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Abstract

The Maryland In-state Tuition Referendum (Maryland Dream Act) was signed into law in 2012. Since then, colleges in Maryland have seen an increase in undocumented student enrollment (Hunter-Cevera, 2015). There is a dearth of literature as to how college admissions offices train their staff to recruit undocumented students. This study aims to understand the effects of professional development on admissions counselors’ multicultural competence in working with the undocumented student population. After completing a one-day, four-hour training, which included a didactic lecture, role-playing, and guest speakers, the difference in admission counselors’ multicultural awareness, knowledge, and terminology of undocumented students was compared. Additionally, focus groups were conducted to gather qualitative data. Results indicated a 16% increase in the overall mean of the multicultural competence measure when compared to the pre-survey. Further quantitative analysis indicated multicultural knowledge and awareness had a statistically significant change in mean, while multicultural terminology did not. The qualitative data suggested participants were more aware of undocumented students’ experiences in the United States and gained clarity on policies affecting undocumented students in higher education. Participants also wanted more guidance on how to navigate conversations with undocumented students to avoid microaggressions and embrace the counselor role. Implications for practice and research are discussed.
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Executive Summary

There are 11-million undocumented immigrants in the United States (Passel & Cohn, 2015) and an estimated 65,000 graduating from high schools throughout the United States each year (Passel, 2003). Approximately 7,000 - 13,000 undocumented students a year enroll in post-secondary education (Passel, 2003). Maryland has an estimated population of 60,000 undocumented immigrants under the age of 24 (The Migration Policy Institute, 2016). Maryland became the first state to pass a Dream Act by popular vote in 2012 (Hesson, 2012), but there are 20 states with similar Dream Act laws throughout the nation (Nienhusser, Vega, & Saavedra Carquin, 2016). State Dream Act laws allow states to redefine residency requirements to award undocumented students in-state tuition (Nienhusser et al., 2016). States have taken it upon themselves to pass Dream Act laws since a federal Dream Act has failed to pass in Congress since 2001 (Schmid, 2013). Maryland DREAMers are projected to gross an estimated $66 million each year since passing the Maryland Dream Act due to expected higher income, taxable income, and reduction in incarceration and public welfare rates (Gindling & Mandell, 2012). While economic gains should be of interest to the state, there has not been a proactive approach to recruit more undocumented students to institutions of higher education. Furthermore, on a national level, the United States is at a crossroads on immigration reform. The focus of this study was to measure to what extent admission counselors’ multicultural competencies on undocumented students was impacted by attending a professional development.

Currently, the United States is experiencing a rise in “anti-Latino nativism and restrictionist backlash, particularly aimed at the rising number of undocumented college students” (Olivas, 2015, p. 356). Reviewing the historical context provides greater insights into the timeliness of this research. In 1982, the Plyler v. Doe case determined that undocumented students must have a free, public K-12 education (Gonzales, Heredia, & Negron-Gonzales, 2015). Not providing this free
education would ultimately lead to a lifetime of hardship for this population (Gonzales et al., 2015). Thirty years later, President Obama announced the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) policy in 2012 (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2016). This policy enables undocumented immigrants who meet certain criteria to work legally in the United States (Gonzales et al., 2015), and provides in-state tuition at some public colleges throughout the country, including Maryland (University of Maryland, n.d.).

The National Bureau of Economic Research shows that DACA recipients in comparison to immigrants not eligible for DACA had a 15% increase in high school graduation, 45% decrease in teenage births, increased college attendance by 25% among DACA women, and an increase in employment among those enrolled in college (Kuka, Shenhav, & Shih, 2018). Furthermore, research indicates states that pass Dream Act laws incentivize undocumented students to enroll in college (Kaushal, 2008). Flores (2012) found that undocumented students were 1.54 times more likely to enroll in college after their state passed a Dream Act.

While the latest trends indicate that undocumented student initiatives, like state Dream Act laws and DACA, are benefiting students and the economy, there is a dearth of literature on what colleges are doing to recruit more undocumented students to their institutions. Undocumented student recruitment is a fairly new phenomena with very few studies exploring undocumented student competencies amongst college staff (Cadenas, Cisneros, Todd, & Spanierman, 2016; Cisneros & Cadenas, 2017; Nienhusser & Espino, 2016), and even fewer attempting to understand college admission counselors’ knowledge and recruitment practices of undocumented students (Hesse, 2017; Nienhusser, 2014). Therefore, a needs assessment was conducted first to collect preliminary data from admission counselors’ on their experiences with undocumented students.

The needs assessment was conducted in April 2016. Nine participants were interviewed from a public, four-year college in the state of Maryland about their experiences with
undocumented students and the extent to which they received any training on recruiting this population. Findings suggest that admissions staff may confuse which policies apply for DACA vs DREAMers, a strategic recruitment plan does not exist to actively recruit undocumented students, and day-to-day protocols have not been established for recruiting and advising undocumented students. All participants shared that they would like to receive training on undocumented students, and shared examples of what topics should be addressed in the training. These suggestions, such as reviewing the historical and current context of undocumented student policies in the United States, learning how to navigate conversations while reducing microaggressions, and hearing from undocumented students directly, were taking into account when designing the professional development.

The professional development was conducted in November 2017. The recruitment email was sent to 228 admissions staff at 18 different institutions throughout the state of Maryland. Participants were given three weeks to reply via email or phone. The final response rates were 16 (7%) confirmed, 12 (5%) declined, and 200 (88%) did not reply. The majority of participants were overwhelmingly female, White, had more than five years of higher education experience, and worked at either a public four-year college or public two-year college.

The professional development training was a one-day, four-hour training, which included three activities: didactic lecture, role-playing, and guest speakers. The didactic lecture reviewed the history of undocumented students and covered current information on DACA and Dream Act policies. During this portion of the training, participants were asked to consider how all these events influenced undocumented students’ ecological systems (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; 1994). The role-playing activity consisted of two participants reading a script in front of the group. The purpose was to have admissions counselors empathize with what undocumented students may experience when an admission counselor is incompetent. A discussion regarding microaggressions, empathy, and
proper terminology concluded this portion of the training. In the final activity, two guest speakers presented their experiences as DACA recipients. They were asked to share their personal experiences during the college application process, college, and post-college life as an undocumented immigrant in the United States. The participants had opportunities to ask questions.

Participants completed the Multicultural Counseling Competence and Training Survey, Revised (MCCTS-R; Holcomb-McCoy & Day-Vines, 2004) before and immediately after the one day training. The instrument had 14 out of 32 items modified by replacing the term *multicultural students* (or similar terms) with *undocumented student*. Furthermore, four focus groups were conducted: three after each activity and one final focus group to examine the participants’ experiences. A fidelity of implementation survey was also conducted after each activity.

The MCCTS-R pre-survey found that the mean score among all participants was 2.37. After the conclusion of the professional development, the MCCTS-R post-survey found that the mean score among all participants was 2.77. The mean difference was .40 or a 16% change. The effect size between the pre and post survey results was .712, indicating a large effect size (Cohen, 1969).

The pre-survey subscale means for multicultural knowledge, awareness, and terminology were 1.99, 2.97, and 2.82, respectively. The post-survey subscales means for multicultural knowledge, awareness, and terminology increased to 2.60, 3.11, and 2.86, respectively. The changes in mean from multicultural knowledge were the highest at .61 (30% change), followed by awareness at .14 (4% change), and finally terminology at .04 (1% change). The paired sample t-test for the MCCTS-R pre and post survey subscales scores indicate that multicultural terminology did not achieve a statistically significant finding based on a p-value above .05 (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Multicultural knowledge and awareness did in fact have p-values below .05 and t-values of 12.6 and 2.48, respectively.
Key assertions that emerged after the qualitative data analysis were an awareness of undocumented students, providing tangible takeaways for participants, and that the professional development can be a training for all staff and faculty at a college and not just admissions staff. Participants shared that the professional development was concise and covered various aspects of undocumented students in a short time period. As a takeaway, one participant said, “I would like a list of the top terminology and their definitions that [participants] could walk away from this training with.” Another shared her fears of stating incorrect or insensitive terms by saying, “I am almost tentative now to speak up because I might [say something] wrong.” While the quantitative results indicate short-term gains in knowledge, awareness, and terminology, qualitative findings indicate that participants are still wary or uncertain of navigating conversations with an undocumented student.

Based on a joint analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, the research question, “To what extent does a professional development impact admission counselors’ multicultural awareness, knowledge, and terminology of undocumented students,” can be best answered in two parts. First, the change in means from the pre and post MCCTS-R survey, along with the effect size, and testimonials from the final focus group, indicate that the professional development had an impact, to an extent, on admission counselor’s multicultural competencies of undocumented students. Second, the means of the subscales on the pre and post MCCTS-R survey, along with the testimonials during the final focus group, indicate that multicultural knowledge and awareness had the greatest change in mean while multicultural terminology did not have a statistically significant change and participants shared numerous suggestions on improving their terminology competency after the professional development. The study also found that each activity in the professional development met the fidelity of implementation requirements.
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Key limitations are the limited sample size, the fact that the researcher served as the facilitator, and the MCCTS-R was modified. One implication for practice is incorporating training similar to that of high school counselors by considering how training or certification may be required prior to recruiting undocumented students. Furthermore, recommendations on what future professional development training should encompass, and how participants should be assessed, are discussed. Additionally, a discussion on the implications for research recommend that undocumented students be interviewed to share their experiences during the college recruitment process. Finally, researchers must continue to report on undocumented student trends pertaining to college enrollment, job placements, and other factors that have economic impacts on students, states, and the nation. While immigration reform may divide the nation, economic growth should be a bipartisan issue.
Chapter I: Literature Review

Relevant literature on undocumented students, immigration, Dream Act laws, and the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) policy will be reviewed in this chapter. The current problem of practice is admission counselors’ inability to competently assist and effectively recruit this population during the college application process (Hesse, 2017). This chapter will review the current literature in order to provide a foundational understanding of undocumented students in the United States and how policies have impacted their lives, including their higher education attainment. This review provides the groundwork necessary for what college admission counselors need to know about this population in order to improve recruitment efforts.

The literature review seeks to outline the conceptual framework of Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) *Ecology of Human Development*, better known today as *Ecological Systems Theory* (EST). Beginning with the definition of undocumented students, additional synonymous terms used interchangeably when describing this population are provided as well. This is followed by a description of Bronfenbrenner’s (1994) EST levels: microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem. Each system is defined and academic literature explores their impact on undocumented students’ milieu. Similar studies conducted within a college admissions office with similar populations are reviewed. Finally, a summary on the relationships between undocumented students and college admissions offices are at the conclusion of this chapter.

**Undocumented Students and Synonymous Terms**

There are numerous terms synonymous with *undocumented*. One of these terms is *alien*, defined as, “any person not a citizen or national of the United States” (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2015a). Conversely, a Department of Homeland Security report estimates 11 million, *unauthorized immigrants* reside in the United States (Hoefer, Rytina, & Baker, 2012). Another term, *DREAMers*, is undocumented students enrolled or intending to enroll, in higher
education (Batalova & Mittelstadt, 2012). This term will be discussed further in the marcosystem section, but the acronym stems from the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act of 2001 (Dream Act; Schmid, 2013). The Dream Act is still not federal law. The term unauthorized migrant has been used in studies from non-governmental agencies as well (Passel, 2006). These terms represent the same undocumented population but many researchers and government agencies use them interchangeably.

Some researchers have labeled undocumented students the 1.5 generation (Gonzales, Suárez-Orozco, & Dedios-Sanguineti, 2013; Rumbaut, 2004). This term applies to a youth who migrated to the United States before age 12 but consider themselves Americans at heart, just not on paper (Rumbaut, 2004). Defining the various terms used with this population provides the foundation for understanding their environment.

**Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory**

Urie Bronfenbrenner was a world-renowned child psychologist and professor emeritus at Cornell until his death in 2005 (Brendtro, 2006). “His ecological research sparked the Head Start movement for disadvantaged children. His advocacy before the United Nations forged international children’s policy” (Brendtro, 2006, p. 165). Bronfenbrenner’s legacy in the field of child psychology is unparalleled, but his lasting imprint was EST.

EST is a conceptual framework used to explain how an individual’s environment influences their development. The environments have multiple layers called systems. Each system is defined using Bronfenbrenner’s 1979 and 1994 publications; however, it is important to note that EST has evolved since Bronfenbrenner’s original findings. Currently, some scholars label EST as bioecological systems theory (Burns, Warmbold-Brann, & Zaslofsky, 2015; Tudge, Mokrova, Hatfield, & Karnik, 2009) adding different systems and intricacies to Bronfenbrenner’s original EST framework.
Bronfenbrenner (1979) defines EST as:

The scientific study of the progressive, mutual accommodation between an active, growing human being and the changing properties of the immediate settings in which the developing person lives, as this process is affected by relations between these settings, and by the larger context in which the settings are embedded (p. 21).

Bronfenbrenner (1979) details three key features in this theory: (a) developing people are growing, dynamic entities that mold into their milieu, (b) the environment and developing person are reciprocally accommodating to one another, and (c) the environment is not one single immediate setting, since larger external influences impact the immediate setting. Each system level (micro, meso, exo, macro, and chorno) will be defined and examples of contextual factors relating to undocumented students’ lives will be discussed. A model for undocumented students’ EST is provided (see Figure 1.1). The first system level is the microsystem.
Microsystem

This is the most immediate setting, which Bronfenbrenner (1979) explains as, “a pattern of activities, roles, and interpersonal relations experienced by the developing person in a given setting with particular physical and material characteristics” (p. 22). Examples of these interpersonal relations include family, school, peer groups and workplace (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). An undocumented student, meaning any immigrant attending a K-20 school system within the United States (Hesse, 2017), is at the center of the EST. Specific individuals in the microsystem’s interpersonal relations include US K-20 schools, teachers and counselors, undocumented and documented family and friends, as well as college admissions staff. This warrants a review of undocumented students and the K-20 environment.

Hispanics make up the largest percentage of undocumented immigrants in the US at 78% (Passel, 2006) and the largest minority group in the US (Passel, 2011). An estimated 65,000 undocumented students graduate from US high schools each year (Passel, 2003). Undocumented students are legally protected to attend K-12 public schooling in the United States by Supreme Court precedent (Lee, 2006). Plyler v. Doe in 1982 will be explored in the marcosystems level due to its landmark significance. However, the Plyler case impacts the microsystem of undocumented students, because it enables them to legally attend public US K-12 (Lee, 2006). When undocumented students enroll in a public school in the US, their population assimilates to American culture, but many challenges exist for undocumented students to assimilate (Gonzales et al., 2015). Schools have the potential to fully integrate this population, but constrained school resources, deprioritization of low preforming students, and the inability to legally participate in certain civic engagement hinders their assimilation (Gonzales et al., 2015). Undocumented students’ interactions with others in their microsystem is part of the mesosystem level.
Mesosystems

Bronfenbrenner (1979) defines the mesosystem as, “interrelations among two or more settings in which the developing person actively participates” (p. 25). If an undocumented student becomes one of the 65,000 aforementioned who graduate from high school, interactions with high school counselors or college admissions staff are part of the mesosystem. A qualitative study found that 59% of undocumented student college-goers discovered their undocumented status when applying to college or financial aid (Gonzales, 2011). Another study found college admissions staff who mentioned in-state tuition qualifications impacted an undocumented students’ decision to enroll in their institution (Pérez, 2010). These studies illustrates the importance of having knowledgeable admission counselors who understand in-state tuition policies. They should be aware of DACA, state Dream Act laws, and other qualifying information prior to interacting with undocumented students in the mesosystem. DACA and state Dream Act laws will be covered in the macrosystem level, but are generally known for providing in-state tuition within public colleges, or in the case of DACA, granting legal work permits. These policies provide undocumented students with a pathway to college or work, or both.

Before transitioning from high school to college, undocumented students experience dichotomous feelings of hope and stress (Ellis & Chen, 2013). If an undocumented student becomes one of the estimated 7,000 - 13,000 students a year enrolling in post-secondary education (Passel, 2003), stress and depression become more apparent. Latino college students experience higher levels of depression and lower levels of self-esteem when controlled for general college stress (Arbona & Jimenez, 2014). Undocumented, Latino students face similar rates of depression on college campuses as well (Muñoz, 2013).

Certain K-12 interactions may hinder post-secondary enrollment rates for undocumented students. Latino students, who interact with high school counselors in the mesosystem, may receive
biased information to not pursue post-secondary education due to the counselor’s perception of unaffordability (McDonough & Calderone, 2006). This could cause a deterrence in the mesosystem. An undocumented student may no longer inquire about post-secondary education with members in their microsystem as a result. In addition, this may cause the undocumented student to seek college information from friends and family, as opposed to professional staff (Pérez, 2010). While some high school counselors become a part of an undocumented student’s social capital network, even throughout college (Garcia & Tierney, 2011), most undocumented students use their family and friends within the microsystem to obtain knowledge on navigating the barriers set by exo and macrosystems (Enriquez, 2011).

**Exosystem**

The exosystem is the third level of the concentric circles diagram. This level references settings not involving the developing person directly, but affecting the milieu in which they live or interact (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Bronfenbrenner (1994) cites that individuals or policies in the child’s environment could influence their well-being, like a parent not qualifying for health care or laid off from their job due to budget cuts. College admissions policies, lack of scholarship opportunities, driver’s license restrictions, and bilingual staff at colleges could affect undocumented students’ exosystem.

College admissions’ policies vary from state to state and institution type: public or private and two-year or four-year. Georgia, Alabama, and South Carolina have created barriers to ban undocumented students from enrolling at certain public colleges in their states (Banks, 2013). In Georgia, the undocumented immigrant population increased 95% from 2000 to 2010 (Hoefer et al., 2012). Georgia’s undocumented students are banned from most public colleges. As a result, private colleges are their only option, and they are historically more costly than public colleges. College scholarships become a problematic option as it requires US citizenship or permanent residency
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(Olivas, 2009). The policies enacted by these states may deter the undocumented student from pursuing a college degree, while states passing Dream Act laws may incentivize the student to enroll (Kaushal, 2008). In fact, Flores (2012) found that undocumented students were 1.54 times more likely to enroll in college after their state passed a Dream Act.

Additional challenges include obtaining driver’s licenses. Driver’s licenses are premissible only in 12 states for immigrants and cannot be used for federal identification purposes (National Conference of State Legislatures, 2015). The state where undocumented students reside has a direct impact on the college, scholarship, and driver’s license options. These policies impact the student’s outlook indirectly within the exosystem, and they impact the parents of these students. Given that undocumented immigrants are predominately of Latino background, bilingual representation at college admissions and financial aid offices are critical to aid this population (Nienhusser, 2014; Olivas, 2009). This calls for updating websites and handouts to Spanish, especially information regarding in-state tuition benefits. These settings in the exosystem impact the undocumented student in their development. It can positively impact their exosystem by having an abundance of bilingual representatives in higher education offices. It can negatively impact their exosystem by having state legislatures deny their right to in-state tuition. Ultimately, the laws and policies of their environment influence undocumented students. These laws and policies become part of the all-encompassing marcosystems.

**Macrosystem**

The macrosystem was the overarching concentric circle in the EST until the chronosystem level was added in the 90’s. Bronfenbrenner (1994) defines the macrosystem as “a societal blueprint for a particular culture or subculture” and goes “beyond the simple labels of class and culture to identify more specific social and psychological features” (p. 40). This setting affects the other settings, specifically the conditions and processes occurring in the microsystem.
The United States is experiencing a rise in “anti-Latino nativism and restrictionist backlash, particularly aimed at the rising number of undocumented college students” (Olivas, 2015, p. 356). The logical question becomes: How did we arrive to this animosity toward undocumented students? The next section covers the ubiquitous legal and political history of undocumented students within the vast jurisdiction of immigration. The purpose is to review the foundation of how undocumented students from K-12 through higher education became DREAMer’s in current society.

In 1972, Kline v. Vlandis was the first case to reach the US Supreme Court on colleges differentiating between resident and non-resident (Olivas, 2004). The University of Connecticut classified all students who were accepted as out-of-state during the application process as non-residents for their entire post-secondary education. Non-residents pay higher tuition and fees than in-state residents at public universities. The Supreme Court ruled the University of Connecticut, thereby all other public colleges in the US, cannot keep students in the non-resident status in perpetuity (Olivas, 2004). Today, public colleges provide residency requirements allowing students to update their status to in-state residents. In-state status usually has lower rates of tuition than non-resident status.

In 1982, the Supreme Court ruled on Toll v. Moreno (Olivas, 2004), the first US Supreme Court case arguing post-secondary, in-state tuition for non-immigrant G-4 visa holders at the University of Maryland. G visas are for “diplomats, government officials or employees who will work for international organizations in the United States” (U.S. Department of State, n.d.). They are non-immigrants because they have a visa status allowing lawful residence in the United States for a specific period. The Supreme Court ruled the University of Maryland’s policy denying G-4 visa holders in-state tuition was unconstitutional under the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution.
Interpreting these results, Olivas (2004) reaffirms the “federal government is preeminent in matters of immigration policy and states may not enact alienage classifications, except in limited cases of political and government functions, or where the states are given such jurisdiction as a feature of the federal scheme” (p. 445).

