a contradictory nature of being apolitical in classrooms by faculty who are hired to teach about institutional racism. Many higher education instructors are hired to do this sort of ‘work,’ and others must recognize the contradictions caused when they are asked to ‘stay neutral’ in the classroom. This façade is unrealistic, and the authors’ personal narratives are prime examples of the need to address political issues, especially those situated around race and racism, in the classroom. Despite the challenges that arise, White educators must persist in transgressing the dehumanizing depoliticization of the classroom, for their own liberation and the liberation of their students.

Aronson and Ashlee revealed vulnerability and failures throughout their teaching, which have led them to understand that both dread and hope are vital. In teaching future educators and through critical self-reflection, they are committed to creating space for the learning that can occur when the tension between dread and hope is foregrounded. Rather than cancelling each other out, these opposing truths build upon each other creating something new, something radical, and something audacious. Indeed, this new audacious hope demands that we reconnect to the collective by struggling alongside one another, sharing in the victories and the pain (Duncan-Andrade, 2009, p. 190). White educators must be committed to sharing the pain of and they must continue striving for the victories.

Despite the challenges that arise, White educators must persist in transgressing the dehumanizing depoliticization of the classroom, for their own liberation and the liberation of their students.

*References: Can be found at the end of this special issue.*
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Experiences of International Graduate Students From Muslim Majority Countries in the Current Political Climate

When international students from Muslim-majority countries enroll in U.S. colleges and universities, they enter unwelcoming national, local, and campus environments. Graffiti threats like, “kill all Muslims,” found at Georgia Tech and the execution-style murders of three Muslim students at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill exemplify how anti-Muslim sentiment, prejudice, and violence—perpetuated by political rhetoric—continues to worsen on college campuses. Specifically, the international graduate student population deserves special attention as they make up approximately one-quarter of the total graduate student population in U.S. postsecondary education (Okahana, 2017). In addition, these students’ adverse experiences result in challenging identity development involving negotiation of heritage culture and dominant U.S. culture, mental health concerns, and a sense of not belonging (Ali, 2014; Atri, Sharma, & Cottrell, 2006-2007; Dey, 2012; Poyrazli & Lopez, 2007; Stubbs & Sallee, 2013). In fact, 59 percent of graduate students withdraw from their degree program prematurely (Nerad & Cerry, 1993; Strayhorn, 2012). Assessing sense of belonging is necessary to shed light on the lived experiences and success for this student population.

The history of higher education is not distinct from that of the U.S., and the national identity of this country has a foundation of systemic oppression (Spring, 2016). This problematic history is illustrated through colonization of Native Americans, enslavement of African Americans, and exclusionary immigration policies implemented to discriminate and oppress minoritized ethnic groups. International graduate students from Muslim-majority countries experience these systemic structures when they arrive in the U.S., and it is impossible to discuss their sense of belonging without examining how systems of oppression impact their experiences. Howard-Hamilton, Cuyjet, and Cooper (2011) defined oppression as an act of control to politically, as well as economically, disadvantaged individuals. Furthermore, Hardiman, Jackson, and Griffin (2007) described oppression as a phenomenon where a social group or organization, subconsciously or consciously, marginalizes other groups for their gain. In the U.S. context, current policies and laws create and maintain acts of oppression through forms of discrimination, exploitation, and marginalization. For instance, the Executive Order 13769 (2017), Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the U.S., was created to intentionally restrict the travel of non-citizens, visitors, and residents from seven Muslim-majority countries. This order targeted individuals labeled as ‘dangerous’ and continued to oppress those of Arab and Muslim identities who did not pose a threat to the U.S.

Historic and current U.S. policies continue to exclude and target marginalized groups; these policies have induced subsequent influences that shape the climate on college campuses. National policies of exclusion, such as the Executive Order, exacerbate the longstanding issues of racism and anti-immigrant sentiment, which often negatively influence the sense of belonging of students. Considering the current sociopolitical climate and the very limited literature on this student population (e.g., McDermott-Levy’s 2011; Tumma-la-Nana & Claudius’s 2013), this study highlights the experience of a select few international graduate students from Muslim-majority countries. This study analyzes the experiences of international graduate students from Muslim-majority countries at Midwestern University (MU), a Predominantly White Institution (PWI) in the current sociopolitical environment. The research question focused on how the sociopolitical climate in the U.S. affects sense of belonging for this student population. The purpose of this study is to disrupt the silencing of graduate students from Muslim-majority countries and give a platform to their lived experiences as college students in the U.S.

Literature Review

International Graduate Student Experiences

International students are those not considered residents of their country of study and are enrolled at an accredited institution on a temporary visa (Organisation for Economic Co-operation Development [OECD], 2013; World Education News and Reviews [WENR], 2009). More specifically, international graduate students are nonresidents of their country of study with a bachelor’s degree who are seeking additional education through a master’s, doctoral, or professional degree program (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). In fall 2016, over one million masters and doctoral students were enrolled in U.S. higher education institutions, 24% of whom (283,496 students) were international students (Okahana, 2017).

International students face a myriad of challenges when coming to the United States to study, including, but not limited to: cultural adjustment difficulties, limited English proficiency, separation from friends and family, immigration issues, and integration into unfamiliar educational systems (Ahktar, 2011; Church, 1982; Duns & Poyrazli, 2011; Kline & Granillo, 2003; Mori, 2000; Wedding, McCartney, & Currey, 2009). In comparison to their typically younger, single undergraduate counterparts, international graduate students experience more difficulty with acculturation, family-related stress, and increased financial difficulties.
The United States is founded on exclusionary practices in the United States. The Influence of White Supremacy (Council of American-Islamic Relations [CAIR], 2017). neo-racism impact Muslim people in the United States. The racialization of Arab and Muslim Americans continues to generate fear within the American public by perpetuating a system of exploitation and oppression of continents, nations, and peoples of color by white peoples and nations of the European continent, for the purpose of maintaining and defending a system of wealth, power, and privilege (Gardiner, 2009, p. 2). Immigration policies directly affect international graduate students’ attainment of higher education and students are subject to the will and power of the U.S. government and such exclusionary practices. For example, the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 explicitly barred the entry of Chinese laborers into the United States for ten years, as well as complicitly and prohibiting natural citizenship of Chinese immigrants (Lee, 2002). This policy gave the U.S. government the ability to limit and exclude, especially non-White racial groups from entering the United States for decades to come. In recent history, the targeting of Muslim Americans, Arab Americans, and those with perceived Middle Eastern origin has been exacerbated by governmental policy. Examples of policy include “Operation Boulder,” which allowed law enforcement to wiretap individuals of Arab descent; a mandate requiring all Iranian students and Muslim students is helpful in laying the foundation for this research. However, the current political climate adds a layer of complexity that was not present in any previous studies. Although the participants of this study are from Muslim majority countries, not all of them identify as Muslim, therefore literature about Muslim students is loosely applicable. This study seeks to fill the void that exists at the intersection of international graduate students from Muslim majority countries and their sense of belonging in a politically hostile environment, currently orchestrated by Trump’s administration. Conceptual Framework: Sense of Belonging of Graduate Students

