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Abstract

This action research explores the extent of social responsibility—by means of philanthropic learning and volunteerism—that develops within the University of San Diego’s undergraduate student government leaders (Associated Students). The study further explores how the organization’s culture may influence service leadership development, and will identify opportunities within the advising methodology that may encourage students’ service to the larger community. The objective of this research is to: 1) observe whether involvement with undergraduate leadership positions (i.e. student government) can have a substantial impact on students’ conceptualization and commitment to their social responsibility to surrounding communities, 2) explore ways in which the Student Affairs division of higher education can encourage said development and commitment to social responsibility, and 3) explore methods of advising that mobilize student leaders to capitalize on philanthropic and volunteer opportunities. Desirably, the outcomes of this research will aid in the creation of a culture of ‘compassion with action’ within the Associated Students organization--translating to long-term care, engagement, and giving.
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Introduction

Defining success seems to be a lifelong mission as it can be a greatly subjective and complex concept. How one personally defines and pursues success is the driving force for many of life’s decisions. Success not only honors one’s personal values but also fulfills an internal yearning that nothing else is capable of doing. For me, success simply means doing what you love, for who you love, with who you love, and doing it well. No particular grade, degree, job position, or salary amount can be equated to the concept of success—it is more of a feeling rather than a quantifiable figure.

I received my BS in Professional Accounting from The University of Alabama Culverhouse School of Business in the Summer of 2015. Accomplished and proud were adjectives I used to describe that particular chapter of my life. Obtaining this degree was far from easy; with bumps and hurdles, the path was quite the challenge. Though difficult and strenuous, the experience was ultimately a success. While I did not receive the most notable GPA or graduate with the most honors, I persevered with many other meaningful takeaways that ultimately made the experience a success. While in school I found that a great deal of my holistic development was a result of the learning that happened outside of the classroom. As a result of my extracurricular involvement, I gained a better understanding and zeal for service and social responsibility. Doing so allowed me to establish my sense of social responsibility by donating significant amounts of time and energy to community outreach—Boys and Girls Club of America Inc., Big Brothers Big Sisters, after school tutoring programs, and various mentorship programs. Being involved in such provided me with a sense of fulfillment and meaning—this was success to me.
These successes have lent themselves to the development of a personal/professional passion for the concept of philanthropy; supporting the welfare of others by means of giving. As I reflect upon the opportunities and successes afforded to me via others’ support, this concept seems even more salient. For the past seven years both my education and professional accolades have been supported by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the United Negro College Fund (UNCF). The support of these organizations not only allow me to invest in my education without financial burden, but also provide me the platform to sew into the community. The UNCF and Gates Foundation have been major influences in my vocational scope as they serve as platforms to create opportunities that empower disenfranchised and minoritized groups. I have not only been provided access to education, but more importantly I have been given the opportunity to find meaning, define, and pursue my idea of success. The impact of this opportunity and influence is far reaching as it informs the personal values that I currently hold. With that being said, it is my responsibility to pay it forward and continue the culture of support (community engagement and philanthropic efforts) by which these two organizations have supported me.

Now positioned in Student Affairs, I have a focused and structured devotion to modeling the above values and leadership qualities for the students in which I interact with. With the right opportunities, platform, and support, I believe students’ developmental opportunities are endless.

**Researcher Positionality**

As I currently serve as the Graduate Assistant (GA) for Associated Students, I frequently interact with a variety of student leaders at the University of San Diego. The technical aspects of the GA position encompass majority both advising students on the basis of leadership and program development, and assessing program and practice effectiveness for the area of Student
Leadership Involvement and Changemaking-- both inform current observations/assumptions and give me a unique perspective as it relates to this research. As we delve into the topic of advising a group as such, it is important to note the dynamic of which the advisor serves in an external consultant capacity with no true “voting power” within the student run government organization.

Though highly productive and competent, I am often reminded how generally privileged (referring to the access to many opportunities and resources not afforded to the majority) affluent the students we serve are. Not to be misconstrued, privilege is no crime or an act worthy of crucifixion; what one does with said privilege is far more significant. Although this concept of privilege may be apparent to someone of this profession and perspective, there is undoubtedly a lack of awareness of said privilege from the student body itself. I have found that with the lack of acknowledgement of privilege lends to the general lack of compassion, understanding, and respect for others of differing backgrounds (socio-economic, cultural, racial, political, etc.)—Possibly reflected within student leaders as well. The Associated Students organization is afforded with great opportunity and resources—whether in the form of access to administrators, significant impact on the institutional policies, or an annual budget of 1.5 million dollars to be used to impact the student body. I am not always convinced that the organization is cognizant of the opportunity and potential impact that they could have on the culture of their student body.

From my own observations, lack of compassion, like other social habits, tends to be a cyclical trend—meaning it is adopted and exercised when one has personally benefitted or first handedly experienced it. This behavior is developed early on in one’s life to only be exacerbated in adult years. As mentioned earlier, some of my values are a product of influences instilled in me during the formative undergraduate years. I find that if values such as service, compassion, empathy, and selflessness are not explored early in development it is difficult to teach in later
years. Within our current political and social climate, it is evident that there is a lack of compassion for those who possess differing backgrounds, ethnicities, sexualities, genders, etc. I have faith that mankind can break this trend of intolerance and embrace a culture of support. The opportunities to catalyze this change lie within the education system. Student Affairs professionals have a unique opportunity that can greatly influence the psychological development of students by assisting in how students make meaning of their collegiate experiences—ensuring that post graduation students are more informed and positive citizens who are aware and committed of their social responsibility. Within the context of my own positionality and research, there is opportunity within the organization of Associated Students to explore and expand on this concept of social responsibility and how it translates to their current leadership development. I am hopeful that we, the global community, can continue to develop similar compassion with action that provided me with opportunities to succeed. As a Student Affairs practitioner, I want to ensure students are provided the opportunity to develop social participatory values such as community, solidarity, empathy, service leadership, and compassion. The most effective way in which Student Affairs can provide these opportunities is what drives my research—I would like to be confident that my practices are enabling student leaders to leave the university with meaningful, impactful, and long-lasting values such as compassion.

**Research Question(s)**

1) Can involvement with undergraduate student government have a positive and/or long-lasting impact on students’ conceptualization and approach to philanthropy and volunteerism?

   a. How can I, a Student Affairs paraprofessional at the University of San Diego, better encourage long-term compassion and giving within our student leaders?
Background

Traditionally, Academic Affairs has been at the forefront of higher education institution’s priorities (Sandeen, 1991). University culture suggests a never-ending pursuit for academic success and intellectual learning —after all, academia is what obtains degrees and accolades that provide vocational opportunities. Often times a parochial perspective to students’ development and satisfaction lands to the responsibility academic affairs when in actuality Student Affairs plays an integral role in students’ ability to integrate, apply, and make meaning of the cognitive skills developed within the classroom (Sandeen, 1991).

Historically, Student Affairs was considered a “peripheral or adjunct” service, meaning it was not regarded as a main educational component of the institution’s administration and deemed to only focus on students’ social and psychological development (Sandeen, 1991; Baxter Magolda, 2001). As institutional systems progressed there has been more emphasis and collaboration between Student and Academic Affairs thus acknowledging the role of Student Affairs in students’ holistic development.

As I currently serve as the graduate assistant for Associated Students, positioned in the student affairs sector of USD’s institutional system, I observe the emphasis of Student Affairs support, student involvement, and co-curricular learning first-hand, as well as the development of students through the co-curricular programming. Similarly to the Academic Affairs sector, Student Affairs seems to be on a never-ending pursuit to student “success”; in conjunction, an assessment guaranteeing quantifiable and visible data of student success—a justification of sorts. From my experience, this mission usually results in numerous, and often times redundant, extracurricular programming that intends to both increase opportunities for development,
exploration, and improve the overall student satisfaction with their collegiate experience. As I develop a deeper understanding of our work, and gain more command of personal practices, I am driven to challenge the intentionality behind this programming and true takeaways as a result of students’ involvement. The platform in which this research was developed derived from the inquiry of whether Student Affairs’ programming results in the intended developmental outcomes of students—opposed to merely serving as momentary distraction from the academic rigor of the collegiate experience.

Literature reviewed in this study has explored both the impact of student affairs practitioners and the numerous factors influencing the developmental takeaways pertaining to the topic of social responsibility. A plethora of studies have focused on the correlation of academic satisfaction and extracurricular involvement with the likelihood of alumni involvement and engagement with relative communities (Ashforth and Mael, 1992; Cook and Lasher, 1994; Drezner, 2009; Hoyt, 2004; Gaier, 2005; Marquez 2015; Smart, 2015). For instance, Noah Drezner (2009) investigates the aspects of external mentoring and developmental extracurricular programming that may, or may not, encourage “pro-social,” or voluntary behaviors within the millennial African-American demographic. Drezner examined how being affiliated with programs such as the United Negro College Fund (UNCF) and National Pre-Alumni Council (NPAC) while in undergrad lead to an increased philanthropic participation later on in life. Throughout the study Drezner utilized social exchange and organizational identity theories, how one identifies themselves based on an affiliation to a particular organization, in order to connect his findings to real life application (Ashforth and Mael, 1992)-- correlating to inquiry of the why’s of engaged students and young alumni participation. Drezner’s findings and utilized theories have influenced both the initial inquiry informing this research and the practices
explored within this research—integrating the why's of student leader programming and how one’s practices may incentivize student “prosocial” behaviors.

Studies from researchers such as Hoyt (2004) attempt to list the many post-graduation factors that may influence alumni involvement and giving to both the alma mater and the relative communities. This particular study analyzed the extent to which donor status is subjective to factors such as, but not limited to, alumni involvement, willingness to give, economic environment, charitable preferences, and capacity to give. The study theorizes the post-graduation, psychological, sociological, and biological factors that could influence donor contributions to their alma mater. Hoyt expands the fundamental theory that aligns alumnus giving to satisfaction of the collegiate experience—encompassing different levels of satisfaction and how those relate to different modes of alumni involvement. Findings suggest that institutional advancement take alternative routes to gain alumni participation—further emphasizing teaching volunteerism to students while currently enrolled at the university. To this point, my work will aim to expand upon teaching volunteerism, and other service leadership attributes, within existing extracurricular programming.