Also in 1982, Plyler v. Doe became the landmark Supreme Court case involving undocumented students in K-12 (Lee, 2006). The state of Texas attempted to charge enrollment fees for every undocumented student attending a public school in their K-12 system (Gonzales et al., 2015). Previously, Wong Wing v. United States in 1896, detailed aliens are persons, and all persons are protected by the due process provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment via Yick Wo v. Hopkins in 1886 (Olivas, 2004). The Plyler case held the same logic, including the Equal Protection Clause, allowing undocumented students the right to K-12 education like any other student (Lee, 2006). In a 5-4 vote, Justice Brennan wrote in the majority opinion that denying undocumented students a free and public K-12 would lead to a lifetime of hardship for this population (Gonzales et al., 2015). Almost fifteen years later, the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996, allowed states to confer a residency status for post-secondary enrollment in higher education due to a clause in the law (Olivas, 2004).

The Plyler case provided universal protection for K-12, and the IIRIRA act gave states the right to classify non-residents to receive in-state tuition. The Supreme Court, however, has yet to review in-state tuition for undocumented college students. In addition, Congress has yet to pass the Dream Act, even though it has been introduced and re-introduced since 2001 (Schmid, 2013). This inaction led President Obama to issue an executive action (policy), not executive order (law), called Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA; U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2016). President Obama announced his plans for DACA on the thirtieth year anniversary of the Plyler decision: June 15, 2012. DACA has already approved 787,855 applicants as of September 2015.
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(U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2015b). Under DACA, undocumented immigrants must apply to qualify for a two-year temporary protective status against deportations, which allows for obtaining temporary social security numbers for legal work permits (Gonzales et al., 2015). DACA recipients may request advanced parole, which allows travel outside the United States for humanitarian, educational, or employment purposes (Immigrant Legal Resources Center, 2015). Undocumented college students with DACA advanced parole status could potentially study abroad and return to their US college. An expansion of DACA’s age and arrival restrictions along with a new policy for parents of undocumented children was argued in the US Supreme Court on April 18, 2016 (United States v. Texas, n.d.). To this date, the DACA expansion has not come to fruition.

Twenty states that have enacted Dream Act laws (Nienhusser et al., 2016). State Dream Act laws vary, but all allow states to redefine residency requirements to award undocumented students in-state tuition (Nienhusser et al., 2016). Maryland, the setting for this research study, is one of the twenty states to have enacted this policy. Originally known as SB167, the Maryland Dream Act was signed into law by Governor Martin O’Malley on May 10, 2011 (State of Maryland, 2011a). Opponents petitioned the law and forced a referendum, becoming the first state to pass in-state tuition for undocumented students by popular vote in November 2012 (Hesson, 2012). Prior to the Maryland Dream Act in 2012, then Republican Maryland Governor Ehrlich vetoed a similar law (Wagner, 2014). The Maryland Dream Act requires public colleges in the state to report the number of enrolled undocumented students to the General Assembly of Maryland (State of Maryland, 2011b). Table 1 shows the 2014-2015 enrollment of DREAMer’s in Maryland’s public two-year and four-year colleges (Hunter- Cevera, 2015). Another provision in the law states that undocumented students cannot count as in-state residents during the admissions process, although they will pay in-state tuition (State of Maryland, 2011b).
Table 1


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Public Two-Year Inst.</th>
<th>Public Four-Year Inst.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Students</td>
<td>Total Student Savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>$105,490.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>$777,753.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2014-15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$12,974.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$632,914.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>** $1,529,131.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This was provided as a public records request from the Maryland Higher Education Commission. ** signifies that totals cannot be stated due to possibly double-counting the same student in different semesters.

Finally, Maryland’s version of the Dream Act requires undocumented students to enroll first at a community college and then transfer to a public, four-year college after earning 60 credits or an associate’s degree (State of Maryland, 2011b). Other states, like California, allow incoming undocumented freshman to receive in-state tuition all four years at a public university (Students Informing Now Collective, 2007). These policies have been known to benefit states economically. Maryland has an estimated population of 60,000 undocumented immigrants under the age of 24 (The Migration Policy Institute, 2016). Maryland DREAMers are projected to gross an estimated $66 million each year since passing the Maryland Dream Act due to expected higher income, taxable income, and reducing the incarceration and public welfare rates (Gindling & Mandell, 2012). While this makes economic sense for states and the country, a federal Dream Act has yet to pass in Congress. The chronosystem explores the historical context on the present day environment for undocumented students.

Chronosystem

Bronfenbrenner (1994) states, “A chronosystem encompasses change or consistency over time not only in characteristics of the person but also of the environment in which that person lives”
Bronfenbrenner credits Elder’s (as cited in Bronfenbrenner, 1994) classic study, *Children of the Great Depression*, as an exemplary model of how the chronosystem can be analyzed. The study looked at two groups of children eight years apart who grew up during the 1930’s Great Depression. Elder found those who were adolescents displayed a greater desire to achieve and focused more on career goals than those who were younger during the Great Depression (Bronfenbrenner, 1994). This was attributed to adolescents witnessing and understanding their family’s economic deprivation and being forced to take new roles to keep the family afloat (Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

The chronosystem views major historical events as contributing factors to someone’s EST. One of the most significant events leading to an increase of undocumented students was the fourth wave of immigration to the United States (Muller et al., 1985). This wave included a high influx of Hispanic immigrants, predominately Mexicans, arriving to the United States in the late 70’s and early 80’s. Undocumented students’ parent’s decision to leave their native country and enter the United States for a better life instills resiliency throughout their lives as they comprehend the magnitude of their parents’ decision (Gonzales, 2011; Gonzales et al., 2013; Seif, 2010). Seif (2010) states:

Their parents have sacrificed to provide better opportunities for their offspring who are motivated to fulfill their end of the immigrant “bargain” by contributing to their families, neighborhoods, and ethnic communities. Cultural values such as *educación* also emphasize communal responsibility. Therefore, ethnic and immigrant identities are strong sources of resilience and civic engagement that should be fostered rather than suppressed (p. 14).

Conger and Chellman (2013) find that undocumented students are outperforming U.S. students in their first semester of college, earning higher GPA’s and college credit completion. Conger and Chellman state, “despite the barriers that the absence of documentation likely pose,
immigrant students without authorization are perhaps just as positively selected and resilient as those with documentation” (p. 12). One year after the MD Dream Act passed, Hispanics in Maryland increased their high school graduation rates by 2.5 percentage points in 2013 (State of Maryland, 2014). Maryland State Superintendent of Schools, Lillian M. Lowery, believes the MD Dream Act encouraged students to graduate high school and seek higher education options (Wiggins & St. George, 2014). College admission counselors must consider these experiences while recruiting undocumented students.

**College Admissions**

The MD Dream Act requires 12 public, four-year colleges (University System of Maryland, 2016) and 16 community colleges (Maryland Association of Community Colleges, 2013) to report the number of enrolled DREAMer’s at each institution (see Table 1). DACA recipients are eligible for in-state tuition at Maryland four-year public colleges as freshmen (University of Maryland, n.d.), while DREAMer’s without DACA status are not. DACA recipients can enroll at four-year colleges and pay in-state tuition all four years, while MD Dream Act students must first enroll at a community college for two years, and then transfer to a four-year public college to pay in-state tuition. All admissions staff in the state must understand this critical difference between DACA and Dream Act pathways to a bachelor’s degree.

Only 53% of college admissions offices knowingly admit undocumented students to their college (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, 2009). This indicates colleges are enrolling undocumented students nationally, but many are not actively recruiting or tracking them. There is no national standard on how to effectively communicate with or recruit this population. In addition, there is a dearth of academic literature analyzing the admissions practices of colleges residing in Dream Act states. One qualitative study specifically focused on admissions counselors’ perceptions of implementing Dream Act policies when working
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with undocumented students at their public college (Nienhusser, 2014). Similar studies have examined how admissions offices recruit minority students (Quarterman, 2008) and LGBT students (Cegler, 2012), of which the latter would be considered hidden identity students. These and other studies will be examined in chapter three as part of the intervention literature review.

Summary

This purpose of the literature review is to provide a foundational understanding of undocumented students’ educational experience in the United States. The lack of academic literature focusing on the relationship with undocumented students and college admission counselors combined with the current political climate relating to immigration efforts justifies this timely research. The next chapter will include the needs assessment results that further validated the need for this study.
Chapter II: Empirical Examination of Factors and Causes

There are 11-million undocumented immigrants in the United States (Passel & Cohn, 2015) and an estimated 65,000 graduating from high schools each year (Passel, 2003). Immigration is a highly debated topic within political and legal contexts, and education is no exception. With a tumultuous 2016 presidential election, which saw undocumented students at the forefront of the immigration issue, community colleges and universities must understand the needs of this population more than ever. Undocumented students live day-to-day in a precarious and vulnerable situation. Many experience depression and self-doubt (Gonzales et al., 2013) while others develop an understanding of how to maneuver illegally within the United States (Gonzales, 2011). Undocumented students rely on their social capital networks, primarily comprised of other undocumented students, family, and friends, for insights on how to maneuver within the United States (Garcia & Tierney, 2011). Because this population is becoming more prevalent within the high school-to-college pipeline, college admission counselors must improve their recruitment efforts in order to enter the social capital networks of this population. This chapter assesses college admission counselors’ experiences with undocumented students through a needs assessment to understand current recruitment efforts.

There is currently a dearth of literature that explores college admission counselors and their knowledge or recruitment practices of undocumented students. Few studies (Nienhusser, 2014; Nienhusser & Espino, 2016) interview higher education staff, some of whom work in admissions, to understand their interpretations of undocumented students and in-state tuition policies. Other studies interview undocumented students to understand their experiences and their interactions with higher education staff as grow up in the United States illegally (Gonzales, 2011; Nienhusser et al., 2016). This chapter reviews the purpose of the needs assessment, methods, limitations, and results. Nine admission counselors from a public, four-year university in the state of Maryland were
interviewed. Erickson’s (1986) qualitative methods was used to analyze the data to approach linking data to assertions. Implications and suggestions for the field of undocumented student recruitment are discussed.

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this study was to understand admissions counselors’ experience and to explain their current process, understanding of policies, and interactions with undocumented student recruitment at their home institution. This needs assessment was conducted by interviewing nine participants from a public, four-year university admissions office in the state of Maryland.

**Methodology**

Qualitative methods allow researchers to focus in depth on small, purposeful sampling to investigate a phenomenology (Patton, 1990). Qualitative inquiry does not require a specific sample size; rather, the purpose and rationale of the study along with time, are considered in exploring a phenomenon (Patton, 1990). This method captured college admission counselors lived experiences when exploring the process of recruitment of undocumented students. The following assertions are not intended to prove the phenomena researched; instead, its aim is to demonstrate the plausibility of the assertion (Erickson, 1986).

**Participants and Data Collection**

The participants for this needs assessment were from a public, four-year university in the state of Maryland. Network sampling, defined as using the researchers own professional network, established the recruitment of participants (Granovetter, 1976). Admission staff eligible for this study included those identified as having roles below Senior Associate Director level and their primary job description involved admissions’ recruitment (i.e. not IT or Marketing).

A total of 19 invitations (see Appendix A) were sent via email to eligible admission staff. There was a total response of 13 (68%) with nine agreeing to take part in the study and four
declining (see Table 2). Semi-structured interviews (see Appendix B) were conducted in person with the exception of one participant interviewed via phone. All interviews occurred in April 2016. The majority of the participants were females with under three years of professional higher education experience. The duration of interviews ranged from 15 to 45 minutes.

Table 2

Participants Demographics and Characteristics for Needs Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name*</th>
<th>Years in Higher Ed</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>3 to 5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryson</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>&gt; 5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>&lt; 3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *All names were changed to pseudonyms.

Data Analysis

All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed for coding purposes (Miles & Huberman, 1984). Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) suggest there are numerous ways to validate qualitative research, which makes it difficult to adopt a standard approach. Common forms of validating qualitative research are member checking, triangulation, and intercoder agreement (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). This analysis used triangulation and intercoder agreement to validate the qualitative data in each assertion. Originally, the researcher found an initial list of ten themes that emerged under four broad categories. The researcher’s faculty advisor conducted her qualitative data analysis with the same transcripts. After reviewing both sets of data analysis, the researcher and faculty advisor condensed all themes into three assertions for intercoder agreement.
after triangulating the data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Assertions are presented in the following section.

**Findings**

Assertions are key linkages found in patterns of generalization within the data analysis. Assertions are supported by subassertions, which are supported by field notes, interview comments, site documents, and recordings (Erickson, 1986). These three assertions will be discussed: *Ambiguous Status, Day-to-day Protocols Are Non-existent, and Lack of Strategic Recruitment.*

Participants are quoted with pseudonyms to protect confidentiality.

**Ambiguous Status**

During the course of the interviews, participants were asked to define certain terms that were directly related to undocumented students. Each participant was asked to define their understanding of the terms *DACA* and *DREAMers.* Participants’ responses indicated their inability to fully understand or confusion of one policy with the other. When asked about the term, DREAMers, Bryson stated, “I have heard it, but to define it; I don’t know that I am able to define it. The water is a little murky.” Angela stated, “I confuse it a lot with DACA. I never got training.” The lack of training is discussed in the third assertion. Finally, Mason stated, “The Dream Act is a pathway for in-state tuition.” A follow-up question was asked, “Do you know what the criteria is?” Mason answered, “I don’t.” The MD Dream Act provides in-state tuition (known as in-county tuition at community colleges) to undocumented students. This tuition status continues when the student transfers to a public, four-year college in the state to receive in-state tuition.

When asked about DACA, most respondents were not clear on defining the policy accurately. Stephanie confused DACA with Dream Act policies stating, “They have to qualify to be a DACA student. They must be in the state of Maryland for a certain amount of years. [If they are not,] they can qualify for the other policy.” Madison believed DACA was a program assisting
parents or students with financial aid. When asked who provides the financial assistance, Madison responded, “If I had to guess, it would be the financial aid office in a school or the government, like FAFSA.” The Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) is a federally funded U.S. Department of Education initiative providing aid to eligible students. Undocumented students are not eligible for FAFSA due to a lack of social security numbers.

Victoria mentioned DACA requires a GED. This confusion stems from the MD Dream Act policies requiring a GED or high school diploma. DACA allows participants to be enrolled in high school, hence, not requiring a GED. Jade was more familiar with DREAMers than DACA and said, “Not sure they have the same eligibility for in-state tuition as DREAMers.” This is inaccurate, because a DACA student has all four years of in-state tuition eligibility at a public, four-year college.

One final subassertion was confusion about what to label undocumented students or how they should label students on the college application. Madison recalled a story during a summertime presentation at a local high school. She was reviewing the application requirements when a student asked her what should be put as his residency status. Madison had never encountered an undocumented student before and was not sure how to answer. “I felt like I didn’t know what to say because as far as the application goes I’m used to people just putting U.S. citizen or permanent resident and continuing on. I didn’t know what to say,” Madison recalled.

Bryson asked, “What is their citizenship? That’s at the root of it.” Victoria recalls a time when an undocumented student had an expired visa. She was unsure if he should apply as an international student or undocumented student. She transferred him to International Student Services (ISS) for further assistance. Any student residing in the United States with an expired F1 visa, or lacking any other legal standing, is technically an undocumented immigrant/student (U.S.
Department of Homeland Security (2015a). In this situation, it can unnecessarily cause the student angst. If proper, day-to-day protocols were established, this could have been avoided.

**Day-to-day Protocols Are Non-existent**

All interviewees revealed no training was implemented or required by the admissions office for counselors working with this population. The MD Dream Act and DACA have existed since 2012. Bryson has been with the university for over five years and states his only training derives from his social capital networks. He adds, “Being here as long as I have been, meeting people and making connections has always proven to be very beneficial when I get stumped…I know there's somebody who knows a little bit more than I do.” Using their social capital networks, admissions staff parallel undocumented students’ efforts to gather information from others more knowledgeable about policies (Garcia & Tierney, 2011). Leo cites another example of social capital as informal training when he “explores” resources in assisting this population and “retains that experience in his mind” due to his lack of formal training. All participants agreed a formal training workshop would help, but Mason felt the lack of training did not affect the ability to do his job.

Another subassertion was counselors’ uncertainty on what to say when recruiting an undocumented student. Madison stated, “I don’t want to make anyone feel uncomfortable…can you say ‘undocumented? I don’t want to say anything that makes me sound insensitive.” These comments highlight undocumented students experiencing microaggressions from counselors during the application process (Nienhusser et al., 2016). When Jade was asked what she needs to know about undocumented students to help her in her role, she stated, “How to have conversations with undocumented students and make them feel comfortable with the admissions process.”

Singular experiences, meaning one on ones with undocumented students who shared their identity, was another subassertion. Because undocumented students have an unspoken, hidden identity, one cannot tell if they are undocumented by simply looking at them. Counselors discover a
student’s status when the student discloses. When participants were interviewed about their experiences with undocumented students, “I did not seek them out” or “I came across one” phrases were prevalent. Bryson discussed the importance of understanding how to work with this population on “coming out,” like LGBT students. Chance interactions in which an undocumented student “came out” occurred mainly in-person or via phone. Participants recalled these moments vividly. Andrea stated, “I actually can't remember any emails where an undocumented student actually came out and said that they were undocumented.” Andrea provided more insights by sharing, “Most of the conversations were by phone, and they were questions about how to fill out our application and how to actually state that they were undocumented.” All participants, except for Mason, stated they had interacted with undocumented students. Participants disclosed that they had interacted with as few as one and as many as 15 to 20 undocumented students during their tenure in admissions.

Singular experiences with undocumented students led counselors to state that they needed clearer steps on recruiting and advising this population. Jade stated, “Just having a clear set of steps would be helpful to walk them through and just being more familiar with the policies that they should know.” Dream Act policies require well-structured implementation plans, administrative commitment to training staff, and an abundance of information on schools’ websites (Nienhusser, 2014). Nienhusser believes strategic recruitment efforts for undocumented students are essential for institutions to consider. The final general assertion examines the lack of strategic recruitment efforts.

**Lack of Strategic Recruitment**

All participants stated they had never received formal training on recruiting or advising undocumented students. Further questioning explored to what extent a strategic plan could exist to recruit this population. Angela vented some frustration when asked why she believed no formal
training was introduced in the past. She stated, “They don't know the subject matter. Usually, when people do not know something, there is a fear attached to it. You have people who are afraid of knowing...they will not bother to empower themselves.” When asked who they were, Angela stated, “Management...They don’t understand how important this is because they don’t have direct experience with it.”

When counselors were asked if a strategic recruitment plan for undocumented students could exist, all agreed it could. Some provided suggestions on how to create one. Ironically, no participant had brought these ideas to senior leadership for possible implementation. Angela suggested creating videos and inviting in an undocumented student to share his/her story on how they navigated the college admissions process. She elaborated, “Create materials and test people on it because you can create trainings however you want, but if you don’t test the knowledge, how do you know [it’s effective]?” Stephanie and Jade suggested a lecture on the history of undocumented students and possible role-play scenarios to increase counselors’ effectiveness moving forward. Victoria said, “It’s an area people are not as familiar with, there are a lot of changes. It is important for us to understand how we can best help these students.” Victoria also states that “there are times students get passed around” and suggested “having a liaison in each department would definitely be helpful, especially in financial aid, resident life, [and the] bursar’s office.”

Leo and Stephanie discussed the growing population of undocumented students and the need to understand them better. Stephanie stated, “This has been a growing population.” Leo added, “This is a group who is becoming more prominent in the country and in the admissions process. We are only going to see more students who are applying to college under some of these different programs.” He suggested recruiting this population strategically by having admission counselors begin with high school counselors who know undocumented students on a more personal level. Andrea suggested working with high school counselors as well but added, “High schools can set up
a general information night on how to be classified as an in-state resident and touch on DACA and Dream Act students.” Usually, college admission counselors’ partner with local high schools on these types of events already, but boldly including this population in the presentation is not common practice. Jade suggested admissions offices apply for grants to serve this population as they have applied for and been granted funds to recruit other underserved populations. However, to strategically recruit this population, undocumented students must become a priority for all levels of senior leadership, beginning with the university president.

Limitations

While this needs assessment is one of a few studies that interview college admission staff about undocumented students, limitations exist. First, member checking was not conducted due to numerous staffing changes. Secondly, the researcher conducted interviews at one university in Maryland. These findings may not be generalizable to all admission counselors in the state and much less throughout the country. Third, this study interviewed participants from nine, public, four-year universities. Most of the undocumented students in Maryland are enrolled in two-year community colleges. Only interviewing four-year college admissions staff adds to the limitations on generalizability. Finally, the researcher knew the staff members because of network sampling. This could have caused bias in the responses, influenced some to participate, and others to decline (Salkind, 2010).

Discussion

Overall, undocumented students are perceived as a vulnerable population with unique characteristics requiring special attention. The results suggest admission counselors do not fully understand undocumented students’ backgrounds. A lack of prioritizing undocumented students training surfaced as a possible reason for the confusion among staff. Many staff members voiced concerns over the lack of strategic recruitment, but no one mentioned articulating these concerns to
senior leadership. This highlights how taboo it is for admissions counselors to bring up the topic of undocumented students during recruitment planning. Participants expressed the need for clearer steps when encountering an undocumented student. Admissions offices must consider the establishment of proper protocols for recruiting this population. This is an opportunity for admissions leaders to begin discussions on how to improve services for this population, starting with internal training.