Several factors can influence a student’s experience through higher education and among these is a campus climate where students feel they belong and are valued (Kuh, 2001). Strayhorn defined the sense of belonging as “a feeling of connectedness, that one is important or matters to others” (Strayhorn, 2012, p. 1). Strayhorn’s empirical research focuses on addressing a gap in the literature that the underlying causal factors that impact the sense of belonging among graduate students, the most important of these factors being socialization. Agents of socialization, such as faculty members and peers serve as spheres of influence in their process to acquire knowledge and skills. Successful socialization allows individuals to not only develop skills and competencies but is also necessary to fully immerse individuals within the program of study and help positively influence student success, outcomes, and overall sense of belonging. Findings gathered from Strayhorn’s (2012) empirical study suggest persistence among graduate students is largely attributed to a sense of belonging, socialization in their communities, and connections to others in the graduate department or professional field. There are important distinctions between undergraduate and graduate student experiences; specifically, graduate students face statistically higher challenges with persistence (Nord & Cerry, 1993; Strayhorn, 2012). Considering 50% of graduate students withdraw prematurely, assessing the sense of belonging among graduate students is necessary to improve student success and motivations for this student population. Assessing a student’s sense of belonging can help in understanding their perceived feelings of acceptance within the campus climate. The researchers examined how MIU engages and fosters a sense of belonging according to Strayhorn’s definition among international graduate students from Muslim majority countries through the lens of...
the graduate student socialization theory and sense of belonging constructs. With isolation and fear already existing for Muslim and Arab populations, particularly in the U.S. context, the researchers’ aim was to discover how the international graduate student population made sense of their belonging at MU.

In addition, the storytelling element of narrative design allows the lived experiences of students to be centered, which is an important factor considering the historical silencing of this population.

Research Design

Using a critical perspective, based on critical social theory, is important while analyzing the way power and justice manipulate social systems that affect individuals (Kincheloe, McLaren, Steinberg, & Monzó, 2017). The researchers decided on a critical narrative inquiry approach to address the systemic issues at play in the participants’ stories. Therefore, a narrative inquiry is the most appropriate methodological approach to bring forth the voices of these international graduate students (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). In narrative research, the data collected consists of the stories and experiences of individuals and how interacting with others in their environment affects their everyday experiences. This design allowed the researchers to analyze the participants’ sense of belonging on campus, explore commonalities in their experiences, and understand how systems of oppression affect students in everyday life at MU (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

Data Collection

Recruitment of participants was established through purposeful sampling techniques, including contact with various student organizations, specifically those with missions to serve Muslim and/or international graduate students, as well as a majority of academic units on MU’s campus (Creswell, 2015). Select members of the research team emailed these student organizations and academic units to explain the purpose of the study and how interested students could participate. In addition to direct communication, the researchers sought to implement snowball sampling in order to recruit additional participants from those who had interviewed (Creswell, 2015). Once participants expressed interest via email, they completed an intake form, providing demographic information to ensure sample group criteria was met. The researchers aimed to interview six to twelve participants and ended with a sample of nine international graduate students from Muslim majority countries.

Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Academic School*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daria</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilias</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joey</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustafa</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janic</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*School names have been modified for confidentiality

Data Analysis

The researchers performed semistructured interviews (Creswell, 2015) focusing on the participants’ stories to hold to the tenants of narrative qualitative research. Interviews were scheduled with one member of the research team, which lasted approximately 60 minutes, were held in a private space in a public building, and were audio recorded for transcription. Each interview started with seven predetermined questions, with the flexibility to divert from the questions, ensuring collected data was consistent with participants’ lived experiences rather than the researchers’ preconceived ideas of their experiences. The nature of these questions aimed to understand students’ perceptions about their sense of belonging at MU given their identities and experiences. Additionally, participants were asked to create their own pseudonyms to protect their identities.

Trustworthiness

In this study, the research team utilized three central methods to increase the trustworthiness of the study findings: two-person coding, member checking, and
external auditing. This two-person method ensured that themes identified from the interview matched across multiple perspectives and mitigated bias. In addition, the team engaged in member checking by inviting participants to review and edit the transcript of their interview and findings to ensure accuracy. Finally, two external auditors were invited to review the study throughout the process and assist in evaluating the project at its conclusion. In addition, a logbook of this process was kept as an audit trail of those interacting with the data and increase trustworthiness (Merriam, 2002). After the completion of the study, the audio recordings were deleted.

The researchers intentionally used the concept of mindful inquiry presented by Bentz and Shapiro (1998), which emphasizes that the identities of researchers are always present in research and researchers should be mindful of this in their studies. All six members of the research team identify as domestic students and have not experienced being international students from Muslim majority countries. Therefore, the researchers engaged in intentional reflection about their individual and group identities throughout the research process.

**Limitations**

The transferability of this study is a limitation because the findings cannot be broadly applied to the greater population of international graduate students from Muslim majority countries. The ever-changing nature of these students’ environments will need to continually be studied to grasp an understanding of the experiences. While this will be difficult for researchers, it is vital to ensure the creation of knowledge that will combat the historical and present systems of power and oppression observed in our society.

**Findings**

The findings of this study reveal the student experiences of nine international graduate students from Muslim majority countries at MU. Uncovering these narratives brings a different perspective to campus environments, including a vast range of experiences summarized with a quote by Diana:

“I bring something different to the table...[international graduate students] always have something very different to say. We come from very different backgrounds, political systems in our countries work differently...The culture is different and so there is always something new we can bring to the table.”

The researchers identified four themes persistent throughout the participants’ stories: ambassadorship of international students, influence of faculty and staff on sense of belonging, opportunities and complications building meaningful relationships, and fear and uncertainty in the current political climate. These themes all relate to how the participants experience a sense of belonging (or not) at MU. A summary of the participants’ demographics is included in Table 1.

### Ambassadorship of International Students

Several participants expressed that international graduate students serve as ambassadors or educators on campus, teaching others about their culture. One participant, Sarah, lived in the United States as a child and had been in the United States for over seven years as a graduate student. In her interview, she discussed her experience of feeling like she is a part of both U.S. and Saudi Arabian cultures, stating:

“I feel like I’m part of both cultures and I feel like the U.S. is my country and Saudi is my country...I always feel that I’m responsible for building a bridge between them because that’s where I live. I live on that bridge, and there are a lot of people that should be on that bridge that are still trying to choose between two places when we’re really, just all of us are one big mix.”

Illas shared similar thoughts, also using a bridge metaphor and expressing the role of international students to create “bridges between different countries.” Three participants also noted the burden of serving as a role model to undergraduate students with similar national and religious identities, both domestic and international. Sarah noted that within their role in cultural student organizations, they “wanted [Saudi students] to feel proud of their identity and [they] wanted them to feel like they can be part of this community and be with themselves and at the same time, be an MU student.”