Other studies have theorized how volunteerism/service learning pertains to cognitive and social development. Astin and Sax (1999) aimed to assess long-term impacts of community and volunteer experiences within the undergraduate years by surveying two different perspectives; the general post-college development (referring to the experience of those students uninvolved in programming not encompassing service leadership) and post-college development affected by the influence of volunteerism. The findings suggest that volunteering six or more hours a week during the last year of college doubles student’s chances of being engaged in volunteer work post graduating from the institution. In this case, commitment to volunteerism was in fact something
that could be adopted and learned within the context of higher education. Although this research concluded in the early 1990’s, making it relatively outdated and lacking consideration of contemporary influences, I will be utilizing a similar mode of data collection by surveying the two different perspectives (students currently involved in the organization and alumni who were previously a part of the organization) and the theories by Astin and Sax to examine how volunteering encourages social responsibility, empowerment, and commitment to community.

Although a large number of these studies provide context that improve the understanding of historical and traditional trends of volunteerism and philanthropic engagement from those who graduate from higher education institutions, a review of the literature presents the void of studies that examine how institutions are encouraging this concept of this “social responsibility” while students are still enrolled at the universities. Of the literature reviewed, only a few seem to relate to the magnitude of practitioner influence. Inozu (2011) specifically focused on the relationship between student and out-of-classroom-faculty and how it contributes to students’ self-reported growth in practical competence and cognitive skills. Findings of this study consisted of students revealing a gain of linguistic competence, personal and vocational competence, and autonomy. Although the findings did not declare any nature of social responsibility or pro-social behavior developed from these interactions, students explicitly credit a great deal of their development to out-of-classroom-learning suggests there is an opportunity for findings from my study to be valid and significantly influential.
Context

Institution Background: University of San Diego

Overview. University of San Diego was established by Bishop Charles Francis Buddy and Mother Rosalie Clifton Hill in 1949. Today, the university is a private, coeducational, Catholic Institution, serving 8,508 currently enrolled undergraduate, paralegal, graduate and law students. Demographics of the student body consists of 51% White, 4% Black, 19% Hispanic, 8% Asian, and 18% Other. The University of San Diego has eight academic divisions and offers it’s undergraduate student body 43 bachelor's degrees, 52 minors with numerous concentrations. In addition to academic programming, USD offers a myriad of extracurricular opportunities for students to get involved outside of the classroom—Living-Learning Communities, Undergraduate Research, Community Service Learning, Ashoka Changemaker, Study Abroad, Internship Opportunities, and over two-hundred student organizations and clubs.

Mission and Core Values. The university mission states that the institution is “[…] committed to advancing academic excellence, expanding liberal and professional knowledge, creating a diverse and inclusive community and preparing leaders who are dedicated to ethical conduct and compassionate service” (University of San Diego, 2004). The university also notes that their core values of knowledge, community, ethical conduct and compassionate service are all reflected throughout the “entirety of the university’s programming”—ultimately encompasses the programming that directly correlates to my work.

Co-Curricular Student Learning

Mission. The mission of the university’s co-curricular programming is to support “[…] holistic development of students; nurturing the mind, body, and spirit.” Co-Curricular Student Learning Outcomes (CCLO’s) focus on students’ development in the areas of authentic
engagement, courageous living, identities/communities, finding purpose, and well-being (University of San Diego, 2016). The CCLO program has been utilized to assess learning and program outcomes, integrate the entire student experience by coordinating existing and/or design new intentional opportunities for students, and incentivize student engagement in the outcomes.

**Organization Background: Associated Students**

**Overview.** The Associated Students Governance branch, more commonly known as AS, serves as University of San Diego’s student government. The AS Leadership Team is comprised of the Executive Board, directors, and chairs. Non-Leadership team consists of the Student Senate arranged in a committee structure including academic, residential and commuter senators. Being that AS is an institutionally ordained student organization, the function of the group is funded by the ‘student activity fee’—0.35% of the university’s estimated cost of attendance for undergraduate students. This fee results in an average annual budget of 1.5 million dollars (student activity fee per student multiplied by total enrolled). The AS Team in its entirety works to solve student issues, create initiatives serving the undergraduate student population, serve as the official liaison between the student body and administration, and financially support several campus services (student clubs/orgs/initiatives, university centers, etc).

**Mission.** The Associated Students Leadership Team serves the University of San Diego undergraduates as official representatives, who “promote opportunities for growth and expression, address student issues, and enrich a diverse, inclusive, and engaged community” (Associated Students, 2016).

**Context Applicability**

As I review the structure of the institution’s ethos, culture, and identity (i.e. mission, vision, and how the institution honors the two) I find a multitude of programmatic and
departmental resources that aim to support student development. Whether macro influences based on racial and socioeconomic demographic of the institution, or micro influences of the policies/processes/procedures of individual student organizations, there are a multitude of facets that can be correlated to students’ perception and adoption of certain values. Within both AS’ and the institution’s identity there is an emphasis of values like community, service, and compassion. These values are articulated throughout the collective identities of the organizations and appear to be intentionally placed throughout varying and multi-level programming. This study explores student commitment to and action invested in these values as well as the institution’s, or my, intentionality in encouraging commitment to these values.

**Methodology**

**Design**

For a practitioner in any field it is imperative to one’s effectiveness to not only continue to expand knowledge of relative area of expertise, but to also avoid complacency and thus, continue to improve upon and develop one’s practices. From my own experiences, the most impactful professional development does not always present itself in the form of a training or lecture. Exercising continuous practice of inquiry, or research, has been proven to be substantially beneficial to my own development. Information obtained by this *inquiry*, and analytics of such, shall be proven pertinent by applying findings to practice—informing methods and techniques. Judi Marshall of *Living Life as Inquiry* refers to inquiry as “a range of beliefs, strategies, and ways of behaving which encourage me to treat little as fixed, finished, clear-cut […] rather I have an image of living continually in process, adjusting, seeing what emerges bringing things into question”(1998). This approach to “research” allows the practitioner to self-reflect and then act upon what is gathered; beneficial and applicable in varying capacities.
Admittedly, prior to exploring the method of Action Research, I assumedly correlated acquiring knowledge through research with the quantifiable data and numerical driven examination. Though this research does possess some quantifiable variables (number of participants in varying cycles), the qualitative data collected takes precedence. Because a significant facet of this research entails exploring and acting upon practitioner practices that may or may not influence student actions, Action Research and the qualitative dimension appears to be the most applicable. This mode of research is fundamentally relational in nature, therefore data collection and reflective aspects of this research are highly informed by various personal experiences/conversations; students whom I advised, colleagues and supervisors who served as ‘critical friends’, and the cross-referencing to established theoretical works have all established the continuous researcher centered research.

For this Action Research study I utilized the research design structure from the Center for Educational Innovation, see Figure 1. This double cyclical framework allowed me as the researcher to begin the data collection with the reflective attribute-- understanding the context of the cycle, needs of the participants, and my dual positionality as both the researcher and participant in the study. This framework presented multiple opportunities for researcher reflection that then informed the later planning and interventions. As prefaced, utilizing this design contributed to my simultaneous self-development with that of the external community-- supporting the progressive nature of the study and allowing ongoing inquiry through acknowledgement of both inner and outer phenomena.
This Action Research process consisted of two core data collection cycles that included researcher reflection, planning, action, observation, and a concluding reflection that informs the later intervention(s). The pre-cycle commenced summer 2017 with both reflective and resource data collection-- pertaining to researcher positionality and student commitment to preexisting philanthropic and volunteer opportunities both at the university and the greater community. Prior to completing the formal research reviewing process, it was imperative that I assessed the need of my research interest-- really understanding the intent and why of the study. In order to best inform the platform of the research, I familiarized myself with the philanthropy and volunteer resources and opportunities that the university offered-- a way of knowing what activities I could connect student leaders with. After solidifying the premise of the study and desired findings from the first data collection, I successfully submitted to and gained approval from the Institutional Review Board.
Participants of the initial cycle consisted of two core pools of individuals; students currently affiliated with the Associated Students team (2017-2018 senate and executive team) and university alumni (graduation class of 2017 onward) identified as alumni of the AS organization. Because interaction with the alumni was not a typical aspect of my position, it was necessary that I worked with the university’s office of Alumni Relations to obtain prospective participant email addresses. In order to gain a further understanding of how the organization impacted its members’ conceptualization and commitment in the context of the study, I surveyed both parties utilizing seemingly unified content-- the different perspectives resulting in differing responses and trends.

The first intervention, or Act, commenced at Associated Students Fall Training on August 21st, 2017. The intervention entailed my presenting a general synopsis of the research topic and offering time and space for student completion of tangible surveys entitled “Social Responsibility Explored” (Appendix A). The survey merged several tasks; students were introduced to, prompted to reflect upon, and articulate personal definitions of the concepts of philanthropy, volunteerism, and social responsibility while simultaneously expressing their relation to university resources related to such. After going through the necessary confidentiality procedures through Alumni Relations on November 10, 2017, I proceeded with the email request to roughly five-hundred identified alum. The email explained the premise and goal of the study and was accompanied by the consent form and survey link (Appendix E). Those who opted to participate completed the online survey “Social Responsibility Explored 2” (Appendix B). The online survey, accessible from (November 20, 2017) to (January 20, 2018), consisted of similar prompts as the “Social Responsibility Explored” with the addition of questions regarding their conceptualization and commitment to the university’s influence. Reviewing, reflecting upon, and
making meaning of both demographic responses then allowed me to gather pertinent information that served as a platform to later action.

Informed by data collected in the primary intervention (Social Responsibility Explored survey) and response of interest to the topic, a subset of the student participants were solicited to be a part of the secondary portion of the research (one-on-one meetings and data collection)—articulated in the initial consent form. For the period of four months, November through March, further data was collected from five student participants during routine scheduled one-on-one advising meetings. Within these meetings, in addition to the traditional professional and leadership development, concepts of service leadership (philanthropy and volunteerism) within their leadership roles were further explored. At the conclusion of the second cycle, March 2018, the selected student participants would be projected to have established and effectively run a student philanthropy, volunteer, and social engagement task force of sorts. Throughout the entirety of the Action Research process I tracked trends, progress, and challenges of both the student participants and the researcher, myself. Documenting such through journaling and note taking then allowed me to form recommendations applicable on both the institutional and individual practitioner context.