Numerous admissions offices allow students to walk in and obtain advising services on how to apply to the university. If research shows that 59% of undocumented college students found out they were undocumented during the college application/financial aid process (Gonzales, 2011), counselors should be knowledgeable on how to handle these types of conversations. Many counselors expressed not knowing what words to use or what questions to ask undocumented students. Admission counselors must be equipped to understand their own privilege and reduce or prevent microaggressions toward undocumented students.

**Summary**

Few studies to date aim to understand how college admission counselors and undocumented students intersect in the real world. Colleges are expected to be safe havens for those who seek intellectual stimulation and personal growth. Many colleges have begun to publicly support undocumented students. Over 200 university presidents, including those at Harvard, Johns Hopkins, and Stanford, have signed a letter urging President Trump to keep DACA as a “moral imperative” and “national necessity” (Pomona College, 2016).

Results from these interviews suggest admission counselors want to do more and have thoughts on ways to include this population in the admissions process. The disconnect between having ideas and not bringing them to senior leadership needs further examination. Furthermore, exploration as to why university leadership has not taken the initiative to require a strategic
recruitment plan in increasing undocumented student enrollment is needed. Colleges, led by their president, must recruit undocumented students actively. It is no longer enough to say, “We welcome all students to our campus.”

Results from the needs assessment demonstrate admission counselors’ lack of training in this area. A professional development was created as an intervention to increase admission counselors’ knowledge, terminology, and awareness of undocumented students. The following chapter focuses on the development of the intervention rooted in various professional development literature.
Chapter III: Intervention Literature Review

Currently, there is no study measuring the effectiveness of implementation plans, training of staff, and the level of information on websites for colleges in Dream Act states (Nienhusser, 2014). This could be a result of admissions offices being secluded from the public and rarely opening their doors for outsiders to examine (Steinberg, 2003). The intervention focused on Nienhusser’s (2014) second suggestion to train staff. The focus of this chapter is to explore the intervention literature and provide a conceptual framework for the intervention.

As the needs assessment in chapter two suggests, admissions staff confuse which policies apply to DACA vs DREAMers, strategic recruitment plans do not exist, and day-to-day protocols have not been established for working with undocumented students (Hesse, 2017). Because all participants agreed a training could improve their recruitment of undocumented students, a professional development seminar was created. The conceptual framework links multicultural counseling competencies to professional development outcomes.

Training and Recruitment in College Admissions

Best practices in training and recruitment on populations encountering the same peril as undocumented students should be explored as no packaged training exists for this population. LGBT student recruitment is a comparable population due to the hidden identity experiences by LGBT and undocumented students (Shedlin, Decena, Mangadu, & Martinez, 2011). Similar populations are discussed, followed by current research on recruiting undocumented students.

LGBT Training Programs

Numerous programs exist throughout college campuses offering workshops on safe zone spaces for LGBT students, but they receive little empirical attention (Woodford, Kolb, Durocher-Radeka, & Javier, 2014). One ethnographic study found the LGBT safe zone trainings created a campus climate of increased visibility, increased support, changed image, and changed attitudes...
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toward LGBT students at a public research university in the mid-west (Evans, 2002). This is promising since LGBT and undocumented students have hidden identities that experience similar types of stigma (Shedlin et al., 2011).

Woodford et al. (2014) explains LGBT trainings cover four categories: 1) understanding LGBT concepts and developing awareness of bias, 2) understanding LGBT issues and recognizing discrimination and heterosexual privilege, 3) becoming support persons to LGBT individuals, and 4) becoming advocates to create LGBT-affirming campuses. The authors point out that setting realistic and measurable outcomes is key. The researchers caution, “Preparing individuals to become allies cannot realistically occur within a 4-hour training session” (Woodford et al., 2014, p. 320). This is an important expectation to set at the beginning of any workshop lasting half a day.

LGBT Recruitment Practices

Cegler (2012) concludes LGBT recruitment from college admission offices have two forms: passive or active. Examples of passive recruitment includes placing LGBT clubs on the college website or collecting data using LGBT campus climate surveys. Active recruitment occurs when colleges send representatives to LGBT college fairs or pair LGBT prospects with current LGBT students during college visits. Admissions offices can implement recruitment activities with undocumented students as well. Focusing on active recruitment is considered best practice (Cegler, 2012).

College admissions offices can partner with LGBT resource centers on campus to participate in active research and recruitment (Cegler, 2012; Einhaus, Viento, & Croteau, 2004). Fliers and mailings sent to local LGBT centers around campus led to positive outreach for LGBT prospects (Einhaus et al., 2004). The collaboration between the LGBT campus center and the admissions offices provides an opportunity for LGBT students to share stories and experiences
during recruitment events. College admission offices can create similar fliers for undocumented students to handout at high schools or community colleges to encourage DREAMers to apply.

Finally, colleges incorporate LGBT information on websites as recruitment tools (Mathis & Tremblay, 2010). Websites with highly integrated styles, meaning they are visibly advertising LGBT clubs and organizations on the college’s admissions webpage, are considered best practices when recruiting LGBT students (Mathis & Tremblay, 2010). Highly integrated methods show LGBT prospective students the school is welcoming and actively seeking them out to enroll in their institutions. Nienhusser’s (2014) suggests that colleges should have an abundance of information, like Dream Act policies or student clubs, for undocumented students on their websites.

**Recruitment Practices of Similar Populations**

Diversity committees are tasked with recruitment and retention of minority faculty at some institutions (Adams & Bargerhuff, 2005). Admission offices can create subgroups tasked with reviewing the recruitment and retention efforts of undocumented students. Leverett, Parker, & McDonald (2007) analyzed the implementation of a six-step marketing framework in recruiting African-American students to increase a public college’s ranking to number two in the country among enrolling and graduating African-American, business undergraduates. This university took an active approach in prioritizing this population in their recruitment efforts and the admissions office was tasked with achieving this goal.

These dialogues in admissions offices encourage the first step in creating awareness of underserved populations. A starting point to developing a recruitment plan can be surveying admissions staff to gather their own strategies and barriers to recruiting diverse students (Quartermann, 2008). While these studies provide examples of recruiting diverse populations, few studies examine what college admissions offices do to recruit undocumented students.
Recruitment Practices of Undocumented Students

While there is a dearth of literature focusing on undocumented student recruitment, some studies uncover crucial findings for admission counselors. One study found 59% of undocumented student college-goers discovered their hidden identity when applying to college/financial aid (Gonzales, 2011). With many undocumented college-goers learning this devastating news for the first time in their lives, college admissions staff must be prepared to counsel undocumented students on different pathways to earning a degree.

When college admissions staff mention in-state tuition in referencing their state Dream Act, there is a higher chance of recruiting that undocumented student to apply and enroll at that institution regardless if another public institution in the state offers the same, in-state tuition benefit (Perez, 2010). This is important to admissions leaders as they prioritize undocumented student enrollment at their college. Based on Perez’s findings, it is important to educate admission counselors on the details of their state Dream Act laws.

The training and recruitment literature on LGBT, other diverse populations, and undocumented students informs the development of a professional development seminar for working with undocumented students while being more culturally competent. The conceptual framework for the development of the training follows.

**Conceptual Framework Literature**

Given that no empirical studies exist on the impact of a professional development on admission counselors’ multicultural competency, professional development literature that involves teacher training will be used to provide the framework for a conceptual framework. While their day-to-day roles in education are different, both are subject to professional development to remain abreast of an array of educational practices and knowledge.
Guskey’s Evaluating Professional Development Framework

Guskey’s (2000) *evaluating professional development* framework provides a foundation on how to evaluate a new professional development seminar. Guskey’s framework is based on Kirkpatrick’s (1959) evaluation model, which had limited use in education because of inadequate explanatory power (Alliger & Janak, 1989; Holton, 1996). This framework has five levels of professional development evaluation, which focus on participants’ reactions, participants’ learning, organizational support and change, use of new knowledge and skills, and student learning outcomes. These are in a hierarchical design from simple to more complex. Guskey (2000) states each level builds on the success of the previous level. This means that level one, participants’ reactions, are extremely important for level two, participants’ learning.

**Participants’ reactions.** Participants’ reactions intend to capture what the participants thought of the experience in the professional development seminar. Guskey (2000) suggests handing out questionnaires at the end of each activity to evaluate what participants thought. The most feasible approach is a rating-scale and/or an open-ended questionnaire. This study used a Likert scale questionnaire at the end of each activity during the professional development seminar to collect the fidelity of implementation (Dusenbury, Brannigan, Falco, & Hansen, 2003).

**Participants learning.** Guskey (2000) states the model’s second level, participants’ learning, measures the knowledge, skills, and attitudes participants gained after the professional development. Each activity in a professional development must state goals clearly outlined prior to the start of the activity. Specific criteria and indicators of successful learning must be stated. Oral or written personal reflections, such as interviews, focus group, or field notes, can document learning. To measure if participants possess the requisite knowledge, a pre and post assessment captured baseline results and post professional development training results.
**Organization support and change.** The third level of the model is organizational support and change. This level relates to the culture of the organization in which the participants reenter after they complete their professional development. The level of support and change that the organization provides or cultivates determines the extent to how successful the implementation of the newly acquired knowledge will be. Sparks and Hirsh (1997) caution that gains made in level one and level two end in level three if the organization does not foster the proper support and change needed to implement the new knowledge. Guskey (2000) contends that it is essential to obtain an organization’s support in implementing a professional development prior to conducting one. This leads to level four of the model in which participants implement their newly acquired knowledge at their organization.

**Participants’ use of new knowledge and skills.** The fundamental question to answer in this level is to what extent does the professional development make a difference in the participant’s professional practice. Guskey (2000) explains implementation in practice is often gradual and does not have a set process. While this study only measured the short-term effects of the professional development, long-term effects on practice can be measured through participant reflections, structured interviews with the participants or their supervisors, or direct observation. These are medium to long-term outcomes and cannot be measured in the timeframe of this study. The highest level of impact for the professional development on the participants is measured with student learning outcomes.

**Student learning outcomes.** This final level of the framework measures the impact on students. Guskey (2000) states it is important to measure unintended outcomes. His example includes a group of elementary school teachers, who devoted their time to a professional development on new writing strategies to implement in their classrooms. They noticed the writing scores on assessments had increased with the group of students taking part in this intervention
versus the group of students that were not part of this intervention. Later, they realized the experimental group of students’ math scores had declined during the same period. This unintended outcome occurred, because the teachers devoted more time in implementing new writing strategies while decreasing instructional time in mathematics. Concerning admission counselors, focusing on undocumented students could have unintended outcomes like neglecting the recruitment efforts of other vulnerable populations like first-generation college students or LGBT students.

Guskey (2000) suggests numerous ways to measure students’ learning outcomes. Aside from the traditional student data like standardized test scores and grades, researchers can measure if changes occurred in students’ attitudes, disciplinary records, study habits, and an increase or decrease in after-school clubs’ participation. These can be measured through questionnaires, interviews, and reviewing student’s records over time. Again, this study did not collect this data due to time constraints.

**Summarizing Guskey’s Framework**

Guskey (2000) provides a framework for developing and evaluating a professional development seminar. While this framework focuses on teachers, it can be implemented with admission counselors. Each level provides examples of how to design, measure, and evaluate a newly created professional development program. While levels one through four of the framework can be implemented by the researcher and admission counselors solely, level five is more difficult data to gather because undocumented students are a difficult population to survey due to their hidden identity status (Ellard-Gray, Jeffrey, Choubak, & Crann, 2015). One possible method to measure level five would be to interview or survey enrolled undocumented students to gain their perspective on the admissions cycle. Guskey’s (2000) five levels of assessment in his framework will be complete if these actions are taken. Other frameworks, like the adult education framework, essential triangle for change framework, and components of a professional development evaluation
Andragogy, meaning how adults learn, will be defined prior to evaluating the other frameworks.

**Adult Education Framework**

Kutner, Sherman, Tibbetts, and Condelli (1997) provide guidance on adult education with two frameworks: essential triangle for change, and components of a professional development evaluation framework. Prior to reviewing each framework, a discussion on andragogy is warranted.

**Andragogy.** Adult learning was coined andragogy in the United States after Knowles (1986) brought the European concept into American academia. Knowles provides five assumptions of adult learners while defining andragogy: (a) self-concept and direct learning, (b) life experiences provide rich resources for learning, (c) learning needs relate to social role, (d) problem-centered and immediate application of knowledge, and (e) internally motivated to learn rather than externally. Throughout the history of adult learning, self-directed learning is the most prevalent (Merriam, 2001). Self-directed learning posits that adults learn every day, and do not depend on instructors or classrooms (Merriam, 2001).

Andragogy explores numerous theories, models, and concepts. However, it does not have one single model explaining how adults learn (Merriam, 2001). This is because adults, just like children, learn in a variety of ways. While we do not know one single best way to teach adults a new knowledge or skill, professional development is one method to deliver new knowledge or skills.

**Essential triangle for change.** Kutner et al. (1997) discuss how to provide professional development to instructors of adult learners through the creation of the essential triangle for change framework. The triangle has three components: an instructor, the adult student, and the adult’s education program. The instructor is managing the classroom or facilitating the session. The adult student is the actual student enrolled in the instructor’s class. Finally, the adult education program is
the topic that is being covered at the professional development. An example of this would be learning a new math teaching skill, or instructional practice on adults with special needs. All three of these components constitute a professional development for instructors teaching adult learners.

An example of an adult learner program could be a state or school sponsored certification program for adults seeking new job opportunities. The rationale for the selection of this framework is due to admission counselors being adult learners who will take part in a professional development seminar.

The essential triangle for change provides a foundation for the conceptual framework developed for this study. While the essential triangle framework provides components for the creation of a professional development seminar, Kutner et al. (1997) provides the evaluation framework to continuously measure and improve all three components within the essential triangle.

**Components of a professional development evaluation framework.** A professional development seeks to cause a reaction within participants to consider new skills and knowledge, and change their behavior after this new knowledge was obtained. When participants reenter their professional workplace, the expectation is for some of that knowledge obtained in the professional development to be used in practice. Kutner et al. (1997) state two critical assumptions of a successful professional development: change occurred in participants and participants changed because of the professional development. Evaluating the professional development is key to understanding how the activities in the professional development led to change in participants’ skills, behavior, or knowledge.

Kirkpatrick (1959) suggests four levels of evaluation: 1) reaction, 2) learning, 3) behavior, and 4) results. These levels build on one another with reactions leading to the acquisition of knowledge. Through this acquisition of knowledge, change in behavior is expected. This is comparable to the aforementioned frameworks of evaluation (Guskey, 2000; Kutner et al., 1997).
Similarly, Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, and Yoon (2001) find the most effective professional development for teachers includes a focus on content knowledge, active learning, and coherence with other learning activities. All of these studies point to similar findings in implementing professional development design and evaluation. Kaufman and Keller (1994) agree that Kirkpatrick’s framework is suitable for studies but recommend an expanded version to include the societal contribution as a fifth level. Societal contribution, while difficult to measure, are to be considered, because every organization is part of a larger system. Similar to Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) EST, what happens in the exo and macro levels has a societal impact on undocumented students’ micro and meso level. The conceptual framework for this intervention incorporates the essential triangle for change, components of a professional development framework, and potential societal contributions.

**Undocumented Student Professional Development Framework**

Miles and Huberman (1984) state a conceptual framework should explain the key factors or variables to be studied and their relationship to one another in a graphical or narrative form. Upon reviewing the literature on professional development design and evaluation, a conceptual framework for undocumented student competency training was developed as a professional development for college admission counselors (see Figure 3.1). The remainder of this chapter reviews the professional development seminar.

**Conceptual Framework for Undocumented Student Competency Training**

Nienhusser and Espino (2016) find that current higher education administrators lack formal learning opportunities on the topic of undocumented students. The researchers conclude the following, “Because the plight of undocumented/DACAmented students is a relatively recent phenomenon, no participant was exposed to any classroom-based instruction on the topic of undocumented/DACAmented students” (p. 8).
While education programs throughout the country have the opportunity to integrate undocumented students’ history and policies into their curriculums, there is no evidence it has occurred on a national scale. Therefore, the conceptual framework on undocumented student competencies addresses the lack of formal training by creating a professional development for college admission counselors.

Figure 3.1. Undocumented student competency training conceptual framework.

**Admission counselors.** The US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (2015) defines postsecondary education administrators as overseers of student services, academics, and faculty research at colleges. They include admissions staff in this working definition. For the purposes of this study, admission counselors are defined as those who travel to schools to meet with students and high school or community college counselors to discuss admissions to their university (Lautz, Hawkins, & Pérez, 2012). This intervention also includes community college counselors since the majority of undocumented students in the state of Maryland are enrolled in community
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colleges (Hunter- Cevera, 2015). All four-year and two-year college admissions staff are called
admission counselors for the purpose of this study.

**Recruitment of undocumented students.** As mentioned in chapter one, Bronfenbrenner’s
(1979) EST has different levels which impact the lives of undocumented students. When it comes
to the recruitment of undocumented students, numerous factors in all systems account for the
recruitment experience. Since admission counselors are part of the undocumented student’s
microsystem, interactions with each other occur in the mesosystem. For the purposes of this study,
recruitment of undocumented students is defined as having all staff trained to knowledgeably and
actively recruit undocumented students (Nienhusser, 2014).

**Undocumented students.** As mentioned in chapter one, under the synonymous terms for
undocumented students, these students are referred in various terms in American society. Dreamers,
meaning undocumented students enrolled or intending to enroll in higher education, are commonly
used in literature (Batalova & Mittelstadt, 2012). For the purposes of this study, undocumented
students are defined as the current population of students who reside in a state that provides in-state
tuition benefits for DACA or Dream Act eligible students at public, postsecondary colleges and
universities.

**Societal contribution.** Kaufman and Keller (1994) structure societal contribution as an
organization’s way to consider the consequences and payoffs of their actions. The researchers
suggest using societal contributions when evaluating improvements to organizations by asking,
“Did we make a positive societal contribution?” (p. 397). While this study does not measure the
societal contributions, this is an important issue to consider for long-term outcomes. The
professional development was created to increase admission counselors undocumented student
competencies, and in doing so, put them in a position to actively recruit more undocumented
students to enroll in college.
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Components of the Professional Development

The professional development had three activities selected by the researcher to improve undocumented student competencies among admission counselors. A review of each activity provides empirical evidence of its use in previous studies to establish the logic for selecting it for this study. The first activity was a didactic lecture, followed by role-playing and ending with guest speakers.

**Didactic lecture.** Abreu (2001) provides a list of didactic resources for training others on multicultural counseling and suggests pre and post surveys are most effective in capturing results of the didactic training. Other research suggests that while learning about multicultural differences is important, participants benefit more from the dialogue (Watt et al., 2009). Having a working knowledge on the history and current policies of undocumented students was the purpose of the didactic lecture. Admission counselors must remain abreast of ever-changing policies for undocumented students and have the ability to provide this information at college fairs or recruitment events. Policies such as the Maryland Dream Act or DACA should be clearly understood and differentiated. This is especially important since Perez (2010) found that simply sharing this information with undocumented students increases the likelihood they will apply and enroll in the admission counselor’s institution. Even more important now, DACA, which provides undocumented immigrants a legal, two-year working permit and is accepted at most public universities for in-state tuition, must be understood in the case it is repealed. While the didactic lecture was intended to solely cover the historical and current policies, the role-playing activity was intended to create discomfort or dissonance.

**Role-playing.** Role-playing requires the ability of participants to take the “perspective of another person” with the expectation that “if a person experiences enough discord or dissatisfaction with a behavior or attitude, the behavior or attitude will change” (McGregor, 1993, p. 217). This
concept evolved from Festinger’s (1957) dissonance theory. McGregor (1993) analyzed 13 studies showing a statistical significance in reducing student prejudice by implementing role-playing.

In this study participants role-played a conversation at a college fair between an admission counselor and an undocumented student. Based on findings that undocumented students’ experience microaggressions during the college application process (Nienhusser et al., 2016), role-playing is an important component of this professional development. Reducing microaggressions such as, “Oh, so you don’t have papers?” and “How did you get to this country?” are a part of the role-playing activity (Nienhusser et al., 2016, p. 20).

The role-playing activity encompassed Goldstein’s (1997) labeling exercise requiring participants to act as someone else while interacting with another participant in a conversation. Two participants volunteered to read a script (see Appendix C) in front of the group. The purpose was to create empathy at the end of the activity by demonstrating what undocumented students may experience when an admission counselor is not competent. A discussion with the group on microaggressions, empathy, and proper terminology concluded this activity.

**Guest speakers.** The final component of the professional development seminar was to bring in undocumented guest speakers to share their experiences with the counselors. Graduate level courses for counselors in education often have guest speakers of disadvantaged backgrounds to improve an understanding of this population in person rather than in textbooks (Bernstein & Behrend, 2001). Guest speakers bring their experiences into a classroom and can open a participant’s mind to various viewpoints (Payne, Sumter, & Sun, 2003). Research shows guest speakers alter student’s attitudes and perceptions in favorable ways, at least when surveyed for short-term outcomes (Guth, Hewitt-Gervais, Smith, & Fisher, 2000).