The duality of the responsibility of being a bridge to both the outside community and members of their own community is certainly a burden for many international students, yet one in which some international students find a sense of belonging and purpose.

However, participants complicated this theme of ambassadorship by expressing that they are not sure that the burden of this should fall on international students. Several participants noted that they should not have to serve in this role. Combating the stereotypes produced in the media about those from Muslim majority countries can be difficult and draining. Sam shared his thoughts on the burden of having to consistently combat others’ perceptions:

“Because [I’m from] Iraq it is hard for me to get a visa to fly almost anywhere—it’s hard to get a visa.”

*Hazal is used to include head scar, burka, and niqab.

### Influence of Faculty and Staff on Sense of Belonging

All the participants spoke about how their interactions with faculty and staff impacted their sense of belonging, but responses varied depending on the participant and whether or not these interactions positively or negatively impacted their sense of belonging. Every participant expressed that they felt a greater sense of belonging to their academic school than to MU as a whole. Participants identified faculty, advisors, academic school-based support services, and the staff at the International Student Support Office (ISSO) as sources of support.

Overall, participants identified that campus support...
services met their basic needs as international students. One participant, Mustafa, stressed his appreciation for offices like the ISSO and international student support in the School of Law by telling a story of how his law advisor helped him apply for internships and get approval for a modified exam schedule. He stated, “I think it’s important that you feel welcomed. You know, if you have a problem, you know where to go.” Participants spoke favorably of their academic advisors, with one participant stating that her advisor always tried to make her feel comfortable and welcome. “I am really, really blessed that my advisor actually has some international experience and that is where he and I really clicked … I think he is the best thing that I got out of this whole department.” Two participants also mentioned the “All Are Welcome” posters some faculty and staff keep in their offices as positive messages, stating that these made them feel like they belong.

Some participants stated resources on campus went above and beyond to support them, yet others felt that support was focused more on practical needs like paperwork than on support that addressed their sense of belonging. One participant emphasized that ISSO staff approached international students with a deficits mindset by assuming that international students need help with everything or that every international student has the same set of needs. Several noted frustration with bureaucratic processes, especially immunization policy changes and forms not including a racial category that they identified with. This lack of consideration for international graduate students resulted in many feeling as though they are seen as temporary in the campus environment, and that when Mizzou sees them as such, there is little incentive to serve the community fully.

Several participants spoke specifically about the support they received from faculty and staff after news of the travel ban. Communication included emails sent to international students from the provost, the ISSO, and academic departments, as well as conversations with faculty and staff. Sam stated, “People especially from faculty and my advisor, asked do you want to talk about it, so I felt good.” A couple of participants noted that faculty specifically asked about the well-being of their families. Communication after the executive orders impacted each of the nine participants positively. Ibrahim stated, “I feel more comfortable and I have more support after Trump’s actions more than before.” Although this quote seems like a positive reflection, Ibrahim said this in comparison to the lack of support that was available prior to the media coverage of the travel bans. Institutions have a long history of ignoring these students despite clear knowledge of how xenophobia and Islamophobia negatively impact the student experience. It is clear that every participant has had different experiences with faculty and staff, and this is again why the researchers emphasize that each student’s experience is unique and must be considered individually.

Opportunities and Complications Building Meaningful Relationships

Participants identified that their experiences with U.S. culture at Mizzou improved their sense of belonging and ability to build meaningful relationships. Many international graduate students in the study expressed experiencing culture shock when leaving their home countries and arriving at a PWI in the Midwest. “You know [Midwest city] is a small city, very very quiet … I don’t know but when I came here I feel like shock, it’s not what I imagined in like the nation” was Ilias’s thought when he first arrived at the institution. In her interview, Daria reflected on her visit to the United States. A fellow international student asked if she felt as though she belonged on campus, and she responded: “And the first thing that crossed my mind was that it’s a White institution, why would I belong here?” Although this sentiment of shock was expressed by several participants, several also spoke about the opportunity to engage in programming that helped ease the transition and form relationships.

Five participants spoke or alluded to difficulty building and maintaining meaningful relationships with domestic students. At Mizzou, Daria stated, “One interesting thing is that most of my friends are international students and not Americans.” Six other participants echoed this sentiment of having more ease connecting with international peers. Mustafa stated: “It is difficult in this country to make friends with Americans. So, sometimes, like most of the time, if I want to hang out or just do fun activities, I go with friends from my country or, you know, who speak my language. I know a lot of international students in the law school and I have friends, but Americans, I’ve found it’s difficult. Just classmates, but not friends.

Joey explained that conversing with domestic students was challenging because they didn’t “have time to speak” or were “not familiar with second language people, how they are speaking.” Sam shared an example of losing a relationship he had formed with a domestic student after a news story broke of an Arab man who drove a pickup truck down a bicycle path near the World Trade Center, killing eight and injuring twelve people.

So there was a guy [domestic student] for two days he didn’t talk to me. I don’t know, I thought that he just feel bad or something, but then I asked a mutual friend “What’s wrong with that guy?” He said, “He’s just upset about New York,” and I said, “Ok, but why he’s not talking to me if he’s upset about New York?” So that’s a shock to me really like a shock … The problem is I know that guy. We laugh together, we take class together, and yeah, so his reaction, I never spoke with him again to be honest.

This example is the reality of international students from Muslim-majority countries because of the rhetoric and stereotypes that exist about Arab culture in the United States. Building relationships in college is difficult, but this population faces more hurdles in accomplishing the same task in comparison to their domestic peers.

Fear and Uncertainty in the Current Political Climate

When asked how the current political climate impacts their sense of belonging, participants disclosed varying degrees of fear and uncertainty. Some participants expressed feeling extremely scared to be in the United States, while others felt there was no need to feel afraid at all. A factor that contributed to participants’ elevated fear is the Islamophobia that exists in the United States. For example, Sarah felt the need to protect her children in the current climate:

“I still feel the repercussions of September 11th and I still felt that I needed to protect my kids … I am not joking that there were many nights … the way I slept was one foot out of the bed and one foot on the bed with the lights on, and I was ready in case I heard anything.

And another participant, Ilias, mentioned that he is concerned about political rhetoric validating Islamophobia, especially amongst Trump supporters. Ilias also expressed that Islamophobia is a fear greater than the fear for women, concluding that Muslim women have a harder time feeling safe because their hijab identify them as Muslim; he mentioned knowing a woman who is too afraid to wear her hijab. Ibrahim shared his opinion on the experience of women who wear hijab: “Women here, who wear hijab or acting as a Muslim, have many difficulties more than me. I notice that with colleagues and with my wife as well. They feel not as comfortable as us.” At least two female-identifying participants expressed feeling as though this can be attributed to female-identifying participants’ fear of outwardly identifying themselves through elements such as religious attire.