Cycles and Implementation

Cycle 1- Social Responsibility Explored
Reflection
Serving as an advisor to the Associated Students has been quite the enlightening experience. I have been able to first-handly observe students’ commitment to addressing a plethora of complex student issues. Historically, the Associated Students has been a very productive student organization--spearheading numerous successful initiatives and creative substantial changes to campus life and the student experience. While some initiatives have been
thoroughly thought out prior to starting, in working with the student leaders, I find that they have had a difficult time linking their initiative purposes to meaningful and impactful outcomes (i.e. CCLO’s; finding purpose, authentic engagement, community engagement etc.)—specifically having trouble defining the true purpose, intentionality, or why’s, of their programming and initiatives. Experimenting with and forming my personal leadership and advising philosophy has led to a particular focus to the concept of intentionality, or the directedness, or aboutness of my actions. Husserl's Phenomenology Conception of Intentionality describes intention as the content of, or meaning behind, an action. Husserl states that intentionality is “the internal component that gives the act its representational character” (Husserl, 1984). This concept further characterizes intentionality as being very relational in nature as it is related to some object, or in this case, students. With this concept in mind I felt as though student leaders, although very productive, had tended to miss the intentionality aspect to their initiatives as it relates to “creating change on campus.” Within my day-to-day meetings with students, aside from this study, I made a habit to challenge students on whom they are advocating for and what for and what sustainable impact they hope their initiative will result in; a manner of exercising intentionality. Often times student didn’t know how to articulate what it meant to lead with intention of compassion for others-- a disconnect that my study attempts to explore. After working with students to plan a large scale philanthropic and volunteer event in spring 2017 I was driven to further explore this type of intentional and meaningful programming through the lens of social responsibility.

Early on within my role, I quickly became aware of several university rules and regulations that pertain to student organizations hosting philanthropy events. With that being said, verifying that the study’s intention and possible impact would be within the scope of the students’ limitations and participation was imperative.
Before having conversations with students about philanthropic and volunteer commitment I needed to know whether they were even knowledgeable of what these concepts meant and how it either related, or not, to their current leadership role and organization.

Plan

The initial planning process consisted preparing the first intervention and data collection. Because I desired participation from the greatest number of AS members and AS alum, with the consideration of time limitations, I felt a survey was the most efficient platform. When generating the survey I had to ensure the formats, prompts, and content of the survey would all be sufficient enough to both gain interest and result in substantial data.

Because I desired for the interventions and prompts to culminate genuine and authentic responses, avoiding swaying or skewing ideas, it was imperative for the surveys encompassed plenty opportunity for open disclosure-- being able to articulate their own conceptualizations of social responsibility, philanthropy, and volunteerism. I utilized Likert scales for frequency, multi-choice options to measure volume, and open-ended questions for reflective responses.

Act

August 21st, 2017 the survey to undergraduate student leaders was administered at their semesterly training. As I presented the abstract of this study and survey to the students I articulated the voluntary nature of the entire experience-- therefore those who were genuinely receptive to the context would be participants. Initially, thirty surveys were administered and within fifteen minutes twenty-one completed surveys were returned, a 70% response rate.

On November 20, 2017 the introductory email and survey was sent to a list of four hundred and eighty three alum contacts of which twenty-nine completed responses were collected. The demographic of the AS alum ranged in ages, locations, vocations, and
experiences. The survey itself was open for two months, ending January 20, 2018, the last survey response was collected on January 4, 2018.

*Observation*

This phase involved coding and analysis of the data collected from both surveys as well as the student responses post intervention.

**Undergraduate Participants - Social Responsibility Explored**

Based on the initial responses from the Social Responsibility Explored, I gathered that students are genuinely invested in their personal leadership development while also expressing that their involvement with the AS organization is related to their desire to truly make a difference within the student life here at USD (as opposed to work study incentive, social aspect of the organization, etc.). Of the twenty-one responses for each prompt, more than half were in favor (Agree or Strongly Agree) with the statements reflecting said ideals, see Table 1.

*Table 1. Social Responsibility Explored— undergraduate survey results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to get more involved on campus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the work study scholarship was a great incentive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I desire to further develop my leadership capacity</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a number of friends in the organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe this position will help me in my future vocational path</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service leadership is an interest of mine</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This information was important to note as motivation could be a key factor to the extent of a student’s commitment to their leadership role; furthermore understanding what intrinsic motivator might encourage involvement with pro-social programming (i.e. compassion for others).

Students were given the opportunity to identify what they perceived to be “social responsible” behavior from a list of multi-choice examples. Of which, thirty-one responses were in favor of the “volunteering at a non-profit” or “creating awareness for homelessness” as socially responsible behavior—more or less expected. An interesting detail to note was that a number of participants resonated with an unconventional mode of social responsibility—signing up for a promotional program accompanied by online shopping (Amazon Smile Program) where .05% of an Amazon purchase is donated to a charity of choice. While some may argue that online shopping does not qualify as pro-social behavior, this data was interesting note while the study explores student conceptualization of philanthropy and how I as the researcher could honor the varying ways social responsibility is exercised. Surprisingly, more participants than I expected selected the option of “sporting a t-shirt promoting your greek life philanthropy event”. This action could very well be considered philanthropy as defined by the students—social responsibility does not have to be a direct action towards a cause but can be the act of creating awareness of certain issues or causes.

When prompted to identify university resources related to philanthropy and/or volunteerism of which they were familiar with students interestingly chose the same four out of the 11 options. When asked to articulate the extent of which the student was familiar with the particular resource they overwhelmingly (71% of responses) disclosed that they had “no affiliation, but have heard of it”--I suspect this is because AS funds a lot of the presented
university resources so students were familiar with the name. The disconnect and why students never got involved on their own is essentially what this study explored.

Concluding the survey responses then led to a collective definition of philanthropy and what it means in the context of the students’ own perception. Within the ‘open text’ box prompt students articulated their conceptualization by either listing words they associated with concept or creating their own definition. Reviewing the responses presented a number of similarities and reoccurring themes; words like community, giving, action, charity, donating, service, charity, time, fundraising, and community were most prevalent. One student articulated ever so eloquently that “philanthropy is a joint-effort organizational approach to addressing an issue or a problem while raising money to address that issue”, while others approached it in a more relational manner by stating it is “taking your time and privilege to support those without it/ give it to those in need” or simply “promoting public welfare through donations of time or money.”

In order to streamline this finding, in consideration of the varying thoughtful responses, I have culminated a definition to be referenced in regards to this study: Philanthropy, and pro-social activity alike, is a joint-effort organizational approach to promoting the welfare of others by addressing inequities through means of offering one’s own privileges (access, abilities, and resources).

As the survey served as both the initial data collection and intervention where students were prompted to reflect on their involvement with such matter, I spent two months, August 21-October 8, observing how students then exhibited this new found definition and if interest and inquiry arose. In this initial phase of cycle one I intentionally limited the amount of intervening to the initial survey; a hands off approach to encouraging activity. By nature of the organization and my role as advisor, students run their prospective initiatives by me so that I may provide
necessary assistance in execution. Over those several weeks I did not visibly observe students adopting or integrating more “pro-social” ideals into their student led initiatives; rather students continued to grapple with understanding their new role as a student leader. Within this timeline students experimented with involving themselves in varying on-campus causes (i.e. food accessibility, residential life matters, creating on-campus community, etc.) but none of which reflected that of the pro-social behavior referred to in this study.

*Alumni Participants-- Social Responsibility Explored 2*

Acknowledging the perspective of participants who, though currently disconnected from the organization, know the context of the organization and how it may have influenced their conceptualization was essential to this study. Obtaining data from the alumni participants, and comparing said data to that of the undergraduate participants’ ensured that I was not projecting findings based on an assumed experience within the organization. The secondary survey sent to alumni provided sentiments from varying age demographics; 10% of the respondents identified with having graduated from the institution 1-3 ago years, 19% for 4-6 years ago, 19% for 7-10 years ago, and 52% for 11+ years ago. This information is pertinent as this study inquires how being involved in this particular organization could/have influenced a sustainable, or “long-term”, commitment to philanthropy and volunteerism.

Understanding an overall satisfaction with the experience at the institution presented a clearer narrative of the biases that might have been reported in some of the survey responses. Whilst analyzing the responses of the Likert scale prompt (1-10; 1 representing *dissatisfied* and 10 representing *completely satisfied*) inquiring the alumni’s contentment with their extracurricular experience, I observed 55% of survey respondents articulated a ‘passive response’ (neutral; 7-8 on Likert scale), and the other 45% responded with ‘promoter’ (content;
9-10 on Likert scale), see Table 2. When asked to articulate their overall satisfaction with their experience at USD (academic, social, extracurricular, etc.) 9% of alumni responded with ‘detractor statements’ (unsatisfied; 0-6 on Likert scale), 27% of responded as ‘passive’ (neutral; 7-8 on Likert scale), and 64% responded ‘promoter’ (content; 9-10 on Likert scale), see Figure 2.

**Figure 1.** Social Responsibility Explored 2-Satisfaction with Extracurricular Experience—Alumni responses.

**Figure 2.** Social Responsibility Explored 2- Overall Satisfaction with USD Experience—Alumni responses.

Data presented in figures 1 and 2, suggests that alumni did in fact have positive sentiments relating to their experience here at the university and within the AS organization—validation for the following data.

In a more direct manner than what was asked in the primary undergraduate survey, I wanted to understand the extent the institution and the AS organization influenced alumni
conceptualization and commitment to social responsibility. The following graphic, Figure 4, depicts the extent in which alumni resonated with statements relating to their adoption of such:

**Figure 3. Social Responsibility Explored 2—Organizational Influence on Conceptualization—Alumni responses.**

As I reviewed the data I saw a pattern related to the extracurricular involvement (Associated Students) and alumni adoption of some type of pro-social behavior. Alumni explicitly noted that the university played a formative role in how they approached their community involvement today. Although many responses expressed passivity in relation to their current participation in philanthropic/volunteer activities, more respondents declared a genuine and steady commitment to the pro-social behavior. In addition, alumni were able to include
supplemental disclosures as it pertains to the prior prompt. Many of the statements stated that social responsibility was something practiced prior to coming to USD (i.e. family influences, parental role modeling, etc.) and that being involved in service-based organizations on campus then provided them the opportunity to develop their own approach to “action based” involvement. Several respondents disclosed that in actuality they chose to attend the university because of its pro-social identity and resources to get involved. Although there are a great deal of opportunities to be involved in such activities, as we observed from the undergraduate survey responses, there is often times a lack of knowledge, involvement, or commitment to such. One particular respondent stated that there are “a multitude of opportunities for students to immerse themselves in community engagement and to be socially responsible. However, I think at times, the opportunities were not shared as well as they could have been campus-wide.” The respondent later articulated that the one of the primary reasons they were aware of such resources was because of their involvement with AS. As reflected in both survey responses, there was a disconnect between established resources and student involvement. These findings support both assumptions that being involved with organizations with service-based missions and values could certainly have a direct impact on the behaviors post graduation, yet that there are areas of opportunity for better participation and commitment from the students.