The guest speakers were two undocumented college graduates the researcher knows based on previous interactions. Both guest speakers were DACA recipients and participated via skype.
They were asked to share their personal experiences during the college application process, college, and post-college life as an undocumented immigrant in the United States. The admission counselors had opportunities to ask their own questions as well. The purpose was for counselors to understand their privileged position in society as a representative of the college.

**Evaluation of Multicultural Competencies**

A review of multicultural counseling provides background on the emergence of this competence. Examples on how to define multicultural variables, such as knowledge, awareness, and terminology, complete the discussion on multicultural competencies. Chapter four provides a detailed description of how the Multicultural Counseling Competence and Training Survey, Revised (MCCTS-R; Holcomb-MeCoy & Day-Vines, 2004) was implemented in the intervention under the methods section.

**Multicultural Competence.** The need for cross cultural training and competence is critical in the multiracial, multicultural, and multilingual society we live in (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). Sue et al. (1982) defined cross-cultural counseling as, “any counseling relationship in which two or more of the participants differ with respect to cultural background, values, and lifestyle” (p. 47). The amount of similarity and difference in background, values, and lifestyle would be “key determinants in discussing cross-cultural counseling” (Sue et al., 1982, p. 47). Finally, Sue et al. warns that the differences between the counselor and client may lead to a lack of understanding, empathy, and inability to utilize culturally relevant counseling modes. Admission counselors must understand undocumented student backgrounds in order to understand and empathize.

The work of Sue et al. led the American Psychological Association to mandate multicultural training for accreditation purposes in 1986 (Chao, Wei, Good, & Flores, 2011). Sue et al. found that cross-cultural counseling entails three characteristics: beliefs/attitudes, knowledge’s, and skills. The three characteristics have 11 competencies. In 1991, the Association of Multicultural Counseling
and Development (AMCD) tasked the Professional Standards Committee to revisit the competencies produced by Sue et al. in 1982, which led to 31 multicultural counseling competencies (Arredondo & Perez, 2006). The American Counseling Association (ACA) endorsed the 31 competencies in 2002 (Arredondo & Perez, 2006) although there was 34 competencies added to multicultural counseling by 1998 (Sue et al., 1998). Numerous instruments have been developed to measure multicultural competence. A review of these instruments and a discussion of the reason for selecting the MCCTS-R follows.

**Instruments to Measure Multicultural Competence.** Early literature focused consistently on counselor’s awareness of their own culture and bias, knowledge of others culture and worldviews, and skills to interject culturally appropriate intervention strategies (Sue et al., 1992). This led to the development of numerous instruments to measure counselor competencies in multiculturalism (Ponterotto, Rieger, Barrett, & Sparks, 1994). Instruments developed in the early 90’s included the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (CCCI-R; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991), Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale-Form B: Revised Self-Assessment (MCAS:B; Ponterotto, Sanchez, & Magids, 1991), Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI; Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994), and Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-and-Skills Survey (MAKSS; D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991).

Holcomb-McCoy and Myers (1999) developed the Multicultural Counseling Competence and Training Survey (MCCTS) to measure knowledge, awareness, definition of terms, racial identity, and skills of counselors who were members of ACA. After receiving 151 responses, results suggest counselors who completed a multicultural course increased their perception of multicultural knowledge and racial identity competence significantly (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999). Ethnic minority group members have higher self-perceived multicultural competence than their White counterparts (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999).
The MCCTS was originally developed, because the aforementioned instruments did not measure for the multicultural competencies established by the AMCD (Holcomb-McCoy & Day-Vines, 2004). Holcomb-McCoy revised her MCCTS in 2001 to assess the perceived multicultural competence of school counselors. The revisions included changing terms clients to students to reflect school counseling and consulted with three ethnically diverse and experienced school counselors on the content and format of the survey (Holcomb-McCoy & Day-Vines, 2004).

Using the revised MCCTS, Holcomb-McCoy and Day-Vines (2004) surveyed 209 school counselors and found three factors that emerged: multicultural terminology, multicultural knowledge, and multicultural awareness. These three factors in MCCTS-R differ from the original five factors established in the original version of MCCTS. Holcomb-McCoy and Day-Vines (2004) suggest using the MCCTS-R over the MCCTS (and other instruments) to measure a counselor’s perceived multicultural knowledge, multicultural awareness, and multicultural terminology based on higher statistical validity and reliability over other instruments.

**Defining multicultural terminology, knowledge, and awareness.** The MCCTS-R measures multicultural terminology, knowledge, and awareness based on Holcomb-McCoy and Day-Vines (2004) definitions of each item on the instrument. **Multicultural terminology** is a counselor’s ability to define and understand concepts related to race and culture (Johnson, 1990). The statement, “I can define discrimination,” measures this competence. **Multicultural knowledge** reflects the counselor’s knowledge of other various cultural groups, which is imperative to counselors working with diverse clients (Mio & Morris, 1990). An example of this is, “I can list at least three barriers that prevent ethnic minority students from using counseling services.” **Multicultural awareness** is the counselor’s self-awareness of his/her own cultural background. Parker and McDavis (1979) suggests this “help[s] counselors and other professionals become more aware of their and others’
attitudes and views toward ethnic minorities” (p. 316). A sample question on the survey states, “I am able to discuss how my culture has influenced the way I think.”

A counselor’s knowledge and awareness of undocumented students’ backgrounds and lifestyles is important. College admission counselors could cause unintended harm by a lack of awareness, for example assuming everyone has a social security number or asking, “How do you plan on applying?” (Nienhusser et al., 2016). This lack of awareness could be detrimental to establish a relationship with an undocumented student. Most undocumented students come from low social-economic status, and very few have college-educated parents (Passel & Cohn, 2009). Counselors must be knowledgeable of the policies in place for undocumented students, especially if counselors intend to be a part of undocumented students’ social capital networks (Garcia & Tierney, 2011). Furthermore, if admission counselors do not understand the proper terminology for defining an undocumented student, whether DACA or DREAMer, then this could lead to confusion or misinformation.

While the professional development intended to increase multicultural competencies among college admission counselors, medium and long-term goals would be to increase undocumented student enrollment. When considering how the recruitment of undocumented students can be measured, this may require follow-up interviews. The needs assessment highlighted a lack of understanding DACA versus Dream Act policies, no active recruitment of undocumented students, and day-to-day protocols are non-existent for recruiting and advising undocumented students. While follow up interviews can occur with admissions staff, undocumented students could be interviewed to share their counseling experiences with those admissions staff who completed the professional development.
Evaluating Undocumented Students Perspectives and Societal Impact

This study did not measure directly what undocumented students experience. In other words, interviewing undocumented students after they interact with college admission counselors who completed the professional development did not occur. This study measures admission counselors’ self-perception of their own multicultural counseling competencies before and after the professional development only. While follow-up interviews can take place with counselors after the professional development, any improvements or changes on recruiting undocumented students is solely the perception of that counselor. There are opportunities, however, to measure undocumented student’s experience in future studies. This is an important component to consider since the long-term purpose of the professional development is to have a societal impact on undocumented students.

Societal impact. While societal contributions are increasingly considered in evaluations, various definitions and limited peer reviewed assessments make it difficult to measure (Bornmann, 2012). Most studies attempt to measure an economic impact to assess the societal impact (Bornmann, 2013). Other studies measure the societal impact without any regard to economic impact. Kaufman and Keller (1994) provide an example of this by measuring how manufacturing organizations consider air pollution when conducting evaluations.

While measuring societal contributions remain a difficult and often debated topic, this study only examined admissions counselors multicultural competencies relating to undocumented students. This study did not measure the long-term contributions to the university, state, and society. Most universities adhere to mission statements incorporating the recruitment and retention of a diverse student, faculty, and staff. One method of measuring long-term societal impact of this professional development is to interview admissions and university senior staff months after this professional development. Another set of interviews can occur with undocumented students.
enrolled or considering applying to college. If undocumented students overwhelmingly support the college’s initiative to train their staff as a sign of becoming better recruiters, this can become an assessment in measuring the societal impact (Kaufman & Keller, 1994). The development of this assessment is further discussed in chapter five’s recommendations on future research.

Finally, economic impact is an important factor in measuring societal impact. As mentioned in chapter one, Maryland has an estimated population of 60,000 undocumented immigrants under the age of 24 (The Migration Policy Institute, 2016). Maryland DREAMers are projected to gross an estimated $66 million each year since passing the MD Dream Act (Gindling & Mandell, 2012). Admissions offices do not bear the sole responsibility of ensuring undocumented students enroll in colleges throughout the state. Numerous individuals mentioned in the microsystem have an impact on whether one of the thousands of undocumented, high-school graduates enroll in college. While this is known, it behooves the college/universities to capture current application and enrollment numbers of undocumented students before any intervention or professional development training. The comparison of these numbers to next year’s application and enrollment data can provide an observed societal impact. The more undocumented students the state of Maryland graduates, the greater economic gains it reaps. If Maryland does not prioritize the post-secondary education of this population, it will lose millions of dollars and not increase the college educated per capita in the state.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter is to provide literature that supports the creation of the professional development intervention and evaluation methods. The MCCTS-R was used as an instrument to assess the intervention based on empirical data. The next chapter details the specifics of the interventions procedures and methodology.
Chapter IV: Intervention Procedure and Program Evaluation Methodology

This chapter outlines the methodology and program evaluation for this study. This includes the research questions, research design, instruments, and procedures. This chapter details the components of the intervention by providing the variables measured, as well as, participant and methods details.

DREAMzone trainings, which are intended to promote self-efficacy and undocumented student ally competencies, have been conducted on numerous college campuses in recent years (Cadenas et al., 2016). The structure of DREAMzone trainings are very similar to the type of professional development intervention used in this study. The two distinguishing factors between this study and DREAMzone trainings are as follows: this study was solely intended for college admission counselors, and outcomes are based on multicultural knowledge, awareness, and terminology, not the relationship to self-efficacy and undocumented student ally competence. While these two differences exist, DREAMzone trainings cover similar material and concepts as the current study.

Research Question and Fidelity of Implementation

This intervention was developed based on the needs assessment results indicating admission counselors lacked essential competencies needed to recruit undocumented students. All counselors reported that they have not received training, would like to be trained, and were still confused on various policies on undocumented students (Hesse, 2017). Therefore, the research question for this study is: to what extent does a professional development seminar impact admission counselors’ multicultural awareness, knowledge, and terminology of undocumented students?

Research Design

The research design for this study is a mixed methods approach using qualitative and quantitative data. Mixed methods research is, “the type of research in which a researcher or team of
researchers combines elements of quantitative and qualitative research approaches for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration” (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007, p. 123). Griffin and Museus (2011) recommend using a mixed methods approach in higher education studies to balance the weakness of one methodology with the strengths of another. The research design is a concurrent triangulation design (see Figure 4.1) using qualitative and quantitative data to interpret the results (Hanson, Creswell, Clark, Petska, & Creswell, 2005).

Figure 4.1. Concurrent triangulation design for mixed methods approach.

The logic model (see Figure 4.2) for this study provides the inputs, outputs, outcomes, assumptions, and external factors. Each item is explained in the process evaluation and outcome evaluation sections. The purpose of the logic model is to provide a visual representation of the
study.

**Figure 4.2.** Logic model.

**Process Evaluation**

The process evaluation occurs in the inputs and outputs sections of the logic model. It is important to note that the logic model includes external factors and assumptions. Each section is discussed further.

**Assumptions.** The assumptions section of the logic model includes the researcher’s assumptions for the current intervention. These assumptions include: 1) admissions staff not being trained on reducing microaggressions, 2) lacking a working knowledge on undocumented student policies for in-state tuition, 3) not actively recruiting undocumented students, and 4) their limited
partnerships between community college admissions staff, four-year university admissions staff, and high school counseling offices.

The needs assessment concluded that the admissions staff lack a working knowledge of undocumented student policies, and they do not actively recruit undocumented students. While all participants in the needs assessment stated they have not received training on working with undocumented students, it is not clear if this lack of training leads to microaggressions. Finally, there is no evidence that participants for this study have collaborated with other higher education admissions staff or high school counselors for the sole purpose of addressing undocumented student concerns.

**External factors.** The researcher concluded that the external factors were admissions directors not prioritizing this type of training, DACA being repealed, and admission counselors lacking the time to participate in a professional development due to other responsibilities. Ideally, if admissions leadership prioritized this type of training, it could potentially create a supportive environment from key stakeholders. Stakeholders are identified as “individuals, groups, or organizations that have a significant interest in how well a program functions” (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004 p. 18).

**Inputs.** The inputs section of the logic model includes the essentials needed for the study to take place. These are time, participants, the professional development curriculum, and approval for the study. This study was conducted in November 2017 and the recruitment of participants was conducted in October. Unfortunately, the timing of the study and the lack of participants became a limitation.

**Outputs.** The outputs section has activities and participation. The participation section details that the ideal candidates for this study are college admission counselors. This is due to their agreement in the needs assessment that formal training on undocumented students is needed. While
the needs assessment study in chapter two interviews four-year college admission counselors at one public university in Maryland, the intervention invited multiple admissions staff from two and four-year colleges. A detailed eligibility list of participants and how they were recruited is further discussed in the methods section of this chapter. The activities’ section has multiple components. First, the quantitative and qualitative data gathering piece was key to measuring the short-term outcomes of the study. This is explained in further detail under the procedures section in this chapter. This is followed by the three activities with the intervention that included role-playing, didactic lecture, and guest speakers. While each of these activities were reviewed in chapter three, this chapter provides details about how each activity was implemented with fidelity. This chapter will also review the procedures used to measure fidelity.

Outcome Evaluation

The outcome evaluation has short, medium, and long-term outcomes in the logic model. In order to begin identifying the outcomes, a theory of treatment is required. A theory of treatment involves defining the problem as the first step to identifying treatment (Leviton & Lipsey, 2007). The needs assessment found that counselors would like to improve their undocumented student competencies. Therefore, the activities were developed based on previously established professional development trainings. As stated in the theory of treatment, minimal and maximal effects should have expected timelines after an intervention has taken place (Leviton & Lipsey, 2007). The timelines are the logic model’s short, medium, and long-term outcomes. Given this intervention was part of a dissertation study, the only measurable outcomes were short-term at this time.

The short-term outcomes are connected to the activities of the professional development. These short-term outcomes include counselors learning skills to reduce microaggressions, growing awareness of privilege to build empathy, and increases in knowledge and terminology of Dream
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Act and DACA policies. The medium-term outcomes would encompass building partnerships with university, community college, and high school staff on behalf of undocumented students, and establishing a subgroup within admissions focusing on undocumented student recruitment. The long-term goal is to change the culture of the college/university to embrace undocumented students and proactively recruit and monitor this population each year, like other populations including military or first-generation students. The following section details the specifics of the study from participants and data collection to data analysis.

Methods

The logic model provides a visual description of the study and its components. The following section details how those components were implemented and measured. This section begins with the participants for this study by detailing participant eligibility and recruitment.

Participants

Like the needs assessment, a letter of information for this study was sent via email to college admission counselors (see Appendix D). This recruitment effort targeted public colleges in the state of Maryland. Two private college’s admissions office staff were invited to participate based on those college’s public support for undocumented students. Participants and their institutions remain anonymous to protect their identity. Berger, Begun, and Otto-Salaj (2009) state cost-effective strategies for recruiting participants is ideal for intervention studies. Therefore, the recruitment strategy consisted of searching the directory of the two-year and four-year colleges with keywords like “admissions,” “enrollment,” or “counselor.” A spreadsheet was kept with the following information: first name, last name, email, phone number, title, and school name. This ensured a cost-effective strategy while still recruiting participants for the study.

Participants must interact with students as a primary job role in order to have been eligible for this study. This excluded marketing, information technology, or other departments that work
within the admissions office. There were no title exclusions (i.e., Director, Associate Director, etc.). This served two purposes: to increase the number of potential participants by not excluding participants based on title, and to raise awareness of undocumented student training to all levels of admissions offices.

**Measures and Instruments**

Since this study was a concurrent triangulation mixed methods design, qualitative and quantitative measures and instruments were used to collect data and interpret findings (see Figure 4.3). The qualitative data was measured by conducting focus groups while the quantitative data was measured with the MCCTS-R (Holcomb-McCoy & Day-Vines, 2004). The fidelity of implementation was measured using a Likert (1931) scale survey developed by the researcher. These measures and instruments are discussed in the procedures section of this chapter under data collection and data analysis.

![Figure 4.3](image)

*Figure 4.3. Mixed methods design for study. Left, concurrent triangulation research design with measures and instruments for research question. Right, fidelity of implementation design.*
Procedures

This section discusses the intervention implementation, data collection, and data analysis. A detailed description of the intervention includes the fidelity of implementation (Dusenbury et al., 2003), the timeline for the study, and the proximal outcomes measured.

Fidelity of implementation. The fidelity of implementation refers to “the degree to which teachers and other program providers implement programs as intended by the program developers” (Dusenbury et al., 2003, p. 240). Dusenbury et al. (2003) discusses the importance of fidelity of implementation by highlighting patterns and errors in previous studies. An example is a Type III error, which occurs when the intervention is not implemented as planned and the methodological or conceptual framework is blamed for the failure (Dusenbury et al., 2003). To avoid this type of error, interventions must have a sound implementation plan from the researcher. Berman and McLaughlin (1976) discuss a RAND corporation report which found three patterns of implementation: a) cooptation or adapting the intervention without organizational change in behavior, b) mutual adaptation or both the intervention and organization intended to change behavior together, and c) non-implementation and non-adaptation or neither happened. The mutual adaptation, or option b, was found to be the most effective.

McGrew, Bond, Dietzen, and Salyers (1994) argue assessing fidelity of implementation requires identifying important elements of previously conducted programs. After reviewing the literature, there is no research study implementing specific activities in a professional development seminar on undocumented students. DREAMzone trainings are the most similar, but details of how and what material is covered is minimal. Therefore, each activity within the intervention was selected from previously conducted programs reviewed in chapter three.

Dusenbury et al. (2003) provides five ways to measure fidelity of implementation: adherence, dose, quality of program, participant responsiveness, and program differentiation.
Because this study is a non-replicated study, an example is discussed for each of the five measures. The fidelity of implementation was measured using quantitative data based on Likert scale survey responses.

Adherence. Adherence focuses on the critical elements of effective programs that achieved their objective (Dusenbury et al., 2003). This is measured by asking participants if the objectives of each session were met using a Likert scale (McGrew et al., 1994). To measure adherence, a four-point, Likert scale was used at the end of each activity (see Appendix E). It is suggested to use a four-point, Likert scale instead of a five-point scale to avoid a participant’s tendency to select the middle choice, forcing a positive or negative response (Kutner et al., 1997). A score of three or four indicates high fidelity, while a score of one or two indicates low fidelity. Therefore, the question on the Likert scale developed for this study asked participants, “How consistent was the objective with the actual activity?”

Dose. Dose is defined as “the amount of program content received by participants” (Dusenbury et al., 2003, p. 241). For example, how much content participants absorbed in the duration of the professional development. While this was only a four-hour professional development and each activity lasts approximately 45 minutes, the dose was measured by asking participants to rate the material covered during the allotted time.

Quality of program. Hansen, Graham, Wolkenstein, and Rohrbach (1991) assess a quality of delivery by the facilitator. Dusenbury et al. (2003) considers ratings of provider effectiveness to measure the quality of the program. This objective, however, was not asked on the survey to avoid social desirability (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Participants may have felt compelled to answer in a positive manner since the researcher was also the facilitator of the professional development. This is further discussed in the limitations section of chapter five.
Participant responsiveness. Participant responsiveness is, “ratings of the extent to which participants are engaged by and involved in the activities and content of the program” (Dusenbury et al., 2003, p. 244). Hawkins, Abbott, Catalano, and Gilmore (1991) measure participant responsiveness by assessing how aware participants are of the intervention’s components. For this fidelity measure, the Likert scale developed asked participants to rate if “the activity kept me engaged and involved.”

Program differentiation. Program differentiation is “identifying unique features of different components or programs so that these components or programs can be reliably differentiated from one another” (Dusenbury et al., 2003, p. 244). The crux of program differentiation is analyzing which components within an intervention are the most effective in creating change. Since the intervention has three different activities, the final Likert scale question at the end of each activity was, “This activity has made me a better admission counselor for undocumented students.”

Data collection for intervention. The intervention was conducted as a professional development lasting approximately four hours. This section reviews how the data was collected during the intervention. First, it is important to distinguish the different components that are measured in this intervention. The concurrent triangulation design was implemented to review the study, but there are two distinct outcomes to be measured.