Although higher degrees of fear were a concern for several participants, others expressed having lower levels of fear. Ilias, a student in the School of Law, said he feels safe because of the government’s checks and balances—he feels everyone is protected by the law and that studying the law of the United States gives him a sense of security. Ilias said he is not afraid of President Trump because “no one person runs the country.”

Feelings of fear related to uncertainty were also mentioned by participants. Six participants expressed feelings of uncertainty regarding their abilities to obtain visas, their abilities to go home and have their loved ones come to the United States, and postgraduation opportunities. Sam expressed the level of uncertainty by stating:

“I am doing a masters or to continue Ph D, and I am genuinely thinking that I should apply [outside of the United States] or maybe Germany or something. I don’t want to stay because I thought the situation would change, but at the end of the day this is really bad. And based on today I’m okay, and tomorrow there might be a ban, and then I will not be able to go to United States. I wasn’t traveling but I know of friends that were traveling to visit their families they couldn’t get back and you know what happens with the airports and courts.”
Several participants were also sure to mention that personal safety and feelings of fear are not new phenomena due to the current political climate, noting difficulties obtaining visas and extensive airport security screenings as examples of preexisting challenges. The United States has experienced Islamophobic sentiment for an extended period. Participants disclosed that Arab and Muslim people already do not feel safe in the United States and the current political climate simply exacerbates their fear.

**Discussion**

Together, the four themes explore how participants conceptualize their sense of belonging at MU and how both the campus and sociopolitical climates impact their student experience. The first two themes, ambassadorship and influence of faculty and staff, focus on how campus life influences their sense of belonging. Every participant noted that they feel a stronger sense of belonging on campuses, their time on campuses, but it is important to make the distinction between how the local and national environment can have a significant impact on students. The participants spoke about their experiences with gender, racial, and religious aspects.

Several students referenced the rhetoric of the 2016 presidential election, which impacted them in negative ways. The participants reported being fearful of what could happen while walking down the street or interacting with domestic students. There was a distinct difference in the way students perceived their fear and how they were treated to their gender identification. Most of the male students stated that they felt a level of fear but recognized that their physical appearance may not always make it clear that they are from a specific region or have certain religious beliefs. Conversely, the women stated a great level of fear, specifically the women who wore religious identifying garments. Additionally, the researchers noticed a pattern for students who attended the law school in regard to feelings of security and support. Knowledge of U.S. laws and regulations helped alleviate some of the fears that were present after news of the travel ban. Aside from fear, many of the students also discussed being in a state of constant uncertainty relating to the executive orders. Fear and a sense of uncertainty can cause serious distress for international graduate students, especially when considering their plans for the future. While institutions are focused on creating supportive environments for international graduate students, they must also focus on cultural differences, ethnic origin, and the ways identity (including gender) can affect students’ sense of belonging.

**Implications**

There are two sets of implications to improve the sense of belonging for this population: one for immediate action and one for broader consideration to address systemic problems that create an unwelcoming environment for this student population. On a daily basis, faculty and practitioners should continue the positive practices noted by the participants including actively voicing support for international students, creating meaningful relationships with students they advise and teach, and displaying symbols of support and cultural validation on campus and in text, including posters, flyers, and emails. A special emphasis should be given to educating faculty and advisors on culturally responsive practice because students consistently mentioned the importance of their academic units in their sense of belonging. Institutions should take this study as an impetus to examine conditions that maximize success for diverse student populations on their campuses.

Although these practices have the potential to contribute to a greater sense of belonging for this student population, the researchers recognize that these recommendations focus on making an issue better without addressing the larger problem. The researchers acknowledge that these recommendations will not create a long-term change in campus and national culture in an environment built upon White supremacy. Throughout all the interviews, the researchers noted an underlying tone of the normalization of oppressive, isolating, and exclusionary practices, especially in how students discussed how the MU community does not see the value in investing in them. Participants spoke of exclusionary practices as normal and expected. This normalization is dangerous and should inspire action from those who seek to create more campuses where all students feel like they belong. To truly achieve a welcoming environment, a broader change of campus and national culture is needed. Additional research on how this student population experiences the collegiate environment is needed. Systemic change will require collective action to break down systems of oppression.
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Students of color have reported encountering significant challenges while entering and attending institutions of higher education (Harper & Hurtado, 2007). Turner (1994) stated that students of color feel like strangers in some- one’s house when referencing institutions of higher education. As a result of racism and anti-immigrant attitudes, scholars have identified that students of color experience hostile campus racial climates, a lack of sense of belonging, racial microaggressions, and racial battle fatigue (Hurtado, 1992; Smith, Allen, & Danley, 2007). The collegiate experience for students of color has been further negatively intensified by the era of President Trump’s administration with rhetoric and proposed policies that are anti-immigrant, Latinx/Chicanx, Muslim, Black, and LGBTQIA+. The rhetoric and policy positions of the Trump administration and like-minded individuals are nothing new in American society, but the delivery method has become anything but subtle. Universities have experienced racist propaganda found on campus and a rise in controversial conservative guest speakers that have led to students across the nation protesting these events. For instance, at the institutions where this study took place, signs stating “STOP THE RAPEs, STOP THE CRIMES, STOP THE MURDER, STOP THE BLACKs” were found the week before school started. Additionally, other signs were posted once the semester began that stated, “IT’S Okay to be White.” In other words, as the political rhetoric has become blatant, actions targeting communities of color have followed suit.

Several of Trump’s proposed policies have targeted communities of color through bills that would prohibit Muslim refugees, end Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), and deny rights to transgender individuals. Considering the immediate shock and heightened discussion of such policies among students, this paper investigates the impact of the racist and anti-immigrant policies on Latinx/Chicanx undergraduate students leading up to the 2016 presidential election and after the election of Donald J. Trump. The paper uses the campus racial climate as a theoretical framework to understand their experiences on campus. The paper asks three questions:

1. What are the impacts on Latinx/Chicanx undergraduate students (on and off campus), regardless of documentation status, due to the election of Trump and the anti-immigrant and anti-Latinx/Chicanx rhetoric?
2. How has the campus racial climate for Latinx/Chicanx students been altered by the heightened discussion of potential anti-immigrant policies?
3. What are the intended and unintended consequences of the Trump-era discourse on the Latinx/Chicanx college student experience?

Implications for Latinx/Chicanx Undergraduates

In the following section, we introduce racist nativism and its influence on political rhetoric and policy. Next, we cover how literature describes the Latinx/Chicanx student college experience. Then we delve into our study that draws from campus racial climate frameworks and literature. After presenting our methods and data sources, we present eight themes across all focus groups and end the paper by discussing the findings and the impact on Latinx/Chicanx students.