Like in the initial survey, I wanted to gauge how the particular pool of respondents conceptualized the concept. In similar fashion, the alumni logged a number of key words and phrases that they correlated to the concept of philanthropy; giving (time, energy, talent), giving back, assistance, support, relational, educating, caring, passion, generosity, worthy cause, and resources were the most common themes. An interesting and distinguishing detail between the two survey responses was that the alumni associated philanthropy and social responsibility to
giving back as opposed to solely giving for the sake of giving in the manner the undergraduate population articulated. Alumni emphasized the relational aspect to service; whether that means having been a beneficiary of the entity they are supporting or having personal connection with the cause--that would need to be considered when exploring commitment of such within the undergraduate population.

Listed were a number of extremely articulate personal definitions of philanthropy. For the premise of this study I have combined them into one all encompassing phrase as follows:

*Philanthropy is a philosophy based on love of humanity that involves generosity in relationships and building lasting and sustainable ties between communities where learning and action come together in the form of service (time, monetary donations, expertise, passion) in the pursuit to help those in less fortunate or disadvantaged situations.*

As depicted in Figures 4 and 5, there are several similarities and differentiations between the undergraduate and alumni conceptualizations. It is imperative to note comparables like giving, time, service of the two figures. While these were common and expected responses, this study could then utilize this verbiage to communicate the varying expressions social responsible behavior. Though encapsulating numerous favorable similarities, the responses presented several differences with significant relevance to the study. While reviewing the undergraduate responses I noticed a great deal action based terms relating to service leadership (i.e. helping, serving, fundraising, donating, giving, etc.)--“Awesome,” I thought. After reviewing the alumni responses I noticed their conceptualization referred to more intentional actions. For instance, alumni expressed things like, “Passion for approving the welfare of others; Supporting by educating; Advancing the dreams of the less fortunate; Giving back; Intentional action; Love of humanity, etc.” There appeared to be more of a relational approach to these concepts. Whether
intentional or not, alumni did not record transactional connotations of *philanthropy* and *volunteerism* and instead paired the actions with intentional representation of the *who* and *why’s* of the service. Understanding intentionality could very well be the factor aligning students/alumni to the desired long-term commitment of this study—*compassion with action* requires a great extent of intentionality. This idea in mind, in conjunction with the undergraduate conceptualization, served as a platform for how I then navigated later interventions and exploration of what it might look for student leaders to exhibit this behavior.

*Figure 4. Social Responsibility Explored- word association/definition/conceptualization—Undergraduate responses.*
Reflection

Participation was an interesting dynamic in this particular cycle of the study. Because the data collected in the cycle was an essential base of the entire project I was hesitant to observe who would respond and what the responses would be. I hoped I would have a substantial amount of data with quality content. Starting the initial intervention at training was a risk; this was some of the students’ first time interacting with their advisor and we had not yet created a relationship. I honestly did not think I would get as much of a response from the amount that I did-- especially with a completely voluntary survey. Because the majority completed the survey I assumed they would then take it upon themselves to participate in these conversations/initiatives post training... I was wrong. The longer I waited to intervene the further the conversations/initiatives drifted
towards the traditional and surface level objectives (i.e. installing hammocks on campus, installing new televisions in residential halls, etc.). Because the work of AS is naturally collaborative, I had hoped student leaders who grasped the pro-social concepts/ are already involved in such would implicitly influence peers to follow suit.

At this stage I admittedly expected a lot without enacting a lot. How was I to further explore these leadership traits without students being remotely interested in the topic? Not until the October 3, 2017 check-in was I able to sit with survey data and make meaning of it and plan the later interventions. I needed to understand student conceptualization while simultaneously being aware of my own biases when they did not align with my own. It was imperative that both the students and myself recognized, and capitalize upon, their capacities to do this type of work given their talents, time, and resources. While working through how the conversations with students might have go I created more questions for myself rather than the students. In order for me truly assist in students’ development, was it possible for me to reshape my perception of what philanthropic and volunteer work looks like in this context?

Cycle 2

Reflection

In order to best prepare myself the following cycle interventions I thought it was necessary to reflect on not only the student feedback and data collected in the previous cycle, but to also revisit both definitions composed in Cycle 1 and how I could align them with student’s current capacities. I was interested to see how we might be able to build upon philanthropy within the organization entails “[...] promoting welfare of others by addressing inequities through means of offering one’s own privileges (access, abilities, and resources)” while incorporating the approach that it is a “[...] philosophy based on love of humanity that involves
generosity in relationships and building lasting and sustainable ties between communities where learning and action come together in the form of service[...].”

Planning and Modification

While planning the second intervention I wanted to be intentional about how the concepts would be presented as I observed student interest to be minimal—different than what was articulated in the survey data. The construction of ‘Student Philanthropy, Volunteer, and Social Engagement Task Force’ was derived and modeled from the existing committee structure of the AS organization. Creation of the task force simply entailed creating a mission and purpose for program structure (Appendix D) and a managing approach where the researcher would purposefully maintain minimal interference to student productivity. As part of the study I wanted to allow the activity of the group to come from students’ own autonomy, creativity, and passion for social responsible behavior articulated in the survey data.

The duration of the fall semester consisted of student leaders acquainting themselves with their newfound responsibilities, organization structure, culture, and manner of which it is run. That being said, a considerable amount of time was spent developing relationships, trust, and communication between students and their advisor (myself). Because students had proven to be fairly unresponsive to email communication, and often times unable to make the current mandatory meetings because of poor scheduling, I knew that the following intervention would be arduous to complete. Being that the implementation of the ‘Student Philanthropy, Volunteer, and Social Engagement Task Force’ was originally planned to be introduced via a pre composed email solicitation (Appendix D), I made the decision to modify by introducing the concepts in-person and aligning the task force’s objectives to the context of the standing organization committees.
Act

Adapting to student accessibility, one-on-one meetings were scheduled and committee observations were underway. With minimal direct involvement within committee discussion (in context to this study’s subject matter), I only interjected when prompted by student questions or there was a need to bring order to the collective. This phase of student activity, detailed in the following observations, allowed the researcher to then decide whether modification of methodology was/is appropriate—additional interventions to be implemented if needed.

Observation

The following phase of Cycle Two commenced early October 2017 when opportunity presented itself in the form of student driven interest of community involvement and engagement. Interventions consisted of revisiting the concepts of service, volunteering, and philanthropy with the subset of participants—experimenting with ways in which my practice mobilized them to act upon their pro-social initiatives. The following excerpts describe the observations (per participant) from the experimental timeline from initial meetings through March 2017—each interaction/conversation informing the later.

Participant 1

February 2, 2018: I was able to sit with an executive member that walked me through of few of their initiatives this semester that aligned with past conversations regarding the organization’s giving nature. Participant 1, in contrast to some of the other research participants, had already had an extensive commitment to volunteer work prior to this study. They provided great insight on what it might look like to enable others, the AS team, to have similar commitment.
Early in the semester several exec and senate members proposed a new initiative that attempted to empower the student body/student organizations to explore innovative approaches to get involved with and serve the surrounding Linda Vista community. This “Community Project Fund” initiative was spearheaded by Participant 1 and aimed to provide student organizations with a monetary incentive/support to fund student org volunteer/philanthropic events. The fund itself was financed through this participant’s individual AS budget—of which derives from the student activity fee. To this point, I learned that it is in fact plausible for the student activity fee, the organization’s access and resources, to be utilized for substantial purposes related to this study—creating sustainable ties between communities. Within our conversation the student disclosed that, “AS has not traditionally been involved with much beyond the walls of the university but this is the first step!” This statement then prompted my own reflection on what “being involved with volunteerism”, or community involvement, might look like for these student leaders. Might student leader’s mobilization of the student body to be volunteer and philanthropically active be a desired outcome of this research?

Mobilization of others appeared to be a recurring theme throughout our conversations. When discussing the progress of planning the organization’s ‘Night Without Shelter’ event (a large scaled event with the mission of homelessness awareness; including guest speakers, care package assemblage, and volunteering within the homeless community) Participant 1 admittedly delegated the idea to a committee without much follow-up. Participant 1 essentially presented an idea without providing much support in planning the execution or understanding the intention of such event. It’s probable that this approach was not the most effective delivery as the committee quickly moved on to working other prioritized initiatives. A bit discouraged by the lack of collective motivation behind executing the event, Participant 1 concluded that the organization’s
values simply did not align with his own (i.e. community involvement, volunteerism). Whether the organization valued volunteerism was not a question for myself as a majority disclosed some sort of interest within the ‘Social Responsibility Explored’ survey. The challenge for Participant 1 and myself then became how to ensure the organization was equipped with the tools (referring to and understanding of the importance/impact) necessary to host an initiative of that magnitude or simply be involved in other pro-social programs. Participant 1 was versed in this type of work and therefore was comfortable spearheading an initiative like this but failed to recognize where the rest of the organization was developmentally (in reference to serving in this capacity).

**Participant 2**

Participant 2’s meetings provided a great platform to which I approached other conversations with the remaining participants. During our first meeting on November 17, 2017 we worked on re-defining social responsibility in the context of the individual student. Although Participant 2 completed the initial survey they felt their approach to the concepts could be better articulated in person. Participant 2 expressed that social responsibility should be approached in a “subjective manner”—meaning that in the context of AS it could be better adopted by tailoring it, or aligning it, to individual student values and passions. For instance, Participant 2 articulated their passion for helping others in the manner of manual labor. Participant 2’s ideal of impactful service derives from actually *doing things* for others as opposed to giving donations or “hands off helping” (i.e. their involvement in assisting with natural disaster relief, providing manual labor for local community center renovations, etc.). With this approach in mind I challenged Participant 2 to explore ways in which his passion for the hands on service could align with the service programming of AS.
On November 30th, Participant 2 proposed an amendment to the Student Organization Committee Bylaws to include funds supporting community service and involvement—“Community Project Fund” as referenced earlier. In collaboration with Participant 1 they were able to express why this proposal should be considered and why it essentially aligned with the mission of the AS organization. By referring to their own experience with community involvement, and the connection between their role in AS and service leadership, Participant 2 effectively gained the interest and support from their peers. On December 7 the amendment officially passed. Shortly after, Participant 2 chose to leave the organization in order to focus on school and other involvements. Though I was unable to further observe Participant 2 in the context of AS, I have observed them continuing to exercise their commitment to the Linda Vista community by volunteering within local mentoring programs. Whether interventions within this study influenced said commitment is inconclusive; I am comforted by the simple fact that the participant departed the organization yet continues to exercise service leadership and volunteerism.