The first proximal outcome measured was to answer the research question. The research question of this study is, “To what extent does a professional development seminar impact admission counselors’ multicultural awareness, knowledge, and terminology of undocumented students?” Therefore, the variables that were measured were the subscales on the MCCTS-R (awareness, knowledge and terminology). The data analysis section details how the results of the MCCTS-R were measured.
The MCCTS-R was modified for the purposes of this study (see Appendix F). The participants completed this instrument twice, once before the intervention and once as a post survey after the intervention took place. At the beginning of the professional development, the very first task was to complete the MCCTS-R. The MCCTS-R was dispersed to participants electronically, using Qualtrics software. Along with the MCCTS-R, each participant completed a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix G) already embedded in the survey. The MCCTS-R was then administered one more time at the very end of the professional development for post survey results. The post survey results were saved in Qualtrics. The researcher then exported the data into an excel file and imported it into a statistical software program for quantitative analysis. All findings are discussed in chapter five.

The data collection for the fidelity of implementation occurred immediately after each activity (i.e., didactic lecture, role playing, and guest speakers). The participants completed the fidelity of implementation survey in Qualtrics as well. The participants were instructed to read the survey and select the response that best fits their perception of each element (Dusenbury et al., 2003). There were no pre and post survey results for the fidelity of implementation, therefore, demographic or participant data (i.e., name or unique characteristics) were not needed.

Immediately following the Likert scale survey collection, all participants completed focus groups at the end of each activity. Focus groups provide participants the opportunity to qualitatively share viewpoints, and share the rationale for the viewpoints (Krueger, 1991). The focus groups were conducted using semi-structured interview questions that lasted for approximately 15 to 20 minutes after each activity (see Appendix H). One final focus group was conducted at the end of the professional development seminar after the post MCCTS-R survey was completed. The purpose of the final focus group was to get insights from the participants about the overall experience of the
professional development (see Appendix I). The following section includes the data analysis of the MCCTS-R, Likert scale survey, and focus groups.

**Data analysis.** The data analysis requires qualitative and quantitative methods to obtain findings for the MCCTS-R, Likert scale survey, and focus group responses. The research question and fidelity of implementation followed the data collection and data analysis processes to achieve the study’s findings (see Figure 4.4).

**Figure 4.4.** Procedures for intervention data collection.

Based on Holcomb-McCoy and Day-Vines (2004) study of 209 high school counselors, the mean and standard deviation for each subscale was: multicultural terminology (M = 3.40, SD = .61), multicultural knowledge (M = 2.45, SD = .81), and multicultural awareness (M = 3.36, SD = .61).

Holcomb-McCoy and Day-Vines (2004) provide the following survey questions to associate with each subscale as well: terminology (9, 10, 11, 12), knowledge (8, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32), and awareness (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 14, 15). It is important to note
that questions 4, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, and 32 use the term *undocumented students* to replace broader terms like *students of different backgrounds*.

The MCCTS-R pre and post results were exported out of Qualtrics in an excel sheet, and then entered in a statistical software program to conduct a t-test. The t-test determined if statistically significant differences occurred with the pre and post MCCTS-R overall and the MCCTS-R subscales (Dalgaard, 2008).

The next data analysis was the qualitative analysis for the focus groups. Qualitative methods allow researchers to focus in depth on small, purposeful sampling to investigate a phenomenology (Patton, 1990). Qualitative inquiry does not require a specific sample size and a focus group can be used to explore the phenomenon (Patton, 1990). The focus groups were audio recorded for coding purposes (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011). The focus groups recordings were analyzed using Erickson’s (1986) methods to develop assertions. Assertions are key linkages the researcher finds in patterns of generalization within the data analysis (Erickson, 1986). They are supported by subassertions, which are supported by field notes, comments, and recordings (Erickson, 1986). Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) suggest there are numerous ways to validate qualitative research. Common forms of validating qualitative research are member checking, triangulation, and intercoder agreement (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

The fidelity of implementation seeks to measure if the intervention was implemented the way that the developer intended it to (Dusenbury et al., 2003). Since the researcher was the facilitator for each activity, the fidelity of implementation results rely on participant’s perceptions of the objectives for each element. The fidelity of implementation has five elements to measure: a) adherence, b) dose, c) quality of program, d) participant responsiveness, and e) program differentiation. As previously stated, all elements, except quality of program, was measured in the form of a question using the Likert scale survey developed by the researcher.
All four questions use the same one through four Likert scale with one and two indicating low fidelity and three and four indicating high fidelity. The responses are as follows: one equals did not meet expectations, two equals below expectations, three equals meet expectations, and four equals exceeded expectations. This was intentionally created to force a response that favors a positive or negative viewpoint (Kutner et al., 1997). All sections were calculated to provide an overall fidelity of implementation mean. While true fidelity cannot be measured solely on a Likert scale (Dusenbury et al., 2003), Kutner et al.’s (1997) recommends not having a neutral option for measuring whether fidelity was met. An overall mean of 3.00 or higher, or positive response, determines if fidelity was met for this study.

**Summary**

This chapter reviewed the intervention procedures and program evaluation. The logic model provides a visual representation of the intervention with short, medium, and long-term outcomes. Due to the constraints in time and resources, the intervention was measured with only short-term outcomes. The research question and fidelity of implementation were defined and measurable variables for each component were described. The intent was to measure to what extent the counselor’s multicultural knowledge, awareness, and terminology changed, if at all, after the professional development. The fidelity of implementation measured to what extent the intervention was implemented with fidelity. This study measured four variables of fidelity: adherence, dose, participant responsiveness, and program differentiation. Each variable was defined and a Likert scale survey was created based on previous research.

This intervention conceptualized many components of different studies into one. The DREAMzone trainings are the most closely associated professional development programs for educators interested in learning more about undocumented students. This intervention aims to fill a void in the literature regarding admission counselors and undocumented student training. Chapter
five provides an overview of the findings and limitations. Along with a robust discussion on implications for practice and research, chapter five concludes this dissertation.
Chapter V: Findings and Discussion

This chapter details the methodology, participants, procedures, and findings to provide an in-depth analysis of the outcomes. Limitations will also be discussed. A discussion of the results will answer the research question. The fidelity of implementation will also be reviewed. This chapter will conclude with implications on practice and recommendations on future research in the field of undocumented student recruitment.

Methodology

The intervention was completed on November 10, 2017 as a professional development seminar at the Johns Hopkins University campus in Baltimore, Maryland. The following sections will provide detailed steps on how this study was completed. The research design for this study was a mixed methods approach using qualitative and quantitative data analysis. Mixed methods research is defined as, “the type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combines elements of quantitative and qualitative research approaches for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration” (Johnson et al., 2007, p. 123).

This study addressed the research question: “to what extent does a professional development seminar impact admission counselors’ multicultural awareness, knowledge, and terminology of undocumented students?” The research question will be addressed by reviewing qualitative data in the form of focus group responses, and quantitative data in the form of comparing pre and post survey responses from the MCCTS-R. Qualitative data was analyzed with coding and assertion methods (Erickson, 1986), while quantitative data was analyzed with frequencies and t-test. Additionally, the fidelity of implementation was reviewed to determine which activities within the professional development had the highest and lowest means and if all achieved a mean of 3.00 or greater (Dusenbury et al., 2003; Kutner et al., 1997).
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Participants

The focus of this study was to target admissions staff at public two-year and four-year colleges in the state of Maryland. Due to the public support of undocumented students from two private universities in the state, staff from their admissions offices were invited as well to participate in this study. There were also participants from two-year colleges that were recruited who serve dual roles on their campus such as faculty and advisor/counselor. Overall, the recruitment email was sent to 228 admissions staff at 18 different institutions throughout the state of Maryland. Participants were allowed three weeks to respond via email or phone. The final response rates were 16 (7%) confirmed, 12 (5%) declined, and 200 (88%) did not reply.

Participants’ demographic information (see Table 3) included 15 (94%) females and 1 (6%) male, 8 (50%) White, 3 (19%) Latino/a, 3 (19%) Black or African American, 1 (6%) Asian, and 1 (6%) Other. As for the type of institutions in which they were employed, 7 (44%) were at two-year public colleges, 7 (44%) were at four-year public colleges, and 2 (12%) were at four-year private colleges. Finally, the years of experience in higher education were to 11 (69%) had five or more years, 2 (12.5%) had 3 – 5 years, 2 (12.5%) had 1 – 3 years, and 1 (6%) had less than one year, respectively. Therefore, the majority of participants were female, White, had more than five years of higher education experience, and worked at either a public four-year college or public two-year college.

Table 3

Participants Demographics and Characteristics for Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years in Higher Education</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>4 year private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>2 year public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>2 year public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>4 year public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>4 year public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>2 year public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of Education</th>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>2 year public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>4 year public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3 – 5 years</td>
<td>4 year public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>4 year public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>2 year public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>2 year public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>4 year public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>4 year private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3 – 5 years</td>
<td>4 year public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>More than 5 years</td>
<td>2 year public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Participant’s names and their institutions are confidential and anonymous.

**Data Collection**

Participants arrived to the host site the day of the intervention and checked in with the researcher. The intervention took place inside of a modern Socratic classroom setting and lasted three hours and thirty-five minutes. This section will detail how the data was collected. Then the results of each data component will be analyzed under the qualitative results and quantitative results sections.

The first data set that was collected was the MCCTS-R pre survey. The survey was completed on laptops and mobile devices. The survey questions were uploaded into Qualtrics, a survey tool that allows customized questioning and data fields. The average time to complete this survey was approximately seven minutes. Each question was given a “force response,” which requires each respondent to answer each question needed prior to submitting the survey. This reduced the chances of missing data and allows for a full interpretation of the responses from each participant. The MCCTS-R post survey was then collected at the end of the intervention. This was also completed via Qualtrics, and the average time to complete was four minutes.

During the intervention, focus group responses to structured interview questions and three Likert scale surveys were collected via Qualtrics. The focus group responses were audio recorded. There were four focus groups in total: three after each activity in the professional development and one final focus group to discuss the overall intervention. Each focus group lasted approximately 10
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– 20 minutes. After each of the three activities in the training, fidelity of implementation data was collected using a Likert type survey. This survey was also conducted using Qualtrics and took less than one minute to complete.

Data Analysis

Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) recommend analyzing quantitative data by first extracting, cleaning, and assigning values to each data point that was collected prior to running it in a statistical software program. Qualtrics provides a feature to extract all data sets in Excel. The pre and post MCCTS-R and Likert scale survey data, when extracted, needed to be cleaned up due to numerous data points that were not needed. Some of these data points were IP addresses and longitudinal and latitudinal locations. Once the data was cleaned in excel, the pre and post MCCTS-R data responses were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), a statistical program software (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Data from the MCCTS-R pre and post survey included the participant’s responses to all 32 questions on the survey, as well as, demographic information including: gender, years of experience in higher education, race/ethnicity, and the type of institution in which they are employed (i.e., two-year or four-year and public or private). All the data was saved in a master file within SPSS.

The four focus group recordings were downloaded onto a password-protected computer and saved as MP3 files. The files were then transcribed verbatim and saved in four different word documents. Each document was then uploaded into Nvivo11, a software for qualitative data analysis (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Nienhusser & Espino, 2016). Nvivo11 provides the researcher with the ability to code qualitative data within the software and stores it as themes to compare at the end of each analysis. These themes were then reduced to assertions based on Erickson’s (1986) methods to analyze qualitative data. The findings will be presented in the qualitative results section.
Quantitative Results

The quantitative data in this section will report on the two following instruments: the MCCTS-R pre and post findings and the fidelity of implementation findings. This section will begin with the means and standard deviations of the pre MCCTS-R. The post MCCTS-R means and standard deviations will follow. Finally, the means and standard deviations for the MCCTS-R pre and post surveys, including the subscales, will be analyzed with a t-test. The fidelity of implementation findings will conclude the quantitative results section.

Pre-Intervention

The data presented shows the mean, standard deviation and range for the MCCTS-R pre-survey. First, the means and standard deviations for each item on the MCCTS-R pre-survey instrument are displayed (see Table 4). This will be followed by displaying the means and standard deviation for the three subscales (see Table 5) within the MCCTS-R: multicultural knowledge, awareness, and terminology (Holcomb-McCoy, 1999).

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for MCCTS-R Items on Pre-Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My ability to discuss my own ethnic/cultural heritage.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My ability to be aware of how my cultural background and</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences have influenced my attitudes about psychological processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My ability to discuss how my culture has influenced the way I think.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My ability to recognize when my attitudes, beliefs, and values are interfering with providing the best services to undocumented students.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My ability to verbally communicate my acceptance of students from a culture different from mine.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My ability to communicate nonverbally my acceptance of culturally different students.</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. My ability to discuss my family’s perspective regarding acceptable and non-acceptable codes-of-conduct.  
8. My ability to discuss models of White Racial Identity Development.  
9. My ability to define racism.  
10. My ability to define prejudice.  
11. My ability to define discrimination.  
12. My ability to define stereotype.  
13. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style.  
14. My ability to identify models of White Racial Identity Development.  
15. My ability to define racism.  
16. My ability to define prejudice.  
17. My ability to define discrimination.  
18. My ability to define stereotype.  
19. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
20. My ability to identify my negative and positive emotional reactions toward undocumented students.  
21. My ability to define racism.  
22. My ability to define prejudice.  
23. My ability to define discrimination.  
24. My ability to define stereotype.  
25. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
26. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
27. My ability to define racism.  
28. My ability to define prejudice.  
29. My ability to define discrimination.  
30. My ability to define stereotype.  
31. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
32. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
33. My ability to define racism.  
34. My ability to define prejudice.  
35. My ability to define discrimination.  
36. My ability to define stereotype.  
37. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
38. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
39. My ability to define racism.  
40. My ability to define prejudice.  
41. My ability to define discrimination.  
42. My ability to define stereotype.  
43. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
44. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
45. My ability to define racism.  
46. My ability to define prejudice.  
47. My ability to define discrimination.  
48. My ability to define stereotype.  
49. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
50. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
51. My ability to define racism.  
52. My ability to define prejudice.  
53. My ability to define discrimination.  
54. My ability to define stereotype.  
55. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
56. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
57. My ability to define racism.  
58. My ability to define prejudice.  
59. My ability to define discrimination.  
60. My ability to define stereotype.  
61. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
62. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
63. My ability to define racism.  
64. My ability to define prejudice.  
65. My ability to define discrimination.  
66. My ability to define stereotype.  
67. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
68. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
69. My ability to define racism.  
70. My ability to define prejudice.  
71. My ability to define discrimination.  
72. My ability to define stereotype.  
73. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
74. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
75. My ability to define racism.  
76. My ability to define prejudice.  
77. My ability to define discrimination.  
78. My ability to define stereotype.  
79. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
80. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
81. My ability to define racism.  
82. My ability to define prejudice.  
83. My ability to define discrimination.  
84. My ability to define stereotype.  
85. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
86. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
87. My ability to define racism.  
88. My ability to define prejudice.  
89. My ability to define discrimination.  
90. My ability to define stereotype.  
91. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
92. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
93. My ability to define racism.  
94. My ability to define prejudice.  
95. My ability to define discrimination.  
96. My ability to define stereotype.  
97. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
98. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
99. My ability to define racism.  
100. My ability to define prejudice.  
101. My ability to define discrimination.  
102. My ability to define stereotype.  
103. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
104. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
105. My ability to define racism.  
106. My ability to define prejudice.  
107. My ability to define discrimination.  
108. My ability to define stereotype.  
109. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
110. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
111. My ability to define racism.  
112. My ability to define prejudice.  
113. My ability to define discrimination.  
114. My ability to define stereotype.  
115. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
116. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.  
117. My ability to define racism.  
118. My ability to define prejudice.  
119. My ability to define discrimination.  
120. My ability to define stereotype.  
121. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).  
122. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.
24. My ability to describe the degree to which a counseling approach is appropriate for undocumented students.  
   1.81  .655

25. My ability to explain how factors such as poverty, and legal documentation have influenced the current conditions of undocumented students.  
   2.50  .894

26. My ability to discuss research regarding mental health issues among undocumented students.  
   1.43  .727

27. My ability to discuss how the counseling process may conflict with the cultural values of undocumented students.  
   2.00  .632

28. My ability to list at least three barriers that prevent undocumented students from using counseling services.  
   2.00  .894

29. My ability to discuss the potential bias of two assessment instruments frequently used in the schools.  
   1.75  .856

30. My ability to discuss family counseling from a cultural/ethnic perspective.  
   1.56  .813

31. My ability to anticipate when my helping style is inappropriate for an undocumented student.  
   2.06  .771

32. My ability to help undocumented students determine whether a problem stems from racism or biases in others.  
   1.68  .704

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and Range for MCCTS-R Subscales on Pre-survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Knowledge</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.0-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Awareness</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.0-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Terminology</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.0-4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pre survey results found that item 5 had the highest mean (M = 3.50). This item asked participants to rate their ability to verbally communicate their acceptance of students from a
different culture. Item 26, which asked about participants ability to discuss research regarding mental health issues among undocumented students, had the lowest mean (M = 1.43). The order of subscale means from highest to lowest were awareness (M = 2.97), terminology (M = 2.82), and knowledge (M = 1.99), respectively.

Holcomb-McCoy and Day-Vines (2004) found that the mean and standard deviation subscale scores for the MCCTS-R on 209 high school counselors were as follows: multicultural terminology (M = 3.4, SD = .61), multicultural knowledge (M = 2.45, SD = .81), and multicultural awareness (M = 3.36, SD = .61). The current participant group of college admissions professionals had lower mean scores in all three subscales when compared to the 209 high school counselors. This may be due to the fact that college admission counselors lack, or are not required to have, the same training and certification that high school counselors have (American School Counselor Association, 2018). Since admission counselors are not required to obtain certification in counseling, this may indicate why item 26 and the subscale of knowledge had the lowest mean scores. The following section will review the post-survey results of the MCCTS-R.

**Post-Intervention**

The following data was collected at the completion of the professional development. The MCCTS-R post-survey items mean and standard deviation scores (see Table 6) along with post-survey subscale scores (see Table 7) are displayed.

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My ability to discuss my own ethnic/cultural heritage.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My ability to be aware of how my cultural background and</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences have influenced my attitudes about psychological processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My ability to discuss how my culture has influenced the way I think.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My ability to recognize when my attitudes, beliefs, and values are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interfering with providing the best services to undocumented students.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My ability to verbally communicate my acceptance of students from</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a culture different from mine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My ability to communicate nonverbally my acceptance of culturally</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My ability to discuss my family’s perspective regarding acceptable</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and non-acceptable codes-of-conduct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My ability to discuss models of White Racial Identity Development.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My ability to define racism.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My ability to define prejudice.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My ability to define discrimination.</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My ability to define stereotype.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My ability to identify my negative and positive emotional reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toward undocumented students.</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beliefs about undocumented students.</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My ability to give examples of how stereotypical beliefs about</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undocumented students impact the counseling relationship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My ability to articulate the possible differences between the</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonverbal behavior of the five major ethnic groups. (i.e., African/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My ability to articulate the possible differences between the</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal behavior of the five major ethnic groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My ability to discuss the counseling implications for at least</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two models of racial/ethnic identity development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My ability to discuss within-group differences among</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undocumented students (e.g., DACA undocumented student vs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DREAMer undocumented student).

21. My ability to discuss how culture affects an undocumented students vocational choices.
   Mean: 3.00  SD: .632

22. My ability to discuss how culture affects the help-seeking behaviors of undocumented students.
   Mean: 2.87  SD: .619

23. My ability to discuss how culture affects the manifestations of psychological disorders.
   Mean: 2.56  SD: .963

24. My ability to describe the degree to which a counseling approach is appropriate for undocumented students.
   Mean: 2.56  SD: .813

25. My ability to explain how factors such as poverty, and legal documentation have influenced the current conditions of undocumented students.
   Mean: 2.93  SD: .680

26. My ability to discuss research regarding mental health issues among undocumented students.
   Mean: 2.37  SD: .806

27. My ability to discuss how the counseling process may conflict with the cultural values of undocumented students.
   Mean: 2.56  SD: .813

28. My ability to list at least three barriers that prevent undocumented students from using counseling services.
   Mean: 2.87  SD: .957

29. My ability to discuss the potential bias of two assessment instruments frequently used in the schools.
   Mean: 2.37  SD: .885

30. My ability to discuss family counseling from a cultural/ethnic perspective.
   Mean: 2.12  SD: .806

31. My ability to anticipate when my helping style is inappropriate for an undocumented student.
   Mean: 2.87  SD: .619

32. My ability to help undocumented students determine whether a problem stems from racism or biases in others.
   Mean: 2.62  SD: .806

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for MCCTS-R Subscales on Post-survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My ability to discuss how culture affects an undocumented students vocational choices</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to discuss how culture affects the help-seeking behaviors of undocumented students</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to discuss how culture affects the manifestations of psychological disorders</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to describe the degree to which a counseling approach is appropriate for undocumented students</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to explain how factors such as poverty, and legal documentation have influenced the current conditions of undocumented students</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to discuss research regarding mental health issues among undocumented students</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to discuss how the counseling process may conflict with the cultural values of undocumented students</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to list at least three barriers that prevent undocumented students from using counseling services</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to discuss the potential bias of two assessment instruments frequently used in the schools</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to discuss family counseling from a cultural/ethnic perspective</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to anticipate when my helping style is inappropriate for an undocumented student</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to help undocumented students determine whether a problem stems from racism or biases in others</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interestingly, item 5 had the highest mean again (M = 3.31). Items 19 (M = 2.12) and 30 (M = 2.12) had the lowest means, respectively. Item 19 asked participants to rate their ability to discuss the counseling implications for at least two models of racial/ethnic identity development while item 30 asked to rate the ability to discuss family counseling from a cultural/ethnic perspective. These findings could also be related to college admission counselors lacking formal credentials and training in counseling. The post survey subscales means were in the same order of highest to lowest as the pre survey subscales: awareness, terminology, and knowledge, respectively. The following section will compare the pre and post-survey results of the MCCTS-R for the professional development.