Exacerbation of Racist Nativism and Trump

Nativism is defined by Hingham (1955) as an intense opposition to an internal underrepresented group because of fear it is foreign or “un-American.” Nativism has a connection to nationalism in the sense that nationalistic ideologies justify the fear “that some influence originating abroad threatens the very life of the nation within” (Hingham, 1955, p. 4 as cited in Huber, López, Malagon, Velez, & Solórzano, 2008). The discourse around nativism can be described as “dog whistle politics,” or a form of strategic racism spoken in code and targeting a specific audience (López, 2015). Such discourses emphasize racial divisions while masking themselves as “neutral.” For example, Attorney General Jeff Sessions justified the rescinding of DACA by stating that the program “denied jobs to hundreds of thousands of Americans [citizens] by allowing those same illegal aliens to take those jobs” (Shear & Davis, 2017). This fear is exacerbated when foreigners are racialized as Latinx/Chicanx and that traditional American values will be lost if overtaken by this growing minority population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016). Through this fear, racism becomes an important factor in how nativism is exercised where it begins to attack the Latinx/Chicanx community as non-native. During his presidential candidacy announcement, Trump played off of this fear by stating that “when Mexico sends its people … they’re not sending their best … They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists …” Racist nativism is then defined as assigning people of color, like the Latinx/Chicanx community, values that are perceived to be inferior to traditional native (White) values. Furthermore, racist
nativist rhetoric divert attention from social structures that maintain oppressive practices and exploit immi-
grant communities (Huber et al., 2008).

We argue that the Trump administration, as a result of the changing demographics in the United States, upholds these racist values through hostile discourses and policies against people of color; immi-
grant communities, and other historically marginal-
ized/minoritized groups. Through this discourse, there is a strong urgency to revert back to so-called tradi-
tional American values while assigning negative val-
es to historically marginalized communities. Through this paper, we intend to look at how discourses of the Trump administration are impacting the sense of belonging for Latinx/Chicanx students and how they experience the campus racial climate.

Latinx/Chicanx Students and the College Experience

Studies have demonstrated that hostile campus racial climates create traumatic and unwelcoming experi-
ences for Latinx/Chicanx students (Franklin, Smith, & Hung, 2014; González, 2002). Many of these experienc-
es are perpetrated by racial microaggressions (Huber & Solórzano, 2015; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000; Yosso, Smith, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2009) or the subtle, innocuous, preconscious, or unconscious degradation and putdowns aimed at reducing, diluting, atomizing, and encasing the essence into the whole. Addition-
ally, Smith, Allen, and Danley (2007) correlated racial microaggressions to racial battle fatigue, or the stress responses due to constant exposure to racial microag-
gressions. These traumatic experiences contribute to why students of color report that the campus climate is more hostile compared to their White counterparts (Harper & Hurtado, 2007).

Negative campus racial climates are facilitated by the institutional campus culture that often perpetuates “prejudice and discrimination, racial stereotypes, low expectations from teachers and peers, exclusions from the curriculum, and pedagogy that marginalizes and tokenizes the voices of Latinx/Chicanx college stu-
dents and other undergraduates of color (Castellanos & Gloria, 2007; Lopez, 2005 as cited in Kiyama, Museus, & Vega, 2015). For instance, studies have found that Latinx/Chicanx students experience racist stereotypes and anti-immigrant sentiments that are perpetuated by entities across college such as university staff, faculty, and students (Gloria, Castellanos, Scull, & Villegas, 2009; Sanchez, in-press; Yosso et al., 2009). Latinx/Chi-
canx students have college experiences partly because of the narrow perception of racial and ethnic identities by universities and colleges (Cavazos, Johnson, & Sparrow, 2010; Cerezo & Chang, 2013; Gloria & Castellanos, 2012; Pérez & Sáenz, 2017). A large body of research has demonstrated how Latinx/ 
Chicanx and fellow students of color feel “out of place,” lack a sense of belonging, feel unsafe, and experience regular racial microaggressions on college campuses (González, 2002; Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Kiyama et al., 2015; Rosso et al., 2007). Nonetheless, students and resources that foster multiculturalism and diversity tra-
ditionally have not had the full support of educational institutions (Bauman, Bustillos, Bensimon, Brown, & Bartee, 2005). In addressing hostile racial climates, institutions are contributing to the trauma of students of color and, with it, to the barriers they must navigate.

Furthermore, studies have also demonstrated that Latinx/Chicanx students have to fulfill family commit-
ments such as being caretakers and helping financially while in college (Cerezo, Lyda, Beristianos, Enriquez, & Connor, 2013; Kouyoumdjian, Guzmán, García, & Talavera-Bustillos, 2017). Studies have also revealed that finances play an important factor in how Latin-
x/Chicanx experience college (Gloria et al., 2017; Kouyoumdjian et al., 2017; Queguera, Locks, & Vega, 2009). Pérez and Sáenz (2017) interview students that underwent physical and psychological trauma due to the possibility of losing scholarships and other finan-
cial aid. These challenges add to how Latinx/Chicanx experience their college campuses and demonstrate a lack of commitment and/or understanding on how to support, retain, and graduate historically minoritized students (Harper & Hurtado, 2007).

Theoretical Framework: Campus Racial Climate and Culture

To understand the impact of Trump-era rhetoric on Latinx/Chicanx student experiences, we use campus racial climate and culture literature as our theoretical framework. The campus racial climate and culture are often referenced when discussing the experiences of historically marginalized students on campus. However, there are important distinctions between the two. Solórzano, Cep, and Yosso (2000) define the campus racial climate as the overall racial environment of the college campus, and this is supported by studies that have found that there are racial differences in the perceptions of students of color (see Harper & Hurtado, 2007, for a review). The campus racial climate is more relevant to the experiences of students of color than the general campus climate making it a racialized component to their postsecondary experience due to historical and contemporary exclusion (Hurta-
do, 1992). Schvaneveldt has described that hostile campus climates negatively impact students’ sense of belonging, academic outcomes, and health outcomes (Harper & Hurtado, 2007; Solórzano et al. (2000) stated that a positive racial campus climate includes at least four elements: (a) the inclusion of un-
derrepresented students, faculty, and administrators; (b) a curriculum with an underlying historical context of people of color; (c) programs that encourage the recruitment, retention, and graduation of students of color; and (d) a university commitment to a racially diverse college campus. Hurtado, Clayton-Pedersen, Allen, and Míleim (1998) and Míleim, Chang, & Antonio (2005) provided a framework to understand campus climate that included organizational structures, histo-
ries, and external forces such as governmental policies and sociohistorical forces. The campus racial climate is focused on finding these discrepancies, measuring students’ attitudes, perceptions, observations, or inter-
actions within the racial environment of their campus (Museus & Jayakumar, 2012).

Campus climate can change based on surroundings, perceptions, and times, campus culture is deeply 
embedded into institutions and takes a long time to change. Campus culture has been defined as “the insti-
tutional history, mission, physical settings, norms, tradi-
tions, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavioral both individuals and groups in an institution (Kuh & Hall, 1993, p. 2). Additionally, the campus culture is manifested in the institution’s mission, traditions, language, interactions, artifacts, physical structures, and other symbols (Museus & Jaya-
kumar, 2012). In essence, campus culture is the shared values and norms that govern the institution and their decision-making. Campus culture is intertwined with the decision-making of institutions, the effects of campus cultures are far reaching where the experienc-
es of all their students are impacted by it at some level (Museus & Jayakumar, 2012).