Participant 3

February 12, 2018 marked the first time I observed Participant 3 explicitly addressing the topic of service within his role. Our one-on-one meeting revolved around the conversation of what it means, and might look like, to serve the greater community (outside the walls of USD) within the context of being a student leader. The conversation brought up several pivotal and important aspects associated with university policy, organizational structure and bylaws that might have impacted the magnitude of student involvement with philanthropic activity.

In reference to a statement I made (prior to the inception of this study) regarding “programming with intentionality” and “responsible resource stewardship”, Participant 3
inquired about utilizing the student activity fee for more than “surface layer activities”; *surface layer activities* pertaining to hosting social events, funding materialistic luxuries (i.e. new televisions in residential halls or installing hammocks around campus). Although fairly ambiguous, the Associated Students Bylaws stress that the AS funds (derived from the university’s student activity fee) shall be utilized to improve experience of, assist, and benefit the *undergraduate population* (opposed to other on and off-campus populations). Participant 3 articulated that although they did not have extensive experience in the AS organization, or utilizing the AS fund for their initiatives, they observed that it was just “simpler” to put on the “surface layered activities” that appeared to benefit the student population. “If not these sorts of initiatives, what would you suggest,” I asked.

Participant 3 then attempted to illustrate programming that added to the student’s “learning experience” rather than “just the ‘fun’ experience.” “I don’t perceive USD as being the most advocate-like school… or a school with extensive community engagement for that matter,” added Participant 3. In reference to the difference in popularity and attendance rates of varying university events/programs, the student concluded that the student body simply doesn’t value other types of programs as they do the “surface level” ones. This student might have demonstrated a personal interest in exploring more pro-social programming but was not convinced that the student body, or their organization, would be as receptive to the idea. Because I too held similar sentiments and did not have an “expert” response to his statement, I was uncertain how to coach him through it. Utilizing prompts reflective of the research questions of this study, I responded in a manner that would require the two of us working together to answer. “What would it look like to mobilize a culture here at USD to **want** to serve others like the university's modeled ethos? What does it look like to mobilize AS and begin the culture shift?”
Very thoughtfully, Participant 3 expressed that they believed the shift would likely be driven by AS as the organization has great influence on the student body. The question of concern then inquired how we might mobilize the organization itself.

Eager to begin the process of gaining peer buy-in, Participant 3 asked my opinion on effectively presenting this idea to their committee. “Does it have to be a particular committee to spearhead this? Does it have to be an adjunct committee or something like that?” Because I had first handily observed how students responded to supplemental task being added to their already busy schedules, I was sure to steer the student in a direction that did not result in a lack of peer commitment. I affirmed the student that “it can look like anything you want ” and that they “do not need an additional committee, title, or be designated in order for you all to serve in the magnitude that you desire.” By the end of our meeting both the student and myself were challenged to reflect on how we wanted to move forward.

Our second meeting, February 26th, was a very productive meeting where the student prepared a very detailed agenda which entailed reviewing a list of current projects—some of which relating to our previous meeting’s conversation. Prior to this meeting, Participant 3 was prompted to reflect on their role in the organization and to construct a personal mission of “changemaking” (referring to their specific role/title within the organization). Participant 3 articulated that community service had always been a value of theirs of which their family instilled in them. The student desired to explore this community engagement in the context of being autonomous student. They expressed that the exploration of such had led them to their involvement with the AS organization. Participant 3 aspired to both continue serving in some capacity while getting involved as a student leader. This urge to serve had led Participant 3 to
being involved in a number of pro-social initiatives with varying on-campus organizations, departments, and centers.

As the student informed me of the numerous initiatives they were involved in I noticed an interesting pattern; although very productive Participant 3’s activity was disconnected from that of their AS duties. Participant 3 had managed to work with numerous on and off-campus partners, assemble groups of students and administrators, and align various resources but none of which concerned AS. Impactful in it’s own right, Participant 3’s work was done in a siloed manner; there was not a great deal of intersectionality happening between their AS related work and other involvement. I interjected in order to examine why this was the case. In essence, Participant 3 disclosed that they were unsure whether the work they were doing, or the people they were working with, aligned with that of their AS responsibilities therefore they worked on them separately. The student essentially worked twice as hard trying to fulfill their duties as a member of AS while simultaneously completing other responsibilities. “Why cant the work you’re doing be considered AS work,” I asked. I assured the student that just because an initiative does not derive from the organization itself does not mean the organization could not support or marshal resources towards said initiative. Associated Students does not explicitly limit what productivity is within the organization but it also does not explicitly capitalize on student leader’s additional on and off-campus involvement (in this case involvement in the community).

Compartmentalization of work appears to be a trend between several of the Participants in this study. I offered the idea of “working smarter not harder”—challenging the student to allow their various roles/involvement to inform one another. My statements appeared to resonate as Participant 3 reiterated that they had noticed the pattern as well. The student had been doing the type of work I attempted to coach him through but was doing it separately from the
organization. If AS were to capitalize on Participant 3’s productivity, and get involved in such activities, we needed to further explore ways in which Participant could mobilize the team to follow suit.

March 20, 2018 marked our final meeting within the parameters of this research. Within this meeting we solidified several action plans that led to inspiring and impactful initiatives that entailed the mobilization of campus community members. Throughout the semester I had been challenging Participant 3 to reflect upon what it might look like to not only model the type of productivity they exhibited, but to also mobilize their team to do the same. I reiterated to the student that mobilizing a group in this capacity is no small notion and that their leadership would definitely be tested. Within our conversation Participant 3 disclosed that some initiatives they offered to their committee were taken up but majority were not. It was apparent that the student was frustrated by the lack of energy and commitment their committee had towards the presented initiatives. Participant 3 was passionate about this type of service leadership but could not attain buy-in from his fellow committee members. Instead of dwelling on the lack of engagement from the team, Participant 3 decided to go a different route. Opposed to just focusing on mobilizing their team the student shifted their focus to creating opportunities for the larger student body to engage with the surrounding San Diego community. Determining the most effective way to present the importance of this work/involvement that would gain interest from their constituents was the next task. Ironically, this disconnect was also something I grappled with through the entirety of this study; I could offer a definition of philanthropy and volunteerism but how would I, we, express the significance in a manner that would result in commitment?
The conversation of mobilization and “beginning a culture shift” within the undergraduate student population then led our focus to Participant 3’s final proposed initiative—“reframing the C in USD’s LLC program.”

The University of San Diego’s first-year LLC program (Living Learning Communities) is a theme based grouping system that aims to ease academic and social transition to university life, expand upon intellectual curiosity outside the classroom, and establish a sense of community between faculty, students, and administration. First-year students self select themes they resonate to their interest (Cultivator, Collaborator, Advocate, Illuminator, or Innovator) and will serve as a platform to their engagement with ‘Changemaking’ (University of San Diego, 2017).

Being a first year student and having an immediate experience within this programming, Participant 3 expressed a feeling of disconnect between the program’s intention and the tangible outcomes. “I understand the purpose of the LLCs but I do not think the structures and parties involved are aligned in a way that make the programming super effective,” stated Participant 3. The student then asked what I thought about the idea of “expanding the ‘C’ of LLC” and reframing what “community engagement and involvement means in the first year experience.” I was ecstatic to observe the Participant’s innovative approach to beginning this culture shift at the university. The student saw an opportunity for the university to further expand on the learning opportunities of the LLC program and capitalized on it. Participant 3 and myself devised an approach in which he could effectively propose the modifications to administrators-- aligning the reframing of community engagement to that of the university’s ethos of service and compassion seemed most suitable. Involvement in the surrounding Linda Vista community (including but not limited to volunteering) is an on-going conversation of the campus and Participant 3 sought ways to put action to it. In collaborating with on-campus community involvement professionals, Residential Life administrators, and other Student Affairs professionals, this student leader had made this initiative more than an idea. I was delighted to observe this participant utilizing their
resources and access to make significant change on campus that would ultimately influence the entire first-year population. I was also enthused by the intentionality of creating opportunities for students to learn attributes of service leadership and begin to develop pro-social qualities. Following the conclusion of this study Participant 3 continues to work on this initiative. I gladly continue to provide support and consultation to the process.

**Participant 4**

‘Meaning-making’ and motivation were two recurring themes utilized to understand this particular student’s intention in serving as a student leader. While gaining an understanding of the student’s motives I hoped to encourage more pro-social ideals and actions within their leadership. November 29, 2017 Participant 4 and I began the reflective journey in making meaning of their current role as a student leader—we referred to this as the “why conversation.”

Like most student leaders within this organization Participant 4 expressed that they were in their role in order to “make a difference on campus”, “serve the undergraduate population”, and “develop their leadership skills.” I very inquisitively interjected their statement with a simple question of “Why?” Taken aback Participant 4 hesitantly responded with a, “Well, I don’t know; I feel like this is what I am supposed to do.” “Why,” I countered. At that point it was evident the student was stumped. I expressed to the student that within my own studies I had learned that being able to answer “Why” at least four times reveals true intention behind our actions—the underlying purpose. I clearly had their attention and continued to explain how this concept was applicable in the context of being a student leader.

The work we (you, myself, and AS) do is not just for this here and now; not just for the current student body; not just for the sake of generating cool initiatives for today. The purpose and vision of your experience as student leader is for you to experiment with your leadership, develop yourself as a whole person, and be prepared to be a contributing member to society after you leave the institution.
I made it a point not to discredit the work that the student was doing for the campus but wanted to emphasize the importance of truly understanding their “why” and approach to “serving the undergraduate population.” “What does it mean to serve the undergraduate population? What might it look like for you to serve them in a different capacity… to serve their developing minds,” I ended. The student was clearly absorbing what I had to share as they took notes and quoted some of what I said to share with their committee. Prior to this meeting I had not used that speech before so I am pleased that it was comprehensible and not too extraneous. Concluding the meeting the student articulated an appreciation for the conversation and resonated with a great deal of the content. I was interested to observe the extent of which the student’s actions would then alter post our “why conversation.”

