

College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University

DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU

CSBSJU Distinguished Thesis

Undergraduate Research

5-2022

The Sanctuary Campus: Establishing Safe Spaces of Higher Education for Undocumented and DACA-Status Students

Lizbet Martinez-Port

College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's University, lmartinez002@csbsju.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/ur_thesis

Recommended Citation

Martinez-Port, Lizbet, "The Sanctuary Campus: Establishing Safe Spaces of Higher Education for Undocumented and DACA-Status Students" (2022). *CSBSJU Distinguished Thesis*. 28.

https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/ur_thesis/28

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. It has been accepted for inclusion in CSBSJU Distinguished Thesis by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@csbsju.edu.

The Sanctuary Campus: Establishing Safe Spaces of Higher Education for Undocumented and

DACA-Status Students

Distinguished Thesis

The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University

By

Lizbet Martinez-Port

May 2022

The Sanctuary Campus: Establishing Safe Spaces of Higher Education for Undocumented and
DACA-Status Students

Approved By:

Pedro dos Santos

Thesis Advisor
Professor of Political Science

Whitney Court

Faculty Reader
Professor of Political Science

Roy Ketchum

Faculty Reader
Professor of Latino/Latin American Studies

Whitney Court

Chair, Political Science Department

Abstract

The election of President Donald Trump in 2016 brought fear to undocumented and DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) status students on campuses across the United States. In his campaign, Trump detailed his desire to get rid of the Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. Various institutions of higher education created resources, put in place sanctuary policies, and even declared themselves as sanctuary campuses to fight against the challenges that hindered undocumented and DACA students from achieving a higher education. This paper focuses on the policies at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University, two private Catholic institutions of higher education in rural Minnesota. This paper identifies five sanctuary policies implemented by institutions of higher education; non-disclosure of student information, disallowing immigration officials onto campus, increased financial aid opportunities for undocumented students, preventing school officers from acting as immigration enforcement agents, and demonstrations of public support for undocumented students. Through content analysis of school websites and interviews with staff and administration at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University, I examine the policies established to support undocumented and DACA status students and whether they are sufficient for these institutions. This paper concludes with policy and resource recommendations for those involved in policy making decisions at institutions of higher education, to best protect and support their undocumented and DACA students.

Introduction

There are more than 450,000 undocumented students enrolled in higher education in the United States (President's Alliance on Higher Education and Immigration 2020). Various obstacles hinder undocumented students pursuing higher education, including "unfavorable admission policies, limited access to extracurricular opportunities in high school, and a lack of guidance through the college application process" (Safstrom 2018, 1529). Moreover, undocumented students are ineligible for federal financial aid and lack access to in-state tuition rates. They may also have difficulties finding employment during the school year. Aside from these challenges, they worry about their immigration status and fear deportation. When interviewed, Xavier Maciel, a student leader at Pomona College, says, "college historically is a system designed to keep certain groups of people from gaining social mobility. It still is today. It is not designed to support undocumented students, and that is the failure in our modern schools" (Lloyd 2019, 158). These difficult conditions are also at risk of changing with different presidential administrations and policy makers. The 2016 election was significant because it demonstrated that a new administration could make consequential decisions such as deciding to rescind DACA. To combat some of the obstacles undocumented and DACA students face, universities can adopt policies to make their educational experience more manageable for those students.

Villazor and Gulasekaram explain, "because universities exist for the purpose of educating students, they have the expected obligation of ensuring a safe educational environment for all of their students" (2018, 557). The ability to create the safest learning environment possible lies with school administrators who make policy decisions. Based on this idea, my first research question is, how do the policies at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's

University protect their undocumented students? First, I seek to understand the policies currently in place, how they may have changed after the 2016 election, and their purpose. My second research question is, do the staff and administration feel like the policies that the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University have implemented are enough? This question allows me to move forward from understanding the policies themselves to learning about how they are working. To explore this more in depth, I would have to get at the perspectives of those involved in policy making decisions.

This thesis focuses on school policies at institutions of higher education that protect undocumented students. I will begin with an explanation of sanctuaries, the sanctuary movement, and sanctuary campuses. Next, I will discuss background information on President Trump and the effects of his election on DACA recipients. I will review the scholarly conversations on sanctuary campuses including five main policy points identified in the literature. I will also consider some of the disagreements within the literature. Following, I lay out the methodology, including doing searches on college/university websites utilizing three keywords and conducting interviews with staff and administration at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University (CSB+SJU). I will move onto the content analysis for the website searches and analysis of the interviews. I will conclude with a discussion of the findings as related to the five main policies highlighted in the literature as well as policy and resource recommendations for colleges and universities.