Methods

Because the purpose of the paper was to identify how anti-immigrant rhetoric impacts Latinx/Chicanx students and how they experience the campus racial climate, we utilized an interpretative approach. A qualitative approach en-
ables the examination of topics from the collection and analysis of detailed information (Bhattcharaya, 2017; Creswell, 1998; Pat-
ton, 2002). Qualitative re-
search allows us to answer how, what, and why ques-
tions (Bhattcharaya, 2017; Creswell, 1998; Patton, 2002). Finally, qualitative techniques enable us to 
collect, analyze, and report rich information regarding how, why, when, and where historical events and policies and rhetoric influence the undergraduate Latinx/ 
Chicanx experience.

Participant Selection

Participants in this study were selected purpose-
fully to ensure a partici-
pant pool comprised of individuals who are likely to have experience with the phenomenon studied (Patton, 2002). We used sampling for intensity, snowball sampling, and personal network sampling to recruit participants. Sampling for intensity refers to seeking information-rich cases and snowball sampling provided us the opportunity to ask current partici-
pants to recommend other participants (Patton, 2002). One of the authors is a first-year coordinator and
advisor in the Office for Equity and knew many of the students, which assisted with recruitment and was part of their personal network they used. The sampling methods used ensured participants that could speak meaningfully about the institution and the experiences of Latinx/Chicanx students.
Additionally, several participants mentioned how they felt the institution did not take into account the impact the rhetoric and election were having generally on historically marginalized students and their ability to perform academically.

This analysis resulted in eight themes: (1) power of political rhetoric and Trump; (2) coded language; (3) unsafe academic spaces; (4) racialization of immigration as a Latinx/Chicano issue; (5) burnout, stress, and racial battle fatigue; (6) balancing academic commitments and social activism; (7) the reactive university; and (8) students doing the work of the administration. The themes presented below are not an exhaustive list of all the ways that Latinx/Chicanx students experience the campus racial climate.

**Power of Political Rhetoric and Trump**

Participants discussed the impact political rhetoric was having on their everyday experiences and academics before and after the election. For example, Vanessa (female), a senior getting ready to graduate, mentioned: I remember when Trump got elected, you know how it was at 3 a.m. or something, the next day I had an exam at eight in the morning and I went and I did it … I remember going to my teacher after he graded and I got like a C, so I was like, “Yeah I really couldn’t study or think for this test because of the election.” And he was just like, “Oh yeah … I guess I couldn’t find the people that gave a fuck. Vanessa had been impacted heavily by Trump and his political rhetoric prior to the election. Once Trump was elected, the anxiousness and stress of the rhetoric and what it might mean for her friends and family negatively impacted Vanessa’s ability to focus and prepare for an exam and other academic responsibilities. This anxiousness and what it meant for the future was a common thread among participants.

Additionally, several participants mentioned how they felt the institution did not take into account the impact the rhetoric and election were having generally on historically marginalized students and their ability to perform academically.

Participants referenced how the political discourse impacted their perceptions of safety in certain spaces. For example, students protested the visit from Ben Shapiro, a conservative commentator, citing his rhetoric was harmful to the student body, campus racial climate, and attacked students of color, queer students, and trans students. By the institution allowing Ben Shapiro and his rhetoric on campus, several students indicated fearing for their safety. Roberto (male), a first-year student, described the day of Shapiro’s visit to campus:

There was tension in the air … you could feel it. I realized I was the only person of color there [near the auditorium where Ben Shapiro was speaking], I felt like I was unsafe, like oh no, everyone is going to start looking at me. They were just like saying the rhetoric that Ben Shapiro was saying. I’m like this is not a safe space for me. I should head home. Roberto’s comments expressed the fear participants felt with the increased brazenness of anti-Latinx/Chicano rhetoric on campus.

**Coded Language**

Participants identified the role of coded language in creating a hostile campus racial climate especially when issues of immigration were discussed. Coded language was used to communicate that Latinx Chicano students were not welcome on campus and was rooted in racism, xenophobia, and American exceptionalism. Hector (male), a graduating senior, explained how general comments on campus were rooted in liberal politics and those making the statements often made the comments in a subtle way that created a hostile campus racial climate.

Hector stated: It’s not directly anti-Latino, but this place is weird. All of the people thinking racist hide behind anonymity and liberal politics that White people buy into that make them seem like they are not racist.

Brenda (female), a third-year student, participating in one of two focus groups, described a politically charged event on campus during the fall of 2017.

At least three limitations should be noted. First, students were recruited through the multicultural center where one of the authors holds a full-time position. Second, because students were recruited from the multicultural center on campus, participants were already heavily involved in on-campus events and protests before and after the election. Thus, the experiences of participants in this study may differ from other Latinx/Chicano students. Third, the majority of student participants were of Mexican descent, with only three participants identifying as Central or South American. We cannot draw conclusions of fellow students who self-identify as Latinx/Chicanx.

**Findings**

The final sample consisted of 23 students that identified as Latinx/Chicano. The gender breakdown was nearly even with 12 participants identifying as male and 11 as female. All the students attended the same four-year institution in the western United States. The total enrollment of the institution was around 34,000 in the fall of 2017 and was primarily a commuter school, but recently offered greater on-campus housing options. The city and state in which the institution is located is experiencing rapid growth of Latinx/Chicano populations. In addition, the enrollments of Latinx/Chicanos have been growing year over year. In 2015, Latinx/Chicano students were 15% of the first-time freshman and 12% of the undergraduate population. Focus groups occurred between September 2016 and September 2017.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Each student participated in one of two focus groups lasting between 60 to 90 minutes. Prior to the focus groups, students were asked to fill out a brief demographic questionnaire. Focus groups were conducted using a semistructured protocol. Participants were asked general questions about what it is like to be a Latinx Chicano student at the institution and their perceptions of the campus racial climate before and after the election of Trump. Participants were also asked how they were impacted by the political rhetoric occurring that was seemingly anti-Latinx/Chicano and immigrant. Interviewers asked probing questions to better understand how students view their experience at the institution and what it was like to be Latinx/Chicano. Authors had participants pick pseudonyms to protect their identities.

**Data Analysis**

Each focus group was audio taped and transcribed. Data was analyzed using methods described by Strauss and Corbin (1988) and Moustakas (1994). HyperRESEARCH 2.8 qualitative data management software was used to organize, manage, and code the data. First, the authors triangulated multiple data sources including interview transcripts, HyperRESEARCH code reports, and researcher notes to develop and verify themes. Second, the authors utilized member checks to ensure researcher interpretations aligned with students’ perceptions and comments. Participants were asked to provide feedback on the findings of the data analysis. Finally, the authors continually reviewed and examined the data and themes to develop additional themes.