On February 13, 2018 Participant 4 and myself reconvened after an extended time away from campus. Within this meeting we revisited a conversation of the proposed ‘Night Without Shelter’ event (NWS). Back in late 2016/early 2017 Participant 4 and myself collaborated on a large-scaled event that aimed to bring the USD community together in solidarity and expose the USD student body to the eminent issue of homelessness affecting San Diego. The event consisted of students spending the night outdoors while assembling resources (donated toiletries, supplies, care packages, clothes, etc.) to be distributed to the homeless population of downtown San Diego the morning after. The NWS was a great success and inspired Participant 4 to bring the event back this year. During our brainstorm Participant 4 proposed several ways to get the event planning up and going—one of which was establishing an ad hoc committee to be in charge of hosting the event. I shared with Participant 4 my personal experience with attempting to establish yet another ‘task force’ to spearhead an initiative. Trying not to discourage the student from at least attempting to get a group together to host this event, I felt it was imperative
to be transparent and not let the student waste their or my time with waiting on other AS members to be commit in this imitative. I had been down this road before. The student articulated that they were uncertain whether his assigned committee would be perceptible to leading such movement/event with this objective (volunteering with homeless, homeless awareness). “How do you suggest I propose this to the group? I feel like if I just drop an event like this (referring to the magnitude of the homeless issue) in front of them they would not really be knowledgeable of, interested, or committed” Participant 4 stated. Once again, the reservation of effectively mobilizing a group to be involved in pro-social programming arose. My suggestions were to:

1. Start with a simple dialogue; focus on understanding the group’s interests and desired initiatives.
2. Following the committee’s statements, begin discussing the objective and focus of your own interest and prospective initiative, NWS.
3. Try to align peer interest/desires/capabilities to that of the event’s objective then get a read of the group’s response.

In my own practice I felt that this approach not only gave students a sense of ownership of the event/initiative but also has led students to envisioning themselves and their abilities playing a significant part in the success of the event and intended impact. Personally I thought this coaching was a gem but it proved to be not as impactful as I had hoped. As time passed, and the semester/this study came to a close, NWS 2018 remained an idea. As Participant 4 aligned their committee and resources to execute the event, other task, responsibilities, and on-campus causes took priority. The event did not happen and I unfortunately did not observe the respective committee exhibiting any more interest in pro-social programming than before. I did however
observe Participant 4, on their own accord, taking initiative to be more involved in the weekend homeless outreach. Additionally, Participant 4 continued to involve themselves in conversations pertaining to AS and community involvement.

**Participant 5**

Interactions and interventions with Participant 5 revolved more around holistic development rather than solely focusing on the objective of this study—of which I learned was just as valuable as the other Participant interactions. November 18, 2017 Participant 5 and myself spent a great deal of time understanding our leadership roles and revisited the “why conversation.” Though very driven and energetic, I found that Participant 5 was in the early stages of their leadership development. The student was extremely intrigued by the idea of leadership yet had not yet come to an understanding of what leadership actually entailed. Similar to other one-on-one meetings I prompted Participant 5 to disclose why they decided to serve as a student leader. Reflective of other students’ responses the student replied with, “I want to make a difference!” “But why, what does that actually mean,” I returned. In response Participant 5 articulated that serving in leadership was something they were “born to do.” They then listed several previous leadership roles they held and disclosed how holding those roles made them feel. Participant 5 essentially associated leadership with a sense of validation of their intellect and power. I had known this student to seek confirmation by the extrinsic facets of their leadership (i.e. ensuring that the title engraved on their name tag appeared to be the “most respectable”), but I was intrigued to observe it being articulated vocally. I noticed there was a great deal of “I” and “My” in the student’s verbalization of their purpose in being in leadership. Before our time was up I felt it was important to begin a discussion of intrinsic benefits in comparison to extrinsic motivators of leadership. In order to arrive to the importance of
intrinsically motivated leadership I prompted the student to list a few attributes of “good” leadership. Participant expressed that “self-motivation, responsible, accountability, and ability to empathize” were all related to their idea of effective leadership. Capitalizing on the “empathetic” statement I then led our conversation to understanding how empathetic actions entailed authenticity and the ability to acknowledge others’ perspectives—true intentionality. I attempted to make sense of this type of behavior by aligning the student’s idea of “making a difference” and “serving the student body” with truly understanding whom they serve, why they serve, and what motivates them to serve.

I offered Participant 5 the opportunity to articulate how they believed empathy was a facet of “good” leadership. The student articulated that, “someone in leadership should be able to sense what others need so they know how to serve them.” “Right,” I responded. “So leadership, or ‘good’ leadership, means leading from a place with others in mind and not ourselves, correct?” “Yea,” the student responded. I then challenged the student’s response by listing off a few statements I quoted from their own expression of the why’s of their leadership. “The two do not really align; what you articulated as attributes of good leadership and what you expressed as motivators of your own leadership are not the same,” I stated. I was pleased to know that this participant had been able to express some pertinent traits of great leadership but I felt it was important for us to align their ideas to their actions. While serving others and empathetic actions compliment one another, the intrinsic motivation of serving others while extrinsic benefits are absent, or non-factor, lends itself to a sustainable commitment to the type of leadership I had hoped to cultivate.

Reflect
Reviewing collected data of Cycle 2, whether noted in the above observations or mere inexpressible experiences, has proven to immensely impact both student and researcher learning. Although the platform of this study revolved around pro-social behavior, Cycle 2 had revealed more niche aspects of facilitating that type of effective *compassionate leadership*. Themes such as trial and error, mobilization of groups, defining productivity, compartmentalization of work, and intention/meaning appeared to be the most prevalent. Early on in the cycle I learned that sometimes advising, teaching, and research implies some sort of rejection and that “whatever happens can and should be treated as meaningful data rather than an ‘error’” (Fisher, 1991; Torbet, 1995; Marshall, 1998). Reflecting back to the initial processes of this study I wish I had more effectively experimented with a hands-on approach to the beginning interventions. If anything I learned that, although very autonomous, student productivity might be more compelled by an established plan, structure, or role modeling. Because of the nature of this organization, peer mobilization or advisor role modeling would have been imperative to its adoption of pro-social programming.

In all honesty prior to proposing the task force I knew that there was a considerable chance that there would not be much follow through. Not that I was projecting onto students as being genuinely disinterested in the topics of philanthropy or volunteerism, or incapable of exercising compassionate leadership, I was acknowledging how busy the student leaders get during the semester—adding yet another meeting or task would have been perpetuating the over programmatic trend in student affairs.

While observing productivity of student leaders (in the context of commitment to philanthropic or volunteer work) I found several interesting influences related to the very structure of the organization. Like majority of governing systems, policies, bylaws, and power
arrangements align, or create order within, the organization in order for them to serve in the desired capacity—in this case, “serve the undergraduate student population.” I often felt that the committee structure and culture would somewhat limit the possibilities of student involvement. In some manner or another students expressed that they thought they were expected to move under the umbrella of the designated committee or assigned task. This perception often led to student compartmentalization of duties.

I have discovered that more often than not students tend to compartmentalize their work and involvement here at USD. A majority of the participants had various leadership positions both on and off campus yet chose to work independently of one another. For example, one participant was also involved with Fraternity and Sorority Life philanthropy and community involvement yet did not allow that work to inform their work in AS. Students’ leadership and community involvement did not intersect unless explicitly articulated in position responsibilities.

Though unintentional, I believe Student Affairs tends to offer a limited scope of student community involvement. There is definitely more opportunity to acknowledge and honor varying types of involvement, acts of compassion, and crossover of objectives. I concluded that it is not always about adding additional programming (i.e. task force) but rather creating an opportunity for students to develop their approach to service leadership and intentionally integrating more of the pro-social behavior into existing duties (student involvement in philanthropic, volunteer, social responsibility activity). Creating social value to this work is more than a notion. I believe compassionate leadership of this magnitude exceeds merely facilitating single donation or volunteering and be done—it is about developing an intrinsic love of humanity and desire to promote the welfare of others.
Researcher Findings, Learning, and Inquiry

A culmination of the research process, data collected, interactions experienced, and prompted reflections have provided great opportunity for the immeasurable researcher learning. Though some of the development gained could only be expressed in future practice, the following section will illustrate researcher’s retrospective connection of the action research findings utilizing 1st, 2nd, and 3rd person inquiry.

1st Person Inquiry

During this 1st Person I found a great deal of similarities between on my own values/assumptions/behaviors and that of the research findings. Prior to beginning this study I acknowledged several personal assumptions of the context in which I would be working with; students were simply incapable of, or completely unfamiliar with, what it meant to serve people other than themselves. I now acknowledge that this was naively informed by my own perception of the student body (i.e. privileged, not known for advocacy work, etc.). In actuality, student leaders not only possessed concrete conceptualizations of service leadership but also valued that type of work. I concluded that there was simply a disconnect between this compassionate service and the responsibilities/expectations of their current roles.

As the study’s findings emerged I observed an undesirable similarity between student activity and that of my own. Ironically, the more work, life, school, and this study became more demanding the less time I gave to others. I found that I was no longer investing in the community in the magnitude that I traditionally had. My mentoring relationships became more distant, and Saturday mornings became opportune “sleeping in” time rather than the usual “Volunteer Saturday.” I essentially was perpetuating the needs assessment of this very research. Reflective of what I observed from students, these acts of compassion became just additional tasks or
chores on top of my very busy life schedule. I acknowledge that I too need to avoid compartmentalizing the varying aspects of my life and integrate day-to-day task with socially responsible acts. I anticipate that role modeling these desired leadership traits would benefit both my practices and that of which the students I interact.

2nd Person Inquiry

From the inception of the study’s brainstorming phase I wanted to ensure that I intentionally maintained an open boundary between what I learned in class, experienced in the workplace, and reflected upon in everyday life. Intention for doing so was to alleviate possible burnout associated with research—because there were more intersections than not the context of the study was extremely applicable. The nature of the action research provided a space where I had to dialogue with others in order to facilitate inquiry past my own perspective. With the 2nd Person Inquiry in mind, I found great value in understanding the “customer need” before providing a service (i.e. providing my support after students expressed what they need in order to effectively exercise service leadership). This inquiry also led to consultation from fellow colleagues, or critical friends, who often interacted with the research participants as well. Colleagues empathized with the experience of working with student leaders within a student-run organization—validating the challenges and hurdles of mobilizing students from an adjunct position. These dialogues provided an opportunity to reflect on the approach in which I presented ideas to students and compare them to the effective manner in which my colleagues advised students.

Creating a community of inquiry does in fact present some challenges for my own practices. Acknowledging and honoring the different developmental stages present in the group being mobilized will be an on-going practice. Additionally, I have learned that not all external
input and inquiry would be constructive to the study’s context, but would, in some form, be informative to my own professional practice.