**MCCTS-R Pre and Post Survey Results Compared**

When each item on the pre and post-survey was analyzed (see Table 8), all the means increased except for items 5, 7, 10, and 11. Items 5, 7, and 10 had a decrease in mean of 5%, 2%, and 4%, respectively. Item 11 had no change from pre and post. Item 26 and 32 had the largest change in mean with 65% and 56% increases, respectively.

Table 8

**Comparative Changes in Pre and Post MCCTS-R Item Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pre-Mean</th>
<th>Post-Mean</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
<th>% of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 5 had the highest mean in both the pre and post survey. Yet, it decreased by 5% on the post survey. Item 7, which asked the ability to discuss family’s perspective regarding acceptable and non-acceptable codes-of-conduct, and Item 10, the ability to define prejudice, also had decreases in the post mean of 2% and 4%, respectively. This could be a result of attending the professional development and becoming more mindful of multicultural competencies (Ivers, Johnson, Clarke, Newsome, & Berry, 2016). This phenomenon of becoming more mindful of your own multicultural competencies will be addressed in the discussion section.

Item 26 had the highest change in mean from a pre mean of 1.44 to a post mean of 2.38, a 65% change. Item 26 had the lowest mean in the pre survey. The professional development highlighted numerous cases of mental health issues that undocumented students face. The two guest
speakers also spoke about their direct experiences with mental health. This could explain why the pre and post means for item 26 had the highest increase.

The pre and post survey subscale mean scores all had increased (see Table 9). The overall means from the pre and post-survey results were then analyzed with a paired sample t-test in SPSS (see Table 10). While all subscale means increased, multicultural knowledge had the highest mean difference and percentage of change at .61 (or 30%). Multicultural awareness and terminology had marginal increases at 4% and 1%, respectively.

Table 9
Comparative Changes in Pre and Post MCCTS-R Subscale Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pre-Mean</th>
<th>Post-Mean</th>
<th>Mean Diff</th>
<th>% of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Knowledge</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Awareness</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Terminology</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10
Comparative Changes in MCCTS-R Pre and Post Means Based on T-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCCTS-R</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Mean</td>
<td>Post Mean</td>
<td>Mean Diff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall MCCTS-R pre and post-survey results showed that the mean difference increased .40, representing a 16% increase. The p-value at 0.00 and the t-value at 5.64 indicates that there is a significant difference between the pre and the post-survey means (Emerson, 2017). These findings indicate that the post survey mean has a significant increase after the intervention concluded. Since this was a concurrent triangle mixed methods study, the qualitative data analysis
section will add to the quantitative findings (Hanson et al., 2005). Further discussions on the possible impact this could have in the field of undocumented student recruitment and training will be discussed later in this chapter. The following section will now evaluate the fidelity of implementation findings to understand how impactful each activity was within the professional development.

Fidelity of Implementation Findings

The purpose of the fidelity of implementation is to provide data to the facilitator on the activities of the professional development based on the participant’s ratings (Dusenbury et al., 2003). The following data set will display the fidelity of implementation results (see Table 11) for all three activities: lecture, role-playing, and guest speakers. All questions were on a 1 through 4 Likert scale with 1 being did not meet expectations, 2 below expectations, 3 meets expectations, and 4 exceeded expectations. Fidelity is met if average scores for each activity and question are > 3.00.

Table 11
Fidelity of Implementation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Activity Score Averages</th>
<th>Fidelity (including M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>Role-Playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How consistent was the activity with the actual objective?</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The material covered in this session during the allotted time…</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The activity kept me engaged and involved</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This activity made me a better admission counselor for undocumented students</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the fidelity of implementation show that all three activities met the four criteria that was listed by Dusenbury et al. (2003). The overall mean for the lecture (M = 3.24), role playing (M = 3.51), and guest speakers (M = 3.42) activities was 3.39. The highest average within each activity, however, was “the activity kept me engaged and involved.” This could be a result of the presenter, the material, or both.

The fidelity of implementation results indicate that role-playing had the largest mean score among the three activities. If college admissions staff are indicating that role-playing has the highest mean over lecture and guest speakers during the professional development, then future trainings should incorporate more role-playing activities. While the results of the fidelity of implementation provide an understanding of participant’s preferences, the focus groups after each activity provided detailed feedback to enhance the researchers understanding of strengths and areas of improvement during the professional development. The following section will review the qualitative results based on the four focus groups that were conducted.

**Qualitative Results**

This section will review the qualitative data that was captured during the professional development. At the conclusion of each activity, a focus group was conducted with all participants. There was also one final focus group at the end of the professional development. It should be noted that participant number 15 needed to leave before the final focus group was conducted. All qualitative findings were analyzed in Nvivo11 and intercoder reliability was conducted between the researcher and the faculty advisor.
Lecture Focus Group

The lecture activity of the professional development covered numerous aspects of historical and current undocumented student policies. The objective was to increase the knowledge of undocumented students by reviewing how this content applies to higher education. The participants were then asked to share their experiences in a focus group setting. The following assertions emerged during the lecture focus group: foundational knowledge, applicability in practice, and specialized information.

**Foundational knowledge.** The information that was shared with participants covered the historical and current evolution of undocumented students in the United States. The lecture also covered policies that pertain specifically to undocumented students in the state of Maryland. Participants shared that this lecture provided, “a foundational knowledge” that other “colleagues could benefit” from learning. Another participant said, “It was packaged very clearly, it was concise, so that even if you came in and were a novice to this, I think you would have walked away with a lot of knowledge in a very short period of time.” When asked to provide specific points of knowledge that were gained, one participant said, “Personally, I have always been a little confused about the whole Dream Act vs DACA… I thought the way you presented it was very clear.” Participants agreed to that point and one stated, “If a student comes in, and they have this type of status, this is what to do, and if they come in with this other type of status, this is what they can do.” Understanding how to provide guidance for a Dreamer vs a DACA recipient “clarifies it for me,” said another participant.

This assertion of clarity over Dreamer vs DACA recipients based on the professional development directly ties back to the needs assessment. During the needs assessment, admission counselors shared that they confused DACA policies with Dream Act policies and were not clear on
the differences (Hesse, 2017). The following assertion discusses the role of applicability in practice, which is a key theme that participants highlighted throughout the professional development.

**Applicability in practice.** The participants elaborated in depth about the applicability of new knowledge gained throughout the professional development. During the focus group, a participant shared that, “the transition to illegality…was really interesting and learning more about the mental health effects.” This refers to the work of Gonzales (2011) and Gonzales et al. (2013) on the effects of depression, anxiety, and shift in mindset to being illegal in the US to survive. While participants agreed that mental health was an important issue to cover, some would have liked “a bit more research on counseling… to use that in the office.” This participant wanted to learn more counseling methods to ensure that undocumented students “felt safe” when talking to her.

Currently, most college admission counselors are not required to have certification or training in counseling (Phair, 2014). Yet, the findings suggest that admission counselors seek counseling skills before recruiting vulnerable populations like undocumented students. This will be further discussed in implications on practice.

One final major theme concerning applicability was the active vs passive recruitment of undocumented students. Active recruitment is when colleges purposefully attend fairs of specific populations or provide web links on their main pages to certain student groups; while passive recruitment is when colleges simply state we welcome all types of students but do not actively recruit them (Cegler, 2012; Einhaus et al., 2004; Mathis & Tremblay, 2010). Participants said that, “it’s a small change, but you’re giving them a little bit more information” and “I thought that was a really interesting thing to add.” Unfortunately, research indicates counselors do not share their thoughts on improving recruitment strategies for undocumented students with senior leadership in admissions (Hesse, 2017). This is contrary to Nienhusser’s (2014) findings that strongly recommend for higher education staff to consider updating their websites and require leadership to
commit to training their staff on undocumented student concerns. The final assertion from the lecture focus group was specialized information that either was covered in the lecture, or should be addressed in a modified lecture.

**Specialized information.** Participants mentioned that specialized information provided them with more tools to assist undocumented students. An example of this was when participants learned that mentioning in-state tuition to an undocumented student, even though many other colleges may have in-state tuition, made that student more likely to enroll at your college (Perez, 2010). One participant said, “Our office has seen that anecdotally, but have never done any research. I want to take that back to my office and make them aware that by taking about [in-state tuition], it has a direct impact on students choosing to come to us.” This statement ties back to the needs assessment findings in two ways: 1) it reaffirms that admissions offices are not actively recruiting undocumented students, and 2) the likelihood of this recruiter taking this back to her office is very small based on previous testimonials (Hesse, 2017).

The focus group findings also provided feedback on opportunities to include more specialized information for future lectures. Some participants wanted to learn more about the job opportunities available to undocumented students after college. “When you’re recruiting students, the ultimate goal, of course, is to get a job at the end of your degree, and I think that would be a great part to add to the lecture,” said one participant. Another participant asked to explore “professional credentials” since they may not be available for undocumented students that want to become “teachers or nurses.” This depends on the requirements of licensure for each state, but is a valid point to address in future lecture activities. The following section explores results from the focus group conducted after the role-playing activity.
Role-playing Focus Group

The purpose of the role-playing activity was to create cognitive dissonance amongst the counselors to build empathy for what undocumented students encounter during the application/recruitment process (Festinger, 1957). The role-playing activity had two participants volunteer to read a scripted dialogue. They were prepped by the facilitator to understand their roles and the message that was to be conveyed during their role-play scenario (Goldstein, 1997). The role-playing focus group developed two assertions: reducing microaggressions, and becoming an ally.

Reducing microaggressions. A reoccurring theme was how to properly use words and terminology without offending undocumented students. Given that the majority of participants were White, discussing race and microaggressions tends to lead this racial group to experience higher levels of discomfort and fear (Tatum, 1992). This finding may provide insights into why this activity had limited focus group participation. Nonetheless, some participants shared that they fear using the wrong words when recruiting undocumented students, reaffirming Tatum’s (1992) findings. One participant said, “Maybe more examples of dangerous terminologies” could have been covered. Another stated, “I almost wish I could have the same set of language I could use with every student.” The participants were referring to reducing microaggressions on how to ask questions without offending undocumented students. Research shows that higher education staff asked some undocumented students, “So you don’t have papers?” (Nienhusser et al., 2016). This is a form of a microaggression. The participants wanted to know if there was a cheat sheet to avoid microaggressions altogether. One participant shared her desire to have “core language” while another expressed her concern to not “scare them off” so “using the right phrase” is key.

The need for a one size fits all approach to using terms and answering questions was a desire shared by the participants. The purpose of the role-playing activity was to provide examples
of how to become more aware of the terminology that is used when speaking with undocumented students. The participants were then encouraged to discuss real life examples of what they have said, or what they have heard. One participant said, “I think role-playing is probably one of the most effective ways to learn new techniques for talking to people and to be able to understand once you say something aloud how it can be perceived.” This reaffirms the findings of Festinger (1957) and McGregor (1993) on dissonance and how role-playing can help participants understand the perspective of another person. The following assertion will discuss how those techniques can lead to counselors becoming allies.

**Becoming an ally.** Participants stated that the role-playing activity made them consider how to become more effective allies for undocumented students. One participant stated, “I don’t want to tell someone something wrong because of my lack of training.” This sparked others to share their takeaways as well. “As counselors, we need to be good listeners,” said one participant. Another participant followed up with, “Yes, we need to create a rapport [with undocumented students] and then you become the person they are going to ask questions to.” While research shows that undocumented students rely on their social capital networks, primarily comprised of other undocumented students, family, and friends for information (Garcia & Tierney, 2011), participants were offering suggestions on ways to build rapport with undocumented students so that they seek them out in the future.

One participant mentioned the environment on campus and questioned how welcoming the office spaces are. “We need to demonstrate through our facilities as well that we have a welcoming campus,” she shared. Nienhusser and Espino (2016) discuss providing a safe place on campus for these students to meet and openly discuss concerns with administrators. She challenged the other participants to, “think about how we are currently making our spaces welcoming.” The final
activity covered the actual experiences of two undocumented immigrants in the United States that graduated from college.

**Guest Speakers Focus Group**

The guest speaker’s activity provided participants with direct access to undocumented immigrants. The two guest speakers, one male and one female, were both college graduates currently with DACA status. They were recruited through the researcher’s social network (Granovetter, 1976) and agreed to speak with participants via webcam. The guest speakers were asked to provide background information about themselves and share memorable experiences (negative and/or positive) with educators. The purpose was to provide the participants a firsthand look at those who are currently experiencing undocumented status in the US to raise awareness of the realities in which they live. The assertions for this focus group were lived experiences, and opportunities for improvement.

**Lived experiences.** The two guest speakers shared their experiences of living undocumented in the United States on day-to-day basis. “Anytime you hear actual experiences from people who have lived through it, it gives you a better understanding and perspective of the situation,” said one participant. Another said, “Role-playing can seem exaggerated, but these were real people talking about their real lives and what they really went through. People cannot blow it off as something just made up for the purpose of demonstrating something.” Research has shown the potential impact of guest speakers (Guth et al., 2000; Payne et al., 2003).

The participants did share, however, that they would have liked to hear from a currently enrolled undocumented student. Another participant said, “I would like to hear from someone who graduated from college, but did not get DACA, to see where they are now.” The counselors followed up by sharing how they can improve their personal and professional understanding of undocumented students.
Opportunities for improvement. Many participants stated opportunities for improving their awareness of undocumented student needs, or what their colleges can do to improve the recruitment experience for undocumented students based on the testimony from the two guest speakers. One participant shared that her college recently mailed out fliers for a college admissions event in “eleven different languages.” She shared this during the focus group by saying it was a more inclusive and direct approach to recruiting families and making them feel welcomed. This concept of inclusivity ties directly with Nienhusser’s (2014) recommendations to provide information in multiple languages for undocumented students and their families.

Both guest speakers wished their campus provided more resources like counseling for mental health. One participants said, “Both of them highlighted mental health, and perhaps if that were a more robust service on campus that were advertised, it might be more helpful.” Research shows mental health is currently affecting undocumented students due to the uncertainty of their future (Gonzales et al., 2013; Gonzales et al., 2015). Research also shows how undocumented Latino students experience higher levels of depression on college campuses than documented Latino students (Munoz, 2013).

On the topic of resources on campus, both guest speakers shared their frustrations with being labeled “international students.” Picking up on this frustration, participants stated, “They see themselves as American,” yet we still “refer them to the international student advising office…we need to consider how it’s heard and how it’s received.” This was also a theme that arose in the needs assessment when a participant shared that she, “did not know if [an undocumented student] should apply as an international student and referred him to the international student services office” (Hesse, 2017, p. 8). College staff should be more educated on the status of undocumented students (Nienhusser, 2014; Nienhusser & Espino, 2016).
Finally, one participant mentioned a systemic issue within her organization’s hierarchy. She said that, “not having someone on the [admissions] committee, who grew up undocumented” is causing them to “oversee” undocumented student’s needs. This statement reaffirms the needs assessment interviews which stated that management does not understand undocumented students’ needs because they cannot relate to them (Hesse, 2017). When examining Bronfenbrenner’s (1979; 1994) macrosystem under the lens of undocumented students, there is some evidence that shows systemic laws and policies which make it more difficult for undocumented students to achieve upper levels of management (in any field) due to current barriers on education and employment. Further research is needed to understand if, and why, senior leadership in admissions offices do not prioritize undocumented students during the recruitment process. The final focus group explored the overall experience of the professional development.

**Final Focus Group**

After the guest speaker’s focus group concluded, participants were asked to complete the post-MCCTS-R. Participants then completed the final focus group of the day. The final focus group was an opportunity for all participants (except for one participant) to share their thoughts on the overall professional development. The following assertions arose from this focus group: awareness of undocumented students, providing tangible takeaways, and training for all.

**Awareness of undocumented students.** Participants expressed a greater sense of awareness of undocumented students on their campus and in the United States. One participant said, “The lecture was probably the most beneficial” while another agreed by sharing, “The lecture provided very good background knowledge.” Others shared how the role-playing and guest speaker’s activity raised their awareness. “The role playing was so interactive where you can take a step back to analyze what is being said,” said one participant while another states, “the [guest speaker’s] words about how she is ‘more than her undocumented status’ was really powerful.”
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The guest speakers provided anecdotes and stories that participants said impacted their awareness of undocumented students. One counselor came to a realization that finding out your undocumented “is similar to finding out that you are adopted.” Research shows that vulnerable populations with hidden identities share a certain stigma (Shedlin et al., 2011). Another relayed that her “mind was blown” when she was “made more aware of the process of coming out” for undocumented students and how this process is similar to LGBT students (Shedlin et al., 2011). While most of the feedback was positive, one participant reminded the group of how easy it can be to forget some of this new found information. She said, “I definitely have an increased awareness but not dealing with that population on a regular basis I can easily forget some key takeaways.”

Woodford et al. (2014) state that individuals cannot realistically become allies within a 4-hour training session. Guskey (2000) recommends to have follow up professional developments. The following assertion will address this reoccurring theme.

Providing tangible takeaways. Throughout the professional development, participants shared their requests to have some “takeaways, written resources, and references that would help to go get information.” One participant said, “The challenge is keeping up with it,” when referring to the fluidity of undocumented student policies in the United States. This is an important point to note because participants want “a quick double-sided, one-sheet paper” with information but the contents must be updated consistently. This concept was reaffirmed several times with participants requesting information to be “laid out” or “written down so it sticks better.” Woodford et al. (2014) expose the limitations of just one four hour professional development.

Participants requested a list of “top terminology and their definitions” that people can walk away with. Another participant followed up by suggesting, “Particularly the definitions of DACA vs Dreamers to understand what the real difference is.” This finding slightly contradicts the earlier findings that participants shared they have a clearer understanding of the difference between DACA
vs Dreamers. While they understand the difference in the short-term, a long-term solution could be to provide a tangible takeaway after the profession development.

Counselors reiterated the need for a single document with definitions and guidance for conversations. While it may seem practical to create a handout on how to navigate a conversation, the end goal would be for counselors to know this information and be able to use it without referring to the handout. It would be impractical and unprofessional for a counselor to speak with an undocumented student and have to use a handout to provide guidance to the student; instead, research suggest that professional developments are an opportunity to develop these competencies (Nienhusser & Espino, 2016). With that being said, the counselors shared that this professional development would benefit multiple faculty and staff, not just admission counselors.

**Training for all.** The participants expressed the benefits of all staff and faculty taking part in this professional development. One participant shared that her institution requires multicultural training and how this professional development “could easily serve the entire institution.” Some participants from two-year colleges who serve dual roles on campus (i.e., faculty and counselor) said that “faculty” could benefit from this since “they meet with students as well.”

The group then elaborated on their concerns that only training admissions staff could affect the undocumented students’ experience on campus. “The admissions office cannot do the job for the entire campus,” said one participant. Another shared, “once they go beyond [admissions], if no one else knows about them, they are left without support.” That comment was followed up by someone stating, “It’s an all hands on deck, and everybody should be included [in the trainings].” Nienhusser’s (2014) suggesting that admissions offices, and the college overall, should be trained on the laws and policies impacting undocumented students.

Finally, the participants shared that a more knowledgeable community would reduce inconsistencies in ways to serve undocumented students. The main example that reoccurred was the
incorrect labeling of undocumented students as international students. One participant shared that this professional development made her realize “that she has some biases” and “when answering a question [she] was actually basing it on something else.” Another participant shared that, “[she] did not even think about the whole international student idea because they are undocumented. Now I think of them as American.” While they are technically not American, they are technically not international students either. Gonzales (2011) and Gonzales et al. (2013) state that undocumented students do not fit in one category and therefore may lead to others being unaware of how to best guide them. Rumbaut’s (2004) states that undocumented students are the 1.5 generation, defined as youth who migrated to the United States before age 12 but consider themselves Americans at heart, just not on paper.

Providing all campus faculty and staff this training may reduce the confusion of how to best serve undocumented students and which campus department to send them to (i.e., registrar’s vs international student services). The next section will provide a summary of the research question and findings.

**Summary of Research Question and Findings**

The research question for this study was “to what extent does a professional development impact admission counselors’ multicultural awareness, knowledge, and terminology of undocumented students?” The research design was a concurrent triangulation design using qualitative and quantitative data to interpret the results (Hanson et al., 2005). Therefore, the MCCTS-R pre and post survey findings, as well as the focus group findings were analyzed to answer the research question.