Sanctuaries

The term sanctuary extends back to biblical times. It comes from the idea that “sanctuary” would be a place of refuge where the authority of God prevails over that of

government. In medieval Europe it was common for fugitives to escape convictions and death sentences by claiming sanctuary in a church (Little 2019). There is a well-known scene, based on religious customs, from the Hunchback of Notre Dame where the character Quasimodo saves a young woman, Esmeralda, from execution by bringing her to the cathedral and declaring sanctuary (Hugo 1892, 257-258). The church was legally considered a safe space, and while oftentimes people were permanently exiled, their life was spared. Another historical example of sanctuary is the Underground Railroad in the United States. This network of secret routes and safe houses helped enslaved African Americans escape in the 19th century (Allen 2016). In a similar manner, sanctuary jurisdictions act as safe spaces for undocumented immigrants by supporting and sometimes hiding those threatened by deportation. When sanctuary is declared by a city or local jurisdiction it refers to “jurisdictions declining to participate in federal immigration enforcement” (Villazor and Gulasekaram 2018, 554). This moves into policy related areas within state and local governments.

The idea of sanctuary has been around for millennia but the sanctuary movement for immigrants in the United States began in the 1980s with faith-based groups and congregations publicly declaring sanctuary to protect those fleeing conflict and violence in Central America (Paik 2017, 6). The movement has been reinvigorated since the early 2000s in response to mass deportations, and now includes certain religious congregations, educational institutions, local jurisdictions, and food and retail shops that commit to supporting immigrants, regardless of their status. Paik explains that sanctuaries have taken their roots from congregations that provided shelter to immigrants under threat of deportation, and the movement has spread to “city, county, and state governments that have passed sanctuary policies that limit their cooperation with federal immigration authorities in tracking down and deporting undocumented immigrants”

(2017, 5). One of the significant shifts in the sanctuary movement was its adoption in colleges and universities.

After the election of President Donald Trump in 2016, there was a wave of fear that came over undocumented students on campuses across the United States. In his campaign, Trump detailed his desire to get rid of the Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). DACA was introduced by the Obama administration in June of 2012 through an executive order. It offered temporary deferral of deportation for a renewable period of 2 years to eligible youth (Mallet-García and García-Bedolla 2021, 1166). DACA significantly assists undocumented students pursuing higher education in a variety of ways. DACA recipients are given a social security number with which they fill out the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) that gives them the ability to receive financial aid (Malik 2015). They are also given work authorization which allows them to find jobs to help pay for school and support their family. Another benefit of DACA is that it removes some of the stress and psychological barriers due to fear of deportation. These benefits and more help undocumented students pursue their dream of receiving a higher education. In September of 2017, the Trump administration announced that it would rescind the DACA program. This created a significant push in the sanctuary movement. As Huerta and Ocampo explain, “the climate of uncertainty generated by Trump immigration policies fueled efforts across college and university campuses to protect and expand support for undocumented students” (2017, 1). The movement reached campuses all across the United States with different responses from institutions.

When applied to colleges and universities, the term sanctuary does not have an independent legal definition but generally it offers “the provision of a safe space in the face of a threat, most generally for migrants, the threat of detention, deportation, or incarceration” (Carney

et al. 2017). Simply put, a sanctuary campus is “a college or university that has instituted policies to protect undocumented students from deportation” (Safstrom 2018, 1529). Sanctuary campuses have only recently emerged with a need to protect undocumented students from changing federal policy. By 2018, eighty campuses had adopted non-cooperation policies and sixteen had officially declared themselves to be “sanctuary campuses” (Cade 2018, 477). This declaration of sanctuary for campuses demonstrates to their communities that they care about all their students and their well-being. As Muñoz, Espino, and Antrop-Gonzalez state, “A school becomes a sanctuary when it begins to consider the importance of students’ psychological, social, and moral safety as ‘vital to the learning process’” (2014, 10). It is important to understand how different institutions support their students.