3rd Person Inquiry

Noting an objective and macro perspective of the study’s findings is essential to its applicability. The study’s interventions and findings did result an increase of several student’s involvement with pro-social initiatives but the true objective of the study is encourage a sustainable commitment to a cause. While the study explored how alumni exhibited social responsibility post enrollment, it is beyond the scope of this study to measure the extent of the impact made on current undergraduate participants after leaving the university. More significant than a quantifiable finding, intentional institutional actions and the expansive cultural shift pertaining to compassionate action is the goal. The interventions here are mere conversations to start larger movement. We can identify philanthropy as a philosophy based on love of humanity that involves generosity [...] and [...] a joint-effort organizational approach to promoting the welfare of others [...] but what does it take to actually put action to it? Through this inquiry I concluded that although institutional structures have great impact on what and how we learn, institutions don’t teach people, people teach people. We as individuals must facilitate innovative ways of thinking, experimenting with approaches to giving and service, and avoid a parochial scope to compassionate action.
Recommendations

Based on findings derived from the study’s interventions, observations, and researcher inquiry, I have created several general recommendations to be considered on organizational/institutional, and individual levels of mobilizing Compassion with Action.

Associated Students and Organizations alike shall:

- **Practice varying levels pro-social programming**: Philanthropic and volunteer activity should be included within the organization’s structure. Engaging in socially responsible behavior can/should be developed while developing leadership styles; providing opportunity to do so is key. As many other on-campus organizations, Associated Students should explicitly articulate involvement of sorts within communication’s programming (similar to philanthropic officers within Fraternity and Sorority Life organizations).

- **Explore innovative ways to explicitly include compassionate values within existing programming and initiatives**. For instance, if your organization hosts a social event (i.e. concert, mixer, “lunch and learn,” etc.) find ways to incorporate attendee involvement with donating resources and/or time by utilizing incentives (i.e. those who donate to the affiliated non-profit is entered for a raffle or sorts).

- **Intentionally and explicitly integrate service within student leader responsibilities**. Doing so not only begins a conversation on what service leadership means within their individual capacities but also further augments a sense of accountability within student leader productivity.

Student Affairs Practitioners shall:

- **Advise and mentor from a place of role model leadership**. Several studies show that referent influence, or the ability of a leader to mobilize individuals, is best exhibited by
the positive interpersonal relationships and example setting of role modeling (Russell & Stone, 2002; Raven, 1959; Yukl, 1998). Role modeling these behaviors and values not only visibly illustrates expectations but also provides great encouragement to those following.

- **Advocate for crossover of students’ varying responsibilities.** Student leaders are traditionally involved in numerous and varying extracurricular activities, practitioners should honor and capitalize on said involvement. Encouraging student leaders to avoid working compartmentally, allowing varying affiliations/involvement to inform one another, should both decrease burnout and increase productivity.

**Reflect on the extent of which we prepare students for service leadership positions.** Early on advisors should begin exploring student’s understanding and conceptualization of leadership and begin assisting students with aligning their talents, interests, and passions with their role responsibilities. This action should not only increase accountability and action within students’ roles but also begin teaching students to work from a place of intention. When advising a “student run” organization (referring to the on-going balance of holding formal authority yet serving as an external consultant to the autonomous organization) advisors should be intentional about preparing students for serving in their roles so that productivity happens sooner.
Conclusion

Though the study concludes, the work of compassion with action shall not. Like noted in the study, this type of work is not transactional and shall be an ongoing cultural shift led by leaders of tomorrow. In reference to the research question, we observe that involvement with undergraduate student government can most certainly have a positive and long-lasting impact on students’ conceptualization and approach to philanthropy and volunteerism. One of the study’s limitations is its inability to measure the extent of impact made on current undergraduate participants after leaving the university but I am comforted as I observe the current impact on student’s commitment to the work. Though this research experience has posed many challenges relating to student involvement/accessibility, organizational support, time, and researcher capacity, I am more driven than ever to continue this exploration. As I continue to refine, reframe, and rethink my own approach to this work, as Higher Education professional and service leadership practitioner, I better understand how I can facilitate the value of compassion and giving with all those who I interact.
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Appendix A

People define Philanthropy in a variety of ways.

I joined Associated Students because...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to get more involved on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the work study scholarship was a great incentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I desire to further develop my leadership capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a number of friends in the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe this position will help me in my future vocational path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service leadership is an interest of mine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you none of the above apply to why you joined Associated Students please explain

People define philanthropy in a variety of ways. In a few sentences, please provide YOUR idea of philanthropy. (i.e. examples, definition, etc.)

Based on your previous response: Of the following acts, check all that you would consider an example of social responsibility?

- [ ] Donating $25 to a charitable cause online.
- [ ] Volunteering at a local non-profit a few hours a month
- [ ] Putting on a small scale event in order to obtain clothes for homeless veterans
- [ ] Donating $1,000 to a scholarship fund.
- [ ] Signing up for Amazon Smile Program (a foundation that will donate .05% of your Amazon purchases to a charity of your choice)
- [ ] Sporting a t-shirt promoting your greek life philanthropy event
- [ ] Graciously tipping your waitress
- [ ] None of the Above

There are a few organizations/events/programs at USD that may or may not be widely known, from the provided lists, please select those you are familiar with.

- [ ] Law Alumni Board Philanthropy and Scholarship Committee
- [ ] Give and Invest For Toreros (GIFT) Program
- [ ] AS Endowment Fund

Please explain how you are familiar with the organization/event/program(s) you chose in the previous question
(For example, "I am an active member of______", "I've worked on______", "I have no affiliation with______ but I
have heard of it", etc.)

Mark the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The main reason I went to college was to get a well-paying job.</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Click to write Scale point 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After I graduate, donating to other non-profit organizations will be more important to me than donating to USD.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As USD's tuition increases, donations matter less.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations from alumni do not have much of an impact on my day-to-day experience as a student.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a current student, USD deserves my support (e.g., volunteering, donations).</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD does not need my money.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have enjoyed my time here at USD.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once I land a high paying job I will have more time and resources to give back.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service leadership is a value of mine.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Default Question Block

Institutional Review Board

Research Participant Consent Form

For the research study entitled: Compassion with Action: Cultivating Long-Term Philanthropic Morale Within Undergraduate Student Leaders

I. Purpose of the research study
Novien Yarber is a graduate student in the School of Leadership and Education Science Masters of Higher Education Leadership at the University of San Diego. You are invited to participate in a research study he is conducting. The purpose of this research study is to understand student affair’s role in facilitation of long-term philanthropic morale.

II. What you will be asked to do
If you decide to be in this study, you will be asked to:
Complete a questionnaire about your conceptualization of philanthropy and how your current/past role in Associated Students has shaped that conception.

Your participation in this study will take a total of 20 minutes.

III. Foreseeable risks or discomforts
This study involves no more risk than the risks you encounter in daily life. Sometimes when people are asked to reflect on their feelings, they can sometimes feel sad or anxious. If you would like to talk to someone about your feelings at anytime you can call toll free, 24 hours a day: San Diego Mental Health Hotline at 1-800-479-3339 or the USD Counseling Center at 619-260-4655

IV. Benefits
While there may be no direct benefit to you from participating in this study, the indirect benefit of participating will be knowing that you helped researchers better understand how to encourage compassion and service leadership within his practice.

V. Confidentiality
Any information provided and/or identifying records will remain confidential and kept in a locked file and/or password-protected computer file in the researcher’s office for a minimum of five years. All data collected from you will be coded with a number or pseudonym (false name). Your real name will not be used. The results of this research project may be made public and information quoted in professional journals and meetings, but information from this study will only be reported as a group, and not individually.

If you are requesting a Certificate of Confidentiality, consult your IRB representative and the NIH website:
http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/coc/

VI. Compensation
You will receive no compensation for your participation in the study.

VII. Voluntary Nature of this Research
Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You do not have to do this, and you can refuse to answer any question or quit at any time. Deciding not to participate or not answering any of the questions will have no effect on any benefits you’re entitled to, like your health care, or your employment or grades. You can withdraw from this study at any time without penalty.

VIII. Contact Information
1) Novien Yarber
Email: nyarber@sandiego.edu
Phone: (520) 528-5570
2) Annie Ngo  
Email: maianhngo@sandiego.edu

I have read and understand this form, and consent to the research it describes to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I graduated from the University of San Diego:

- 1-3 years ago
- 4-6 years ago
- 7-10 years ago
- 11+ years ago

On a scale from 0-10 (0 being completely dissatisfied and 10 being exceptionally satisfied) please rate your contentment with your extracurricular experience at the University of San Diego?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all content</th>
<th>Extremely content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a scale from 0-10 (0 being completely dissatisfied and 10 being exceptionally satisfied) please rate how content you were with your academic experience at the University of San Diego?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all content</th>
<th>Extremely content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a scale from 0-10 (0 being completely dissatisfied and 10 being exceptionally satisfied) how content were you with your overall experience at the University of San Diego (including, but not limited to, your belonging, support from university professionals, campus climate, campus living, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all content</th>
<th>Extremely content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the following extracurricular programs/organizations, which were you actively involved in while attending the University of San Diego?

- University Ministry (retreats, immersion trips, service opportunities, etc.)
- Student Leadership Programs (Associated Students, Fraternity/Sorority Life, Resident Hall Leadership, etc.)
- Community Service Learning Programs (CASA, Rainbow Educators, etc.)
- Sports and Rec (Intramural, sport clubs, Outdoor Adventures, Wellness programs, etc.)
- Other Student Organization(s): ____________________________

People define philanthropy in a variety of ways. In a few sentences, please provide YOUR idea of philanthropy. (i.e. examples, definition, etc.)
To what extent do you agree that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>after graduating, you have had a steady commitment to community engagement (volunteerism, philanthropy, etc.)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the concept of social responsibility was learned while you attended the University of San Diego</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the concept of social responsibility was explored within your extracurricular activities at the University of San Diego</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your experience at the University of San Diego played an integral role in how you engage with your community</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your extracurricular activities played a formative role in your approach to social responsibility</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide any supplemental comments you’d like include with your survey responses.
Appendix C

Associated Students
One : One Interview Guide

SCRIPT

Introduction:
Good Afternoon,

The purpose of these meetings will be to further explore your conceptualization of civic and social engagement. There are no right or wrong answers, this is just an open discussion where we both can learn what student philanthropy and volunteerism looks like at the University of San Diego.

Guiding Question(s):
What does philanthropy mean to you?
Do you believe you’re in a position to be a philanthropist now?
How do you think Associated Students enables you to volunteer?
How can I support you in your volunteerism?
How can I support you with your philanthropy?
Good afternoon, everyone. The meeting will now commence.