The MCCTS-R pre-survey found that the mean score among all participants was 2.37. After the conclusion of the professional development, the MCCTS-R post-survey found that the mean score among all participants was 2.77. The mean difference was .40 or a 16% change. After
conducting a t-test with the pre and post survey means, the p-value was 0.00 and the t-value was 5.64, indicating that the change was statistically significant (Emerson, 2017). With the mean, standard deviation, and sample size for both pre and post surveys, the effect size was also calculated. Cohen (1969) states that the effect size is “the degree to which the phenomenon is present” (p. 9). In order to measure the effect size (also known as Cohen’s $d$), the two means must divided by the pooled standard deviation. Cohen’s $d$ for the pre and post effect size of this intervention is .712. Effect sizes range from small (<.20), medium (.20-.50), or large (> .50) (Cohen, 1969). Since Cohen’s $d$ is .712, this would be considered a large effect size. While the mean increased from the pre to the post survey, and the effect size is significant, the MCCTS-R subscales must be evaluated before addressing the research question.

The pre-survey subscale means for multicultural knowledge, awareness, and terminology were 1.99, 2.97, and 2.82, respectively. The post-survey subscales means for multicultural knowledge, awareness, and terminology increased to 2.60, 3.11, and 2.86, respectively. The changes in mean from multicultural knowledge were the highest at .61 (30% change), followed by awareness at .14 (4% change), and finally terminology at .04 (1% change). To provide further analysis, a paired sample t-test was conducted for all subscale pre and post means (see Table 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Pre Mean</th>
<th>Post Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminology</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paired sample t-test for the MCCTS-R pre and post survey subscales scores indicate that multicultural terminology did not achieve a statistically significant finding based on a p-value
above .05 (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Multicultural knowledge and awareness did in fact have p-values below .05 and t-values of 12.6 and 2.48, respectively. The following section will discuss the key findings from the qualitative data before answering the research question.

Participants provided various testimonials on their experience in the professional development ranging from new found knowledge to critiques of missing topics that could have been covered. In order to answer the research question, qualitative findings must be analyzed with quantitative findings. While the focus groups were conducted after each activity in the professional development, the final focus group conducted at the end of the professional development is of particular importance to answering the research question. That focus group was specifically asked to answer semi-structured interview questions on the extent to which the professional development has helped them with multicultural knowledge, awareness, and terminology of undocumented students.

Key assertions that emerged during the final focus group was an awareness of undocumented students, providing tangible takeaways for participants, and that the professional development can be a training for all staff and faculty at a college and not just admissions staff. To answer the research question, the first assertion (awareness of undocumented students) must be vetted more thoroughly. Participants used the term awareness during numerous responses. This does not necessarily indicate that they were referring to multicultural awareness. An example of this is when a participant said “The lecture provided very good background knowledge and made me more aware [of undocumented students].” Here the participant states that she is more aware, but because of the new knowledge she gained during the lecture activity. This could be an indication that multiple multicultural competencies can be raised during one activity of the profession development. Others shared how the role-playing and guest speaker’s activity increased their
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awareness and terminology competencies. One participant said that she has an “increased awareness of what the terms are” when referring to role-playing activity.

It is important to note that no participant stated that they felt the professional development did not address multicultural knowledge, awareness, and terminology. However, the majority of feedback during the final focus group was to have a guide or script of how to reduce microaggressions. One participant said, “I would like a list of the top terminology and their definitions that [participants] could walk away from this training with.” Another shared her fears of stating incorrect or insensitive terms by saying, “I am almost tentative now to speak up because I might [say something] wrong.”

Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) recommend to display mixed methods findings with a joint display that combines key qualitative findings paired with quantitative statistical results (see Figure 5.1).

---

**Figure 5.1.** Joint display of key quantitative and qualitative findings.
The joint display shows the two key findings for both the qualitative and quantitative data analysis. The quantitative data findings showcase the statistical significance for multicultural knowledge and awareness, and Cohen’s $d$. It also highlights the fact that multicultural terminology was not statistically significant. The qualitative data findings suggest that multiple multicultural competencies may have been addressed at once during the professional development. Participants shared these experiences during the final focus group. Participants also shared that terminologies for undocumented students could have provided tangible takeaways in the form of handouts or one-page brochures.

Based on a joint analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, the research question, “To what extent does a professional development impact admission counselors’ multicultural awareness, knowledge, and terminology of undocumented students,” can be best answered in two parts. First, the change in means from the pre and post MCCTS-R survey, along with the effect size, and testimonials from the final focus group, suggest that the professional development had an impact, to an extent, on admission counselor’s multicultural competencies of undocumented students. Second, the means of the subscales on the pre and post MCCTS-R survey, along with the testimonials during the final focus group, suggest that multicultural knowledge and awareness had the greatest impact while multicultural terminology did not have a statistically significant impact and participants shared numerous suggestions on improving their terminology competency after the professional development.

Therefore, while the findings suggest the professional development had an impact on admission counselor’s multicultural competencies on undocumented students, multicultural knowledge seems to have had the greatest impact, followed by awareness, based on quantitative and qualitative findings. While multicultural terminology had qualitative findings that suggested an impact, the lack of statistical significance, paired with questions and concerns about using incorrect
terminology during the final focus group, suggests the impact was not as great as the other two multicultural competencies. The discussion section will review limitations and provide insights into the implications on practice and the recommendations for future research.

**Discussion**

The qualitative and quantitative findings suggest that the professional development had an impact on admission counselor’s multicultural competencies, with knowledge and awareness competencies having the greatest impacts. The fidelity of implementation results shows that the three activities within the professional development achieved their set objectives by achieving a mean <3.00 on all categories. The research question asked: to what extent did this professional development impact admission counselors multicultural knowledge, awareness, and terminology of undocumented students? The quantitative findings show a 16% increase in the overall mean scores between the pre and post survey with a .712 effect size. The qualitative findings affirms the quantitative findings by analyzing and validating the experiences of the participant with their own testimonials. While the overall intervention shows promising results, there are several limitations that need to be addressed. Following the limitations section, a discussion on the implications of this study on future research and practice will be discussed to conclude this chapter.

**Limitations**

This study examined college admission counselors’ multicultural competence as a result of the professional development training, specifically focusing on undocumented student populations. Although this study is one of the first of its kind to focus on counseling undocumented students in admissions, many limitations exist. While 228 admissions staff from 17 colleges throughout the state of Maryland received an invitation, only 16 participants from seven colleges participated in this study. The National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC), the governing body for college admissions, has approximately 13,000 members (Phair, 2014). Based on
NACAC’s membership, a sample size of 374 counselors would provide generalizable findings with a 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error (Das, Mitra, & Mandal, 2016). Therefore, these results are not generalizable as the sample size is not large enough (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The limited sample size could have also been attributed to the timing of the professional development training. Admission offices generally recruit students in the fall semester, review applications throughout the fall and winter, and monitor communications with students during spring (Dearden, 2017). This makes the summer months, June through August, the ideal option for future trainings. Future studies could also offer monetary incentives, or special certification, which tend to increase participation rates (Elwell, 2017; Gardiner, Bryan, Gardiner, & Bryan, 2017; Groth, 2010). Additionally, based on the qualitative data from participants, admission counselors suggested that this training should include others outside of admissions. Future studies could potentially recruit all staff and faculty in higher education, and invite K-12 professionals and teachers as part of the training process (Cisneros & Cadenas, 2017).

Another limitation of this study was that the researcher served as the facilitator for the training and conducted the qualitative data analysis. This could potentially lead to inherent bias in the data analysis (Mehra, 2002). Miyazaki and Taylor (2008) state that “researchers’ characteristics may inadvertently affect results through biased research design or through biased recording, interpretation, or evaluation of participant responses” (p. 780). Furthermore, some of the participants were recruited via network sampling (Granovetter, 1976), meaning they were already known affiliates of the researcher. This dual role as the researcher and facilitator, as well as knowing some participants, could have influenced respondents need for socially desirable behaviors (van de Mortel, 2008). Social desirability is, “the tendency for research participants to attempt to act in ways that make them seem desirable to other people” (Salkind, 2010, p. 1395). Future studies using multicultural competency surveys such as the MCCTS-R (Holcomb-McCoy & Day-Vines,
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2004) could potentially incorporate a social desirability instrument such as the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale to control for this variable (Constantine & Ladany, 2000; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

While many multicultural competency surveys exist, using the MCCTS-R instrument for this study was another limitation. First, the MCCTS-R consists of “32 behaviorally based statements assessing school counselors' perceived multicultural counseling competence” (Holcomb-McCoy & Day-Vines, 2004, p. 156). Since the MCCTS-R does not specifically measure undocumented student counseling competencies, which is at the crux of the professional development, construct validity limitations exist (Mathison, 2005). For example, items about racism, stereotypes, and other specific terms that were not directly discussed in the professional development yet they remained on the instrument. Furthermore, 14 out of 32 items in the MCCTS-R were modified to state *undocumented students* as a replacement for the term *multicultural students* (or similar terms). Changing the terms in a pre-existing scale compromises the reliability of the instrument (Bruce, 2003). Cisneros and Cadenas (2017) have developed a 10-item DREAMer-ally scale. This scale measures undocumented student knowledge competency and higher education employees’ self-efficacy. While Cisneros and Cadenas (2017) state the instrument needs further validation, the DREAMer-ally scale is recommended for future studies. Furthermore, since participants completed a pre-MCCTS-R for baseline results, this could have led to *pretest sensitization*. Salkind (2010) defines pretest sensitization as “a cognitive or psychological change in a subject due to administration of a [survey]” (p. 1092). Salkind (2010) suggests administering one survey at the conclusion of the professional development training and then conducting a follow-up survey. Aside from pretest sensitization, participants may have attended the professional development with assumptions about undocumented students based on the timing of the study. Undocumented immigrants were consistently in the news during the weeks of recruitment for this study, which may
have affected results. Sternadori (2017) found that news stories on marginalized populations might abate bias among participants in a study. Future studies can account for implicit biases before the training by administering the Implicit Association Test (Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998).

Finally, the experimental design of this study required a one-time, four-hour seminar style training. Woodford et al. (2014) states, “preparing individuals to become allies cannot realistically occur within a 4-hour training session” (p. 320). Guskey (2000) recommends that professional development programs should have follow up sessions to be more impactful. Future studies should consider multiple professional development sessions throughout the year.

**Implications for Practice**

While this study has a number of limitations, the results have many implications for policy, procedure and practice in higher education institutions. This section will discuss the role of admission counselors, the type of professional development training admissions offices can implement, and implications for the impact to undocumented students’ ecological system.

**Role of admission counselors.** The role of an admission counselor is to meet with students to have a dialogue about admissions to their university (Lautz et al., 2012). Currently, college admission counselors’ enter the profession with little to no counseling experience, and a minimum of a bachelor’s degree in varying fields of study (Phair, 2014). Phair (2014) reports that 56% of admission counselors have bachelor’s degrees and only 42.5% have master’s degrees. The top three undergraduate majors for admission counselors are in the areas of humanities/liberal arts, social sciences, and business (Phair, 2014). For admission counselors with graduate training, these mostly lie in the fields of education and business. Education is a broad topic and therefore limited information exists on the type of training that admission counselors have in the areas of human development, counseling skills, and multicultural competence. Additionally, there is no certification or credential required to be an admission counselor (Phair, 2014). Conversely, high school
counselors are required to have an advanced degree in counseling, human growth and development, or a similar area of study (American School Counselor Association, 2018). This training includes courses in multicultural counseling. High school counselors are also required to complete hours of supervised field experience training in order to receive specific state certification (American School Counselor Association, 2018). Finally, high school counselors are required to take continuing education credits in order to maintain their certification (American School Counselor Association, 2018).

Undocumented student recruitment is a fairly new phenomena with very few studies exploring undocumented student competencies amongst college staff (Cadenas et al., 2016; Cisneros & Cadenas, 2017; Nienhusser & Espino, 2016), and even fewer attempting to understand college admission counselors’ knowledge and recruitment practices of undocumented students (Hesse, 2017; Nienhusser, 2014). Higher education administrator positions, which include admission counselors, expect a job growth increase of 15% between 2012 through 2022 (US Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015). As of 2014, NACAC states that there are 13,000+ admissions staff throughout higher education (Phair, 2014). As of 2003 there were 7,000 to 13,000 undocumented high school graduates enrolled in college. Although current data on enrollment rates of undocumented students does not exist, one can assume that this number is increasing based on population statistics (Passel, 2003). Therefore, it is imperative that admissions offices begin to offer professional development training on recruiting this specific population. This calls for a proposed change to college admission counselors’ educational requirements and training.

**Professional development training for admissions staff.** Results from this study indicated that participants wanted to learn more counseling skills and techniques in order to ensure that undocumented students “felt safe” when interacting with them. Specifically, participants’ wanted “a bit more research on counseling” and a more thorough review on “dangerous terminology.” One
participant shared, “I think role-playing is probably one of the most effective ways to learn new techniques for talking to people and to be able to understand once you say something aloud how it can be perceived.” Furthermore, admission counselors stated they want to build a long-term rapport with undocumented students. College admission counselors want to become a part of undocumented students’ social capital networks (Enriquez, 2011) but may not have all the necessary training to do so. NACAC states that admission counselors could benefit from the creation of a license or certificate that provides a deeper “understanding of admissions in the broader context of higher education” (Phair, 2014, p. 46). While this is just a suggestion from NACAC, college admissions leaders could require their staff to attend ongoing professional development specific to populations enrolled in their institutions. Nienhusser (2014) states that college admissions leaders must train their staff on undocumented student competencies. Yet, participants from the needs assessment stated they have never received any type of training on working with undocumented students (Hesse, 2017). The following section will provide a framework for professional development training on multicultural counseling competencies when working with undocumented students.

Specific topic areas. The results of this study indicate that future professional development training could focus on informing practitioners about current state policy affecting undocumented students in higher education. Participants shared that the lecture relating to undocumented student policies helped them “walk away with a lot of knowledge in a very short period of time.” A brief historical overview of undocumented students in the United States followed by specifics on undocumented students’ laws for the state participants reside in, would encompass this area of training.

Additionally results of this study indicate the need for admissions counselors to become more aware of microaggressions during recruitment activities such as informational emails, face-to-
face interactions at college fairs, phone calls and walk-in sessions. Participants in the current study shared their concern with the ability to navigate conversations with undocumented students, specifically to “not say the wrong thing.” These findings indicate that microaggressions are still a concern and further trainings must incorporate these topics. One way to train on reducing microaggressions is to provide specific information on ways in which to ask for information in verbal and written communication to undocumented students. Furthermore, real-life examples of microaggressions that undocumented students experienced based on research or testimonials can be explored. The ability to navigate conversations with an awareness of microaggressions, will equip the admission counselors with *broaching behaviors*. Broaching behaviors are:

A consistent and ongoing attitude of openness with a genuine commitment by the counselor to continually invite the client to explore issues of diversity. In essence, the counseling relationship becomes the vehicle for navigating a discussion concerning issues of difference related to race, ethnicity, and culture (Day-Vines et al., 2007, p. 402).

Given that the majority of admissions staff are White and female (Phair, 2014), broaching behaviors may not come natural to this population. Findings indicate that Whites experience a level of discomfort and fear when discussing race and microaggressions (Tatum, 1992). Furthermore, ethnic minority group members have higher self-perceived multicultural competence compared to Whites (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999). Therefore, specific facilitators may be needed in order to navigate these difficult conversations

*Type.* In order to provide training on the historical nature and current policies affecting undocumented students, didactic lectures can provide a forum to discuss racial and/or ethnic differences that exist between the participants and the students they serve (Abreu, 2001). When the facilitator is discussing the historical and current context of undocumented student policies, participants may complete Bronfenbrenner’s EST (1979; 1994) to understand the multiple systems
that affect these individuals. The facilitator will define each ecological level and then have participants explore contextual factors relating to undocumented students.

In order to better understand microaggressions, admission counselors need to practice broaching behaviors using role-playing activities. Osborn and Costas (2013) found that role-playing has the same impact on counselors whether the script is artificial or real. One participant said, “I think role-playing is probably one of the most effective ways to learn new techniques for talking to people and to be able to understand once you say something aloud how it can be perceived.”

The session can use the script provided in this study’s role-playing activity, or provide a real-life example.

Assessment. In order to understand the extent to which professional development trainings are impacting participants, formative and summative assessment must be conducted. To assess participants understanding of policy and its effect on undocumented students, the facilitator can review the participants’ EST worksheet at the completion of the training. The facilitator can then determine to what extent the participants understand the concepts by evaluating what the participants listed in each level. For example, participants should be able to indicate DACA in the macrosystem and high school counselors in the microsystem. Using Figure 1.1 and Bronfenbrenner’s (1979; 1994) definitions of each level can be used as a guide for the facilitator.

The role-playing exercise could also be assessed using a formative approach to assess the training. After pairing participants to role-play, the facilitator “moves around the room observing the practice, making tactful suggestions for improvement where appropriate and being available to answer questions that might arise” (Lavrakas, 2008, p. 768). A summative assessment can require participants to complete a scale at the end of the training. For example, the DREAMer-ally scale asks participants to rate their competency and self-efficacy on undocumented students (Cisneros & Cadenas, 2017).
Timing. Admissions offices remain active from fall through spring, which make summers ideal for professional development trainings (Dearden, 2017). Guskey (2000) suggests that professional development trainings should have follow up sessions. Ideally, professional development should take place over a number of days throughout the summer months. For the purposes of this study, two trainings can take place. One for the lecture and the other for the role-playing training. Each training could last between 1 to 2 hours.

Incentivizing. Findings from this study suggest that admissions leadership does not currently require nor incentivize admissions staff to attend professional development workshops relating to undocumented student experiences. Sparks and Hirsh (1997) caution that participants in professional developments will not implement any changes they learned if their organization does not foster the proper support to implement the new knowledge when they return. Therefore, admissions leaders have to make a commitment to not only train their staff, but also implement changes that participants suggest based on the training.

To increase participation, university administration may consider providing financial incentives which tend to increase participation (Gardiner et al., 2017; Groth, 2010). Universities can apply for grants in diversity, counseling, or professional development sectors which, if awarded, can fund incentives. Admissions leaders can also require this training as part of admission counselors’ onboarding experience. In fact, during the final focus group, one participant shared that her institution requires yearly multicultural training and that this professional development “could easily serve the entire institution.”

Finally, participants could potentially receive a certificate of completion by the facilitator. Participants can display this certificate, which may invite undocumented students to share their hidden identity similar to LGBT students with safe zone stickers (Finkel, Storaasli, Bandele, & Schaefer, 2003).
**Funding Sources.** Most states have a governing body for colleges and universities. The Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) is the governing body of all post-secondary institutions in the state of Maryland. MHEC could provide statewide support for colleges and universities in the form of developing or sponsoring professional development training in the area of undocumented college students. One of MHEC’s strategic goals is that being reactive, instead of proactive, is a weakness they would like to address (State of Maryland, 2018). By taking a lead in the development of this type of training, or awarding grants to send staff to these trainings, MHEC will take a major step forward in achieving its goal.

Admissions leaders should also consider this training as an investment in staff development. As undocumented students continue to apply to colleges in record numbers, admissions leaders will need to reevaluate the training of their staff. There has been a growing trend of colleges publicly supporting undocumented students, with nearly 200 college presidents urging President Trump to keep DACA (Pomona College, 2016). Ultimately, public support for undocumented students is futile if training, and therefore spending funds to train, is non-existent.

**Outputs.** Many participants in the current study requested a “one-page” handout with key terms and definitions of undocumented student policies and terms. Providing a handout that participants complete, and can reuse for future purposes, provides a tangible item that participants could potentially refer to as they counsel undocumented students.

Long-term outputs of professional development training is ultimately to change the culture of the admissions office, and ultimately the college, to take a more proactive approach on undocumented student issues. Payne and Smith (2011) found that staff who completed an LGBT-ally training felt more empowered to address LGBT concerns. The authors also state that a “top-down” approach is required for any level of climate change (Payne & Smith, 2011, p. 194). Currently, the research indicates that admission leaders are not providing any training on
undocumented students (Hesse, 2017). Therefore, long-term outputs would be for admissions leaders to not only provide training to staff, but also develop a strategic recruitment plan for undocumented students.

A strategic recruitment plan for undocumented students entails that admissions offices’ actively, not passively, recruit undocumented students. One example of active recruitment is to develop a subcommittee to recruit individuals of diverse backgrounds (Adams & Bargerhuff, 2005). The subcommittee can devise a recruitment plan to target undocumented students. If undocumented student know they are actively being recruited, this could potentially create a positive psychological effect. Postive psychology is identified as any intervention that specifically targets positive emotions, gratitude, hope, and goal setting which has been known to decrease anxiety and depression, and increase self-esteem and self-efficacy (Seligman, Ernst, Gillham, Reivich, & Linkins, 2009; Shoshani & Steinmetz, 2014). Studies show that undocumented students experience higher levels of depression, and lower levels of self-esteem when controlled for general college stress (Arbona & Jimenez, 2014; Munoz, 2013). Previous research also indicates that undocumented students consistently live in fear due to their unknown status (Gonzales et al., 2013) so implementing this subcommittee could have potential positive psychological effects.