**Limitations**

At least three limitations should be noted. First, students were recruited through the multicultural center where one of the authors holds a full-time position. Second, because students were recruited from the multicultural center on campus, participants were already heavily involved in on-campus events and protests before and after the election. Thus, the experiences of participants in this study may differ from other Latinx/Chicano students. Third, the majority of student participants were of Mexican descent, with only three participants identifying as Central or South American. We cannot draw conclusions of fellow students who self-identify as Latinx/Chicanos.

**Trustworthiness**

Methods suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1986) were used to strengthen trustworthiness of the findings. First, the authors triangulated multiple data sources including interview transcripts, HyperRESEARCH code reports, and researcher notes to develop and verify themes. Second, the authors utilized member checks to ensure researcher interpretations aligned with students’ perceptions and comments. Participants were asked to provide feedback on the findings of the data analysis. Finally, the authors continually reviewed and examined the data and themes to develop additional themes.
ti-Latino/Chicanx and immigrant rhetoric, students overwhelmingly identified the classroom as a place of increased hostility and increased microagressions during the election cycle and after the election. Paco (male), a senior, described experiences in classes when discussing immigration:

There has been a lot of hostile encounters in the classroom. There have been cases when we are talking about the benefits of immigration and immigration reform. And there have been times when people have spoken out aggressively and de-humanizing comments, something along the lines of “we should exterminate these people” is something I actually heard in the classroom when I was presenting ... and the professor did NOTHING. Despite years of meeting with Latinx/Chicanx and other racial/ethnic student groups on campus about the unwelcoming campus racial climate and culture, the president continued to act unaware and confused.

**Unsafe Academic Spaces**

In addition to discussing the general campus racial climate created by the increased discussion of anti-immigrant rhetoric, students overwhelmingly identified the classroom as a place of increased hostility and increased microaggressions during the election cycle and after the election. Paco (male), a senior, described experiences in classes when discussing immigration:

There has been a lot of hostile encounters in the classroom. There have been cases when we are talking about the benefits of immigration and immigration reform. And there have been times when people have spoken out aggressively and de-humanizing comments, something along the lines of “we should exterminate these people” is something I actually heard in the classroom when I was presenting ... and the professor did NOTHING. Despite years of meeting with Latinx/Chicanx and other racial/ethnic student groups on campus about the unwelcoming campus racial climate and culture, the president continued to act unaware and confused.

**Racialization of Immigration as a Latinx/Chicanx Issue**

Participants were critical of how students, staff, and faculty at the university were unaware of the complexities of immigration even though there is a center on campus that focuses on undocumented students and numerous yearly events bringing awareness to immigration issues. This theme manifested in university entities racializing immigration as strictly a Latinx/Chicanx problem and therefore as a topic that did not have to be addressed in certain spaces. For example, Juan (male), a senior elaborated:

In terms of like immigration being racialized as Latinx, a lot of the people within the multicultural center completely dismiss it (issues around immigration), it’s a lack of awareness because of its association as being Latinx. Universities are supposed to serve all students, but Juan reported how the racialization of immigration as a Latinx/Chicanx issue allowed several university entities, including the multicultural center, to pass on the opportunity to confront and support students with multiple identities and who were undocumented. Instead, university offices relied on Latinx/Chicanx-centric programs/organizations and the Dream Center to address the undocumented community. Juan continued by giving an example of how even other progressive student organizations did the same. “I am also a part of QTSSC (Queer/Trans Student of Color), we met on the day DACA was rescinded and no one brought it up.” Juan’s comments demonstrated how even departmental and student groups that are meant to support historically marginalized students can contribute to feelings of being unwelcome on campus.

The racialization of immigration as Latinx/Chicanx also contributed to the “othering” and notion that students who pertain to that community are foreign. In other words, if let Latinx/Chicanx students know that they are not “native” and are not considered American. For example, Gabriella (who was born in the United States) described how Americans are racialized as White. “They [White people] usually start sentences like, ‘Well, Americans think this’.” Gabriella is describing how his White peers contribute to othering Latinx/Chicanx communities as nonnative to the United States and thus their views are considered non-American.

**Burnout, Stress, and Racial Battle Fatigue**

Individuals identified that as a result of the anti-Latino/Chicanx and immigrant rhetoric, the hostile campus racial climate created a stressful and emotionally draining. Luz (female), a senior, connected the stress she felt to other academic responsibilities:

“Responses from students suggest the election of Trump and likeminded political leaders profoundly and negatively impact the campus climate for Latinx/Chicanx students.”

about the hostile environment. These fears were exacerbated during a period of time in which there were multiple instances of anti-queer and anti-Black flyers posted on campus that played on stereotypes of the respective student groups.
It's like extra stress on top of like homework and work. It's a lot of shit to deal with, it's like psychologically and emotionally overwhelming. I have depression and anxiety so I'm taking medication for it. There is a pattern that I have noticed that when I'm away from school I am fine you know, I'm good, but once I'm back in school all these things start hitting me at one. In terms of how I navigate, I started being selective of where I spend my time, who I talk to, what classes I even participate in, and what classes I don't. Sometimes I feel like there's no point on wasting my energy on these people who are not going to care about what I have to say.

Luz’s experience echoed other students that highlighted they wanted to disengage from the campus and even changed majors to avoid certain spaces. For example, Vanessa stated, “I don’t engage, I disengage. I want to fucking cry all the time. I hate everyone. I just want to sleep. Then I feel guilty the next day.

This semester I have just been super tired. I get way more anxious. I started being selective of where I spend my time, and what classes I don’t. Sometimes I feel like I don’t want to do anything. I feel like I have no energy. I don’t want to do anything. I don’t want to be here. It’s like a feeling of being in a place where you don’t want to be.

On one hand, students wanted to finish their degrees so they could ‘get out’, but they felt they had a responsibility to actively participate in rallies and protests that could be beneficial to their community. Participation in social actions and protests hampered the ability of several of the participants to keep up with their academic work. Multiple participants directly attributed falling behind in classes to participating in the sit-in at the president’s office protesting the scheduled Ben Shapiro event and the perceived lack of urgency by the administration to stop the event from taking place and not allowing hate speech on campus.

Luz commented: ‘It does take up a lot of time and energy. Like I could have been studying. I could have been reading. During the sit in, I spent the whole day (there), that’s when I started to fall behind in readings for classes. It’s stuff that I don’t regret doing because it had to be done and I wanted to be there, but again it’s like, you know, it falls on the students. Participants demonstrated that they were consistently willing to sacrifice their academic standing by falling behind and possibly receiving bad grades in order to advocate for their communities. This sacrifice that Latinx/Chicanx and fellow students of color make is rooted in history, but the increased time and energy students used to combat Ben Shapiro’s visit and other anti-Latinx/Chicanx rhetoric is an unintended consequence of the election of Trump.”

The feeling that the institution was not proactive in dealing with the increased political discourse created a sentiment that the institution did not care about them as students. For example, Luz stated, “I don’t feel like the university supports me at an organizational level, more like people in certain offices, certain professors you can talk to.” Juan continued, “What the Women’s Resource Center did, the massages (a day after the Ben Shapiro event), that’s something proactive they did, not that the university [administrators and other departments] enlisted them to do so.”