First, I would like to thank and commend you all for being here tonight at our very first Associated Students Student Philanthropy, Volunteer, and Social Engagement Task Force gathering. The goal of this task force is to corral all the great ideas you all have shared pertaining to student civic engagement here at USD. The purpose of these meetings is to bring students from differing committees, organizations, and centers together in order to organize your efforts in an efficient and sustainable manner. I’m really excited to see what you all come up with!

With that being said, the task force is in your hands. After today I will not be facilitating the meeting, only observing. I will solely be here for support and to ensure the task force stays on task. The frequency of the meetings, the meeting agendas, and task force initiatives will be your responsibility.
Subject Line: USD Participants needed for a Graduate Action Research Study

Good Evening!

My name Novien Yarber and I am currently a Graduate student at your alma mater, The University of San Diego. I am currently looking for participants for a research study. You are receiving this email because you are 1) an alumni of The University of San Diego, 2) you were identified as a student that was involved with USD’s Associated Students organization, and 3) your experience at the university is highly valued. Your email address was obtained from the office of University Relations. This study is about student leader’s conceptualization and commitment to philanthropy and volunteerism. If you are to take part in this study, you would be asked to complete a 10-20 minute online survey pertaining to your conceptualization of philanthropy and volunteerism and how your experience here at the University of San Diego influenced said conceptualization. To be able to take part in this study, individuals must be/have access to a computer, Internet connection, and have 10-20 minutes to spare. If you are interested in participating or have any questions about the study, please email nyarber@sandiego.edu or call/text Novien Yarber at (520) 528-5570 between the hours of 9am-8pm.

Thanks in advance for your time and consideration.

Best,

Novien Yarber
July 13, 2017

To: Institutional Review Board, University of San Diego

From: Annie Ngo, Adjunct Faculty and Research Advisor

I have discussed the research project “Compassion with Action: Institutional Influences Cultivating Long-Term Philanthropic and Volunteer Morale Within Undergraduate Student Leaders” with Novien Yarber. He is conducting this study as part of his action research project in SOLES at the University of San Diego. I am his research advisor and approve him moving forward with this project. He may submit her IRB for approval. I will continue to support him throughout his research process.

Sincerely,

Annie Ngo, PhD
Adjunct Faculty, SOLES
maianhngo@sandiego.edu
Appendix G

University of San Diego
Institutional Review Board

Research Participant Consent Form

For the research study entitled:
Compassion with Action: Cultivating Long-Term Philanthropic Morale Within Undergraduate Student Leaders

I. Purpose of the research study
Novien Yarber is a graduate student in the School of Leadership and Education Science Masters of Higher Education Leadership at the University of San Diego. You are invited to participate in a research study he is conducting. The purpose of this research study is to understand student affair’s role in facilitation of long-term philanthropic morale.

II. What you will be asked to do
If you decide to be in this study, you will be asked to:
Complete a questionnaire about your conceptualization of philanthropy and how your current/past role in Associated Students has shaped that conception.
If applicable: Participate in 5 in-person interviews pertaining to philanthropy, service leadership, and volunteerism.

Your participation in this study will take a total of _20_ minutes.

III. Foreseeable risks or discomforts
This study involves no more risk than the risks you encounter in daily life. Sometimes when people are asked to reflect on their feelings, they can sometimes feel sad or anxious. If you would like to talk to someone about your feelings at anytime you can call toll free, 24 hours a day: San Diego Mental Health Hotline at 1-800-479-3339 or the USD Counseling Center at 619-260-4655

IV. Benefits
While there may be no direct benefit to you from participating in this study, the indirect benefit of participating will be knowing that you helped researchers better understand how to encourage compassion and service leadership within his practice

V. Confidentiality
Any information provided and/or identifying records will remain confidential and kept in a locked file and/or password-protected computer file in the researcher’s office for a minimum of five years. All data collected from you will be coded with a number or pseudonym (fake name). Your real name will not be used. The results of this research project may be made public and information quoted in professional journals and meetings, but information from this study will only be reported as a group, and not individually.
If you are requesting a Certificate of Confidentiality, consult your IRB representative and the NIH website: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/coc/

VI. Compensation
You will receive no compensation for your participation in the study.

VII. Voluntary Nature of this Research
Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You do not have to do this, and you can refuse to answer any question or quit at any time. Deciding not to participate or not answering any of the questions will have no effect on any benefits you’re entitled to, like your health care, or your employment or grades. You can withdraw from this study at any time without penalty.

VIII. Contact Information
1) Novien Yarber
   Email: nyarber@sandiego.edu
   Phone: (662)380-1159

2) Annie Ngo
   Email: maianhngo@sandiego.edu
   Phone:

I have read and understand this form, and consent to the research it describes to me. I have received a copy of this consent form for my records.

________________________________________
Signature of Participant                      Date

________________________________________
Name of Participant (Printed)

________________________________________
Signature of Investigator                      Date
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COLLABORATIVE INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING INITIATIVE (CITI PROGRAM)
COMPLETION REPORT - PART 1 OF 2

COURSEWORK REQUIREMENTS*

* NOTE: Scores on this Requirements Report reflect quiz completions at the time all requirements for the course were met. See separate Transcript Report for more recent quiz scores, including those on optional (supplemental) course elements.

- Name: Novien Yarber (ID: 6182469)
- Institution Affiliation: University of San Diego (ID: 1652)
- Institution Email: nyarber@ucsd.edu
- Institution Unit: Student Affairs
- Curriculum Group: Students conducting no more than minimal risk research
- Course Learner Group: Students - Class projects
- Stage: Stage 1 - Basic Course
- Description: This course is appropriate for students doing class projects that qualify as "No More Than Minimal Risk" human subjects research.
- Record ID: 22382882
- Completion Date: 19-Feb-2017
- Expiration Date: 19-Feb-2020
- Minimum Passing: 80
- Reported Score*: 87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIRED AND ELECTIVE MODULES ONLY</th>
<th>DATE COMPLETED</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Report and CITI Course Introduction (ID: 1127)</td>
<td>18-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in Research (ID: 1321)</td>
<td>18-Feb-2017</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Ethical Principles - SBE (ID: 490)</td>
<td>18-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/5 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Ethics of Human Subjects Research (ID: 498)</td>
<td>18-Feb-2017</td>
<td>7/7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Research with Human Subjects - SBE (ID: 491)</td>
<td>18-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Federal Regulations - SBE (ID: 502)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Institutional Review Board (IRB) Regulations and Review Process (ID: 2)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Risk - SBE (ID: 503)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Consent - SBE (ID: 504)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/5 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Consent (ID: 3)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy and Confidentiality - SBE (ID: 505)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Research (SBR) for Biomedical Researchers (ID: 4)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/4 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records-Based Research (ID: 5)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic Research in Human Populations (ID: 6)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populations in Research Requiring Additional Considerations and/or Protections (ID: 16680)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research with Prisoners - SBE (ID: 506)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Prisoners (ID: 8)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/4 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research with Children - SBE (ID: 507)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/5 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Children (ID: 9)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools - SBE (ID: 508)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Pregnant Women, Human Fetuses, and Neonates (ID: 10)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Research - SBE (ID: 509)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies (ID: 971)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet-Based Research - SBE (ID: 510)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Group Harms - U.S. Research Perspectives (ID: 14080)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA-Regulated Research (ID: 12)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and HIPAA Privacy Protocols (ID: 14)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/5 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Workers/Employees (ID: 483)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/4 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Topics (ID: 487)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>No Quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts of Interest in Research Involving Human Subjects (ID: 488)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The IRB Member Module - &quot;What Every New IRB Member Needs to Know&quot; (ID: 816)</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>7/7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this Report to be valid, the learner identified above must have had a valid affiliation with the CITI Program subscribing institution identified above or have been a paid independent learner.

Verify at: [www.citiprogram.org/verify/?k18aa3e44-8e63-4380-b9db-a2e33a6c95c2-22382882](http://www.citiprogram.org/verify/?k18aa3e44-8e63-4380-b9db-a2e33a6c95c2-22382882)
**NOTE**: Scores on this Transcript Report reflect the most current quiz completions, including quizzes on optional (supplemental) elements of the course. See list below for details. See separate Requirements Report for the reported scores at the time all requirements for the course were met.

- **Name**: Novien Yarber (ID: 6182469)
- **Institution Affiliation**: University of San Diego (ID: 1652)
- **Institution Email**: nyarber@sandiego.edu
- **Institution Unit**: Student Affairs
- **Curriculum Group**: Students conducting no more than minimal risk research
- **Course Learner Group**: Students - Class projects
- **Stage**: Stage 1 - Basic Course
- **Description**: This course is appropriate for students doing class projects that qualify as "No More Than Minimal Risk" human subjects research.
- **Record ID**: 22382882
- **Report Date**: 19-Feb-2017
- **Current Score****: 87

### REQUIRED, ELECTIVE, AND SUPPLEMENTAL MODULES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Most Recent Date</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History and Ethics of Human Subjects Research</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>18-Feb-2017</td>
<td>7/7(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in Research</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>18-Feb-2017</td>
<td>5/5(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Consent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>5/5(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Ethical Principles - SBE</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>18-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/5(60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Research (SBR) for Biomedical Researchers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/4(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Research with Human Subjects - SBE</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>18-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Report and CITI Course Introduction</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>18-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/3(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records-Based Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/3(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Federal Regulations - SBE</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>5/5(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic Research in Human Populations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Risk - SBE</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>5/5(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Prisoners</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/4(75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Consent - SBE</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/5(60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Children</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/3(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy and Confidentiality - SBE</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Pregnant Women, Human Fetuses, and Neonates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/3(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research with Prisoners - SBE</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research with Children - SBE</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/5(60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDA-Regulated Research</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools - SBE</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Research - SBE</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/3(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet-Based Research - SBE</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The IRB Member Module - What Every New IRB Member Needs to Know</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>7/7(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and HIPAA Privacy Protections</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/5(60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Subjects - Research Involving Workers/Employees</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/4(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Topics</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>No Quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts of Interest in Research Involving Human Subjects</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>5/5(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Group Harms - U.S. Research Perspectives</td>
<td>14080</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>3/3(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Institutional Review Board (IRB) Regulations and Review Process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>5/5(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populations in Research Requiring Additional Considerations and/or Protections</td>
<td>16680</td>
<td>19-Feb-2017</td>
<td>4/5(80%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this Report to be valid, the learner identified above must have had a valid affiliation with the CITI Program subscribing institution identified above or have been a paid independent learner.

Verify at: [website link]