**Undocumented students’ ecological system and the economic prosperity of the state.**

There are nearly 800,000 DACA recipients in this country (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2015), and nearly 60,000 undocumented immigrants under the age of 24 in the state of Maryland (The Migration Policy Institute, 2016). The most recent data out of the National Bureau of Economic Research shows that DACA recipients vs immigrants not eligible for DACA had a 15% increase in high school graduation, 45% decrease in teenage births, increased college attendance by 25% among DACA women, and an increase in employment among those enrolled in college (Kuka et al., 2018). Current research shows, however, that only 53% of college admissions offices
knowingly admit undocumented students to their college (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, 2009). Colleges are consistently looking for sources of revenue in the form of students, which generate tuition. If colleges have a new student pipeline in undocumented students, and data shows undocumented students are out performing US citizens during the first semester in college (Conger & Chellman, 2013) actively training admissions staff to recruit this population is vital.

Furthermore, the implications on the economic benefits that the state of Maryland would receive should be enough to invest short-term funds to reap long-term gains (Gindling & Mandell, 2012). Research indicates states that pass Dream Act laws incentivize undocumented students to enroll in college (Kaushal, 2008). Flores (2012) found that undocumented students were 1.54 times more likely to enroll in college after their state passed a Dream Act. This, in return, leads to more economic prosperity for the state. Gindling and Mandell (2012) estimated that the Maryland Dream Act would gross $66 million each year due to expected higher income and taxable income as well as reducing the incarceration and public welfare rates. With studies that find empirical evidence of undocumented students increasing both college enrollment and employment numbers, it would behoove the state to invest in training admissions staff to become more knowledgeable and better equipped to recruit this population to increase their enrollment (Flores, 2012; Kaushal, 2008).

The implications for practice are the beginning, and not an exhaustive list, of recommendations to consider in the field of college admissions. The next section will address recommendation for future research in the field of undocumented students and college admissions.

Implications for Research

The current study seeks to add to the dearth of literature in training college admissions staff to recruit undocumented students. Although this study provided some results pertaining to admissions counselors’ multicultural competence after completing a one day professional
development training, further research is needed to explore ways to improve training in working with this specific population. Additionally, further research is needed to understand the experiences of undocumented students as they navigate the college admissions process. Furthermore, larger trends in the recruitment and retention of this population must be examined in order to improve services on a systemic level.

The current study used the MCCTS-R as the instrument to measure multicultural competencies. The MCCTS-R for this study modified 14 out of the 32 items to state "undocumented students" in lieu of "multicultural students" (or similar terms). Changing these items compromises the instrument (Bruce, 2003). Recommendations for future research may consider incorporating Cisneros and Cadenas’ (2017) DREAMer-ally scale instead of the MCCTS-R or other similar multicultural counseling scales. The DREAMer-ally scale measures two variables: DREAMer-ally competency and DREAMer-ally self-efficacy. DREAMer-ally competency items ask participants to rate themselves using a 4-point Likert scale on concepts of preconceptions of undocumented students, challenges undocumented students encounter in higher education, and awareness of resources for undocumented students. DREAMer-ally self-efficacy items also require participants to rate themselves. These items attempt to measure participants’ self-efficacy to make their institution a safe(r) place for undocumented students, collaborating between students, faculty, and staff at their institution to be more inclusive of undocumented students, or bridging the trust gap between undocumented students and others on campus. If the current study is replicated, the items on the DREAMer-ally scale are more fitting with the activities in the professional development than the MCCTS-R scale. Therefore, future research should incorporate the DREAM-ally scale to measure participants’ undocumented student competency and their own self-efficacy.

The DREAMer-ally scale can be incorporated as a pre and post assessment, or as a post and follow-up assessment. In fact, Cisneros and Cadenas (2017) administered the DREAMer-ally scale
at several intervals including a pre, post, two-month follow-up, and eight-month follow-up. Cisneros and Cadenas (2017) found that the post to eight-month follow up was statistically significant for both the competency and self-efficacy variables in the DREAMer-ally scale than the post to two-month follow up. Therefore, it is recommend that future studies administer a post and eight-month follow-up after any professional development training.

Future studies can also incorporate other scales to measure for participants’ biases and social desirability. The Implicit Association Test (Greenwald et al., 1998) measures participants automatic affect or attitude to a wide variety of associations, including race, gender, and other categories. These results will provide the researcher with a baseline of participants’ biases to provide more context to their DREAMer-ally scale findings. Similarly, future studies can administer the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) to analyze participants’ social desirability results with the DREAMer-ally findings.

Admission counselors that participated in the current study stated that the professional development should incorporate all members of an undocumented students’ post-secondary education lifecycle. Examples of members in an undocumented students’ lifecycle include academic advisors, faculty, career staff, and other members at the college. Including these additional staff to attend undocumented student trainings serves two purposes. First, this can potentially increase the sample size of future studies. Second, this is an opportunity for researchers to measure the competency and self-efficacy of various faculty and staff throughout a college regarding undocumented students. This will provide a more holistic review of the experiences of undocumented students in the academic environment.

While growing the participant pool from just admission counselors to all faculty and staff in higher education is encouraged, inviting K-12 teachers, counselors, and administrators may also be beneficial. All these individuals reside in undocumented students’ microsystems and may not have
undocumented student competencies. They may also lack training on reducing microaggressions when interacting with undocumented students. McDonough and Calderon (2006) found that some high school counselors have a perception of unaffordability among Latino student’s post-secondary education goals and not properly advise them. These types of microaggressions can have an impact on an undocumented student’s outlook. Therefore, it is recommended that future research studies examine the effects of professional developments on the multicultural competence of K-12 teachers, counselors, and administrators as well.

**Researching undocumented students’ perspectives.** While this study seeks to add to the dearth of literature on training college admissions staff on undocumented student competencies, future research is required to evaluate undocumented students’ perceptions of higher education. Currently, the United States is experiencing a rise in “anti-Latino nativism and restrictionist backlash, particularly aimed at the rising number of undocumented college students” (Olivas, 2015, p. 356). Furthermore, President Trump has declared that he seeks to end DACA, even though two federal judges have blocked his administration from doing so (Phillips, 2018). These events and sentiments cause undocumented students to be depressed and experience lower levels of self-esteem (Arbona & Jimenez, 2014; Munoz, 2013). Research indicates, however, that positive psychology, meaning an intervention that specifically targets positive emotion, hope, and goal setting, leads to decreases in depression and increases in self-esteem (Seligman et al., 2009; Shoshani & Steinmetz, 2014). Therefore, future research must examine the experiences of undocumented students throughout the spectrum of higher education.

Researching what undocumented students feel is important to them in the college application process is a critical. The dearth in the literature, however, may be due to the difficulty of finding undocumented students to interview. Undocumented immigrants are a hidden population, which makes them a difficult population to recruit for studies (Ellard-Gray et al., 2015).
Researchers should nonetheless explore how other populations with hidden identities are recruited. An example of this would be LGBT students. Einhaus et al. (2004) recommends posting fliers at LGBT-ally centers, mailing LGBT organizations, or attending LGBT pride festivals to recruit LGBT students. Regarding undocumented students, Gonzales (2011) was able to interview 150 undocumented immigrants by establishing trust. Gonzales (2011) states that he spent “lengthy periods of time in the field gaining a rapport with respondents and community stakeholders…from various settings, including continuation schools, community organizations, college campuses, and churches” (p. 607). Researchers should anticipate similar challenges to identifying and interviewing undocumented students in future studies. While challenges exist, undocumented students’ perspectives are critical if admission counselors and university staff are to understand how to recruit this population.

Obtaining this data on a national scale can be used to compare undocumented students’ experience from state to state. Researchers can interview undocumented students from Texas, which is the first state to have passed a Dream Act in 2001 (Olivas, 2004), and compare their experiencing applying to, and enrolling in, colleges in Maryland or other states which recently passed Dream Acts. Furthermore, if researchers are able to find undocumented students without DACA, or undocumented students living in states with restrictive laws on college enrollment, researchers should interview this population to compare findings with DACA recipients’ experiences.

**Researching undocumented student trends.** The current research on DACA recipients indicates that educational outcomes are rising compared to immigrants not eligible for DACA. Specifically, DACA recipients had a 15% increase in high school graduation, and DACA women had increased college attendance by 25% (Kuka et al., 2018). Furthermore, data shows that those who obtained DACA status had greater chances of starting a new job, and achieve higher earnings.
than those who did not receive DACA and remained undocumented (Gonzales, Terrriquez, & Ruszczyk, 2014). While the research on DACA indicates that undocumented DACA recipients are making economic and social gains, a federal Dream Act has yet to pass in Congress. Lee (2006) conducted a cost-benefit analysis of passing a federal Dream Act and found that the initial implementation would cost $90 million throughout a ten-year period. Lee (2006) also concludes that the 13,000 undocumented students expected to enroll in college and graduate each subsequent year would “dwarf the $90 million cost of implementing the Dream Act” (p. 257). On a state level, Gindling and Mandell (2012) project Maryland dreamers will gross an estimated $66 million each year due to expected higher incomes, taxable income, and reduction in incarceration and public welfare rates.

Researchers must continue to evaluate the economic impact that undocumented immigrants have on states economies. States should consider the economic impact as the fundamental reason why short-term investments in training admissions counselors, and other educational staff in K-12 and post-secondary settings, is critical for long-term economic prosperity. While immigration reform divides the nation, economic growth should be a bipartisan issue.

Conclusion

The professional development was created based on the needs assessment findings and current literature review. The purpose of the intervention was to create a practical, practitioner-focused, professional development that will provide admission counselors with the knowledge, awareness, and terminology needed to become more competent with undocumented students during the college application and recruitment cycle. The post survey results indicated that the means increased after the professional development. While these results are promising, further research requires larger sample sizes to obtain generalizability. This also includes expanding the participant pool to all college faculty and staff, and not just focus on admission counselors, based on the
feedback from participants. The researcher encourages other scholars and practitioners in the field to replicate this study, and if possible to publish the results, to expand up the growing research on undocumented student professional developments.
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Appendix A

Letter of Information for Needs Assessment

“Qualitative Assessment on College Admissions: Working with Undocumented Students”

Letter of Information

My name is Erwin Hesse and I am a doctoral student at Johns Hopkins University School of Education in Baltimore, Maryland.

Undocumented students have become an emerging population since the early 2000’s. The state of Maryland recently passed the Maryland Dream Act law in 2012. College admissions offices are currently experiencing more interactions with undocumented students. There is currently a dearth of literature on the topic of college admissions offices working with undocumented students. Equally, there is limited research on undocumented student’s experiences with college admissions staff. This research will focus on the viewpoint from within a college admissions office.

I am seeking to interview college admissions staff that have direct contact with students as part of their roles and responsibilities. Whether you have interacted directly or not with an undocumented student is not a requirement. Interviews will be semi-structured and audio recorded, lasting approximately 45 minutes. There is no compensation for participating in this study.

This research assessment has been approved by the Johns Hopkins University Institutional Review Board. If you have any ethical concerns about this research or questions about your rights as a participant please contact me at ehesse@jhu.edu or 301-XXX-XXXX.

If you are interested in being part of this study or would like more information, please contact me via email at ehesse@jhu.edu. Please indicate your first name, last name, and if you agree or decline to take part of this study no later than April 15th.

Thank you for your interest in the study.

Sincerely,

Erwin Hesse
Doctoral Student
Johns Hopkins School of Education
Appendix B

Interview Questions for Needs Assessment

1. Please tell me about your current role in the Office of Undergraduate Admissions.

2. What would you like to know about undocumented students to help you in your role?

3. During your time at the [University Name] admissions office, have you directly interacted with, or believe to have interacted with, an undocumented student?
   a. If yes, how did you know, or believe to have known, that the student was undocumented?
   b. If no, move to question 4.

4. If you requested assistance on working with an undocumented student, what resources (people, website…) would you go to?

5. What kind of training have you had on working with undocumented students?

6. To what extent are you familiar with the following terms?
   i. DREAMer’s
   ii. Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)

7. If you received an email, phone call, or were told in person by a student that they were undocumented, what would be your next steps?

8. To what extent do you actively recruit undocumented students?

9. To what extent do you believe a formal training session covering the history and current state of undocumented students in higher education would benefit you or the office overall?

10. Do you have any questions for me?
Appendix C

Role-playing Script

U = Undocumented student
C = Counselor

Begin role-play with two volunteers

U: Hi, my name is Ethan (male) or Jade (female)… I want to know how to get a scholarship to help me go to your school.

C: Sure, we have scholarships that range from $2,000 to full rides per year. Just curious, what is your GPA and SAT?

U: I have a 1500 SAT out of 1600 and 4.0 with an IB diploma.

C: Wow, you sound like a great candidate for a full ride scholarship. Our deadline is quickly approaching but I can help you throughout the process.

U: That sounds great, but is anyone allowed to apply to your school?

C: I am not sure I understand your question?

U: What if I don’t have certain documents to apply?

C: Oh don’t worry, if you’re missing your letter of recommendation or an essay I can work with you on that. You’re going to be a great student at our college! I cannot wait for you to join our campus! Actually, have you been to our campus yet? It’s so beautiful.

U: Ummm, that sounds great, but I’m not sure I can afford to live on campus unless I get a full ride. But, my real concern is that I won’t be eligible for a scholarship.

C: Oh you’ll be fine. Trust me, your scores are basically at our top 5% of all applicants. Anyways, let me set you up with that campus tour.

U: I’m undocumented.

C: I’m sorry, huh? What do you mean you’re “undocumented?” (use air quotes with your hands)
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U: Like, I don’t have any documentation within the US. I came here at the age of two but I was born in El Salvador.

C: So you’re an illegal alien? How did you get here? I’m so confused? (hands scratching head)

U: Look, I just want to know if I can get a scholarship at your school. It sounds like a great place. You said the campus is beautiful right?

C: Um, I’m not sure if I can help you with that. I’m not even sure if you’re allowed to apply without a social. Sorry but maybe you should ask another school for information.

U: But you just said that my 1500 and 4.0 would make me an ideal candidate for a full ride, right?

C: Yeah, but that was before I knew you were an immigrant. There’s nothing I can do. That’s like federal government stuff. Sorry, but I have students behind you in line. Good luck though.

U: (Walks away…)}
 Appendix D
Letter of Information for Intervention

“Professional Development Seminar on Recruiting Undocumented Students”
Letter of Information

My name is Erwin Hesse and I am a doctoral student at Johns Hopkins University School of Education in Baltimore, Maryland. I am inviting you to participate in a professional development seminar on undocumented student recruitment based on your current professional background in admissions/enrollment.

Undocumented students have become an emerging population since the early 2000’s. The state of Maryland voted into law the Maryland In-state Tuition Referendum (Maryland Dream Act) in 2012. College admissions offices are currently experiencing more interactions with undocumented students. There is currently a dearth of literature on the topic of college admissions offices working with undocumented students. Equally, there is limited research on undocumented student’s experiences with college admissions staff.

I am seeking admissions staff to participate in a professional development seminar geared toward undocumented students. This seminar will consist of a one day, four hour session, and will require the completion of a pre and post survey. Participants will be asked to share their experiences and thoughts in a focus group setting. Your participation in this study will contribute to the growing literature on how to train admissions staff to improve undocumented student recruitment. I expect this professional development seminar will be beneficial to your professional and personal growth, and do not foresee any risks associated by participating.

The professional development will be hosted at the Johns Hopkins Carey Business School, located at 100 International Drive Baltimore, MD 21202. The date is set for November 10th between 1:00 – 5:00pm. If you are interested in being part of this study or would like more information, please contact me via email at ehesse@jhu.edu. Please reply no later than November 1st, 2017.

This study has been approved by the Johns Hopkins University Institutional Review Board. If you have any ethical concerns about this research or questions about your rights as a participant please contact the Principal Investigator, Dr. Ileana Gonzalez, at ileanag@jhu.edu.

Thank you for your interest in the study.

Sincerely,
Erwin Hesse
Doctoral Candidate
Johns Hopkins School of Education
Appendix E

Likert Scale Survey after Each Activity (Role Playing Example)

Role Playing

The objective of this activity was to raise awareness on how microaggressions, whether consciously or unconsciously, can negatively affect the recruitment relationship between an admission counselor and an undocumented student.

Scale

1 – Did Not Meet Expectations  \hspace{1cm} 3 – Meets Expectations
2 – Below Expectations \hspace{1cm} 4 – Exceeded Expectations

Adherence

How consistent was the objective with the actual activity?

1 \hspace{0.5cm} 2 \hspace{0.5cm} 3 \hspace{0.5cm} 4

Dose

The material covered in this session during the allotted time...

1 \hspace{0.5cm} 2 \hspace{0.5cm} 3 \hspace{0.5cm} 4

Quality of Program

The facilitator’s theoretical and practical approach for this activity...

1 \hspace{0.5cm} 2 \hspace{0.5cm} 3 \hspace{0.5cm} 4

Participant Responsiveness

The activity kept me engaged and involved.

1 \hspace{0.5cm} 2 \hspace{0.5cm} 3 \hspace{0.5cm} 4

Program Differentiation

This activity has made me a better admission counselor for undocumented students.

1 \hspace{0.5cm} 2 \hspace{0.5cm} 3 \hspace{0.5cm} 4
Appendix F

Holcomb-McCoy & Day-Vines (2004) MCCTS-R Questionnaire
Modified for undocumented students

1. My ability to discuss my own ethnic/cultural heritage.
   1 2 3 4

2. My ability to be aware of how my cultural background and experiences have influenced my attitudes about psychological processes.
   1 2 3 4

3. My ability to discuss how my culture has influenced the way I think.
   1 2 3 4

4. My ability to recognize when my attitudes, beliefs, and values are interfering with providing the best services to undocumented students.
   1 2 3 4

5. My ability to verbally communicate my acceptance of students from a culture different from mine.
   1 2 3 4

6. My ability to communicate nonverbally my acceptance of culturally different students.
   1 2 3 4

7. My ability to discuss my family’s perspective regarding acceptable and non-acceptable codes-of-conduct.
   1 2 3 4

8. My ability to discuss models of White Racial Identity Development.
   1 2 3 4
9. My ability to define racism.
1 2 3 4

10. My ability to define prejudice.
1 2 3 4

11. My ability to define discrimination.
1 2 3 4

12. My ability to define stereotype.
1 2 3 4

13. My ability to identify the cultural bases of my communication style.
1 2 3 4

14. My ability to identify my negative and positive emotional reactions toward undocumented students.
1 2 3 4

15. My ability to identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students.
1 2 3 4

16. My ability to give examples of how stereotypical beliefs about undocumented students impact the counseling relationship.
1 2 3 4

17. My ability to articulate the possible differences between the nonverbal behavior of the five major ethnic groups. (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).
1 2 3 4
18. My ability to articulate the possible differences between the verbal behavior of the five major ethnic groups.

1 2 3 4

19. My ability to discuss the counseling implications for at least two models of racial/ethnic identity development.

1 2 3 4

20. My ability to discuss within-group differences among undocumented students (e.g., DACA undocumented student vs DREAMer undocumented student).

1 2 3 4

21. My ability to discuss how culture affects an undocumented students vocational choices.

1 2 3 4

22. My ability to discuss how culture affects the help-seeking behaviors of undocumented students.

1 2 3 4

23. My ability to discuss how culture affects the manifestations of psychological disorders.

1 2 3 4

24. My ability to describe the degree to which a counseling approach is appropriate for undocumented students.

1 2 3 4

25. My ability to explain how factors such as poverty, and legal documentation have influenced the current conditions of undocumented students.

1 2 3 4
26. My ability to discuss research regarding mental health issues among undocumented students.

27. My ability to discuss how the counseling process may conflict with the cultural values of undocumented students.

28. My ability to list at least three barriers that prevent undocumented students from using counseling services.

29. My ability to discuss the potential bias of two assessment instruments frequently used in the schools.

30. My ability to discuss family counseling from a cultural/ethnic perspective.

31. My ability to anticipate when my helping style is inappropriate for an undocumented student.

32. My ability to help undocumented students determine whether a problem stems from racism or biases in others.

*Underscore represents the researcher added this term.*
Appendix G

Demographic Survey

1. Please provide the first two letters of your first name, the last two numbers of your year of birth, and the first two letters in your last name. Example: ER87HE.

2. Please circle your racial/ethnic identity. You may circle more than one if applicable.
   - White
   - Asian
   - Black
   - Hispanic
   - Other

3. Please select your gender
   - Male
   - Female
   - Other

4. Please select the amount of years you have professionally worked higher education
   - Less than 1
   - 1 - 3
   - 3 - 5
   - 5 or more
Appendix H

Focus Group Questions after each Activity

1. After completing the X activity, please share some thoughts about the overall experience.

2. To what extent do you believe the objective of the activity was met?

3. Share your thoughts if you believe something in this activity was beneficial to you with regards to undocumented student recruitment.

4. Is there anything that you believe could have been covered in greater detail that was a missed opportunity?

5. Are there any final thoughts you would like to share about the activity?
Appendix I

Final Focus Group Questions

1. Now that you have completed the professional development, please share some thoughts about the overall experience.

2. To what extent do you believe this professional development has helped you with the following:
   2a. Undocumented student knowledge?
   2b. Undocumented student awareness?
   2c. Undocumented student terminology?

3. Share your thoughts on which activity you believe was most beneficial to your position as a recruiter?

4. Is there anything that you believe could have been covered in greater detail that was a missed opportunity?

5. Please describe, if any, the impact the professional development will have on your recruitment efforts for undocumented students?

6. Are there any final thoughts you would like to share about your experience in the professional development?
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