These statements describe the disconnect between Latinx/Chicanx needs and institutional support. Gabriella (female) summed up these feelings by sharing: ‘They [university administrators] have no investment in it, they are just gonna go home, all of them are gonna do the same thing. There is nothing at stake for them, they have nothing to lose.

There was a feeling that by the institution being only reactive, the leadership lacked a sense of urgency to support Latinx/Chicanx students and change the negative institutional culture.

Students Doing the Work of the Administration

Several of the participants referenced how they believed they were doing the work of the administration in providing support for fellow Latinx/Chicanx students. Vanessa explained, “If the university cared or supported us, they wouldn’t have us do their job. Their supposed to care about their students.”

A lot of what the university ends up doing is because of students, we are the ones telling them, “Hey you need to do something about it.” Like with the student organization that supports undocumented students, they pushed a lot to open an undocumented resources center, for (full-time) staff to get hired, and for funding. If it weren’t for students advocating, they wouldn’t have done anything.

I don’t think it would have ever happened. I don’t think that’s on their [administration] radar even though that’s their job of thinking, “How can we make this campus better and more inclusive for students?”

Due to the perceived lack of proactive behavior of the institution, students felt they needed to do the work or put pressure on the administration to create more welcoming environments. Students discussed how they were taking on extra responsibilities and work that other students did not have to take on. Participants discussed how this led to feelings of hopeless-ness and feelings of fighting an endless fight they were bound to lose. Javier (male), a third-year student, noted, “There needs to be more serious repercussions for professors who do say problematic stuff to hurt individuals.”

For Javier, even at the focus group, he felt compelled to advocate for his community however he could. Glenda put into perspective the extra work Latinx/Chicanx students were taking on by saying:

“The Latinx/Chicanx students in our study not only have to compete academically, but also have to survive and strive against hostile climates, culture, microaggressions, and racial battle fatigue, while civically engaging and advocating for their communities.”
When you come to the university, initially all I thought I was going to focus on was my academics; the same way I did in high school. You never think, “Oh I’m going to devote a lot of my time fighting administration and advocating for my community.” That was not initially what I thought about my college experience.

Glenda highlighted the different directions Latinx/Chicanx students are being pulled compared to their peers. For several of the participants, being a Latinx/Chicanx college student meant they had a deep responsibility to their communities and they demonstrated this commitment through social activism.

Discussion

Findings from this study contribute to the literature on contemporary experiences of Latinx/Chicanx college students. Students indicated that the election of Trump and like-minded political leaders profoundly and negatively impacted their perceptions of the campus racial climate and their sense of belonging to the institution. Student responses demonstrated there was a shift that occurred on campus as a result of the election that caused Latinx/Chicanx students to perceive the environment as physically and psychologically dangerous. Previous studies have highlighted the prevalence of negative campus racial climates and cultures (Hurtado & Carter, 1997), but participants in this study demonstrated that universities are sometimes complicit in the shift to greater anti-Latinx/Chicanx and immigrant rhetoric without proactive action.

Students experienced different types of stressors and macro and microaggressions and/or failed to address such aggressions, which created a hostile campus racial climate. Furthermore, the rhetoric of Trump and his policies often seeped into classroom discussions and made students feel unwelcome. For Latinx/Chicanx students and students of color after the Trump presidency.

Fifth, we found that universities are putting a greater onus on students of color with institutional inaction. Student activism and participation are sources of learning and knowledge production (Rhoads, 2009). Although these types of activities are fruitful, they can have negative impacts on the emotional and psychological health of students (Rhoads, 2016). In further analyzing comments made by participants, we pose a question of what it would look like for institutions to acknowledge students’ labor of love for their community.

Scholars have argued we witnessed a shift in racism from the overt racism of the Jim Crow era to a subtler, “color-blind” racism that is equally injurious to the everyday lives of people of color (Bonilla-Silva, 2010). Our findings partially challenge such assumptions when we see overt racism and xenophobia operating at the forefront of the daily lives of Latinx/Chicanx students with the election of Trump. Participants noted a specific shift from the color-blind racism they experienced to a more overt anti-Latinx/Chicanx discrimination during and after the election. Students provided examples of how the campus racial climate became increasingly hostile to their presence. Participants highlighted the institution only reacted to overt acts of discrimination and frequently failed to address any subtle forms of daily racism. As seen with the Ben Shapiro and other conservative talks on campuses around the country, institutions of higher education often cited freedom of speech reasoning for allowing such individuals to speak on campus. Such color-blind, ahistorical reasoning can be harmful to the sense of belonging of students of color and their health.

Students expressed the toll that rhetoric and action/inaction took on their level of energy, psychological health, and physiological health. Participants cited they were dealing with mental health issues that were heightened while attending the institution. These findings align with previous research on racial battle fatigue that found as a result of racial microaggressions, students experienced different types of stressors (Franklin et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2007; Yosso et al., 2009). Although there has been some scholarship on how discrimination and racism impact Latinx/Chicanx students (Franklin et al., 2014; Yosso et al., 2009), additional scholarship is needed. Furthermore, scholarship is needed to understand how institutions of higher education can support Latinx/Chicanx students and students of color after the Trump presidency.

Finally, students expressed the negative impact of the escalation of Trump-era policies had on all Latinx/Chicanx students and their intersectional identities. Although we expected this finding considering certain phenotypes as signifiers of being associated with a Latinx/Chicanx background, we were unsure, at first, how prevalent this would be among our participants. One student spoke about what Picca and Feagin (2007) refer to as performing race in the backpack and frontstage depending on who is present. The student spoke about her light complexion that would enable her to “pass” as White and, thus, hear conversations that were openly anti-immigrant and anti-Latinx/Chicanx. The student was able to see the friendly and hostile sides of the campus racial climate based on her ability to “pass.”

Conclusion

The findings in this paper demonstrate the complicated campus racial climates, cultures, and feelings that Latinx/Chicanx students had to navigate leading up to, during, and after the election of Trump. Latinx/Chicanx students have always faced hostile and unwelcoming climates, but students expressed that such occurrences have become more frequent and harsher. The focus groups illustrate what it takes to enroll, persist, and complete a degree in the current political climate. The Latinx/Chicanx students in our study not only have to compete academically, but they also have an obligation to be civically engaged and continuously advocate for their communities. Given the political and anti-Latinx/Chicanx climates of universities need to create programs and policies that are more inclusive of Latinx/Chicanx students.
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It’s as if my family’s immigration status and experience lie delicately between the two kawayan, bamboo poles, and we’ve been dancing the tinikling with immigration ever since our arrival in the US. ICE sets the pace of how fast we should be dancing, how we weave through the poles as a family. Although it is in our blood, 15 years of dancing between the kawayan becomes tiring. Do we get to walk freely or are we forever bound and trapped to the confines of the kawayan?
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