Relevant to the conversation of protections for undocumented students is the case of *Plyer v. Doe*. A revision to the Texas education laws of 1975 allowed state funds to be withheld from school districts that educated children of undocumented people. This caused conflict and the case was brought to the United States Supreme Court where it was decided in 1982 that the law violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Undocumented people are still people even though they are not citizens of the United States and are thus protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. The law disadvantaged the children of undocumented people, denying them the right to education, without proof that the regulation served a necessary state interest. The law was thus struck down and the case of *Plyer v. Doe* has since been used to prohibit states and school districts from implementing measures that deny undocumented students an education. The only issue relating to the case is that it only applies to K-12 students. There has been debate as to whether it should extend to undergraduate and graduate students, but

it does not currently apply to undocumented students pursuing higher education (Safstrom 2018, 1527-1528).

Scholarly Conversations

A thorough review of the literature revealed five main policies that colleges adopted to protect undocumented students. These include choosing to not disclose student information with regards to immigration status (Villazor and Gulasekaram 2018, Safstrom 2018, Green 2019, Suárez-Orozco, et al. 2015), not allowing immigration officials on campus unless legally necessary (Safstrom 2018, Villazor and Gulasekaram 2018, Chen 2018), increasing financial aid opportunities for undocumented students (Green 2019, Huerta and Ocampo 2017) preventing school officers from acting as immigration enforcement agents (Safstrom 2018, Green 2019, Ishiwata and Muñoz 2018), and the demonstration of public support for immigrant students (Ishiwata and Muñoz 2018, Green 2019, Chen 2018). There were several other sanctuary policies that appeared in the literature, however, these five commitments stood out as the most common and significant policy choices on college and university campuses.

Non-disclosure of student information

One of the main policies discussed in the literature is the idea of privacy in relation to student immigration status. Most schools already follow privacy guidelines due to the Federal Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), but many stated that they would put effort into making sure student's status would not be disclosed. For example, Wesleyan University stated, "that they 'would not cooperate with any efforts to round up people, unless...forced to.' This

includes not sharing their students' information with ICE, unless the agency provides a warrant" (Villazor and Gulasekaram 2018, 557). This idea is also supported by Safstrom who believes that schools could "stop collecting immigration-status information in the admissions process, during student interactions with campus officers, and in other university procedures. If that information were not collected, it could not be obtained even where a valid warrant is issued" (2018, 1535). This decision to not disclose students' information, except when ICE presents a warrant, is loosely based on FERPA. At UC campuses they instruct campus employees to "ask for identifying information from any officer who requests student information or access to campus, along with a copy of any warrant or subpoena if an officer requests access to university housing" (Green 2019, 1060). Students have shown a great appreciation for this effort as it protects them from having to share their immigration status and put them at risk. One student stated, "To college administrations that work with, and support, undocumented students: please respect our privacy. Don't disclose our status to colleagues, friends, or other students" (Suárez-Orozco, et al. 2015, 451). It is also important that administrators, faculty, and staff do not pressure students to disclose their status or participate in activities that may lead to them disclosing their status.

Disallowing immigration officials onto campus

Another major theme that arose in the literature is college and university policies that prohibit or prevent immigration officials from coming onto campus. Safstrom informs that "The University of Pennsylvania, University of Idaho, and Portland State University, in addition to several other schools, have vowed to disallow immigration officials from conducting enforcement activities on campus" (2018, 1538). The only exception would be if they were

legally obligated to allow them to enter campus. Villazor and Gulasekaram explain, “Others, such as Columbia University, instantiated a policy that require ICE to provide a warrant before entering their campus” (2018, 557). While many schools have taken the more passive approach to non-cooperation, “Columbia and Wesleyan have taken bolder stances and been more forceful in refusing access to their campuses” (Chen 2018, 1373). The literature demonstrates that many colleges and universities were willing to work to protect students as much as possible, usually by disallowing immigration officials on campus without a warrant.

Increased financial aid opportunities for undocumented students

The vastest policy that appeared in the literature is an expansion of financial aid opportunities for undocumented and DACA students. A few schools such as Pitzer, Wesleyan, and Columbia embraced their designation as a sanctuary and “adopted policies that included pledges to provide enhanced financial support to undocumented students and students with DACA status, along with promises to protect community members from intimidation and removal” (Green 2019, 1035). Some universities have taken it further than school related expenses and have “offered to cover DACA renewal costs and to pay for costs associated with other immigration benefits or legal representation” (Green 2019, 1067). Many colleges and universities created separate scholarships for undocumented students to continue their education. Some students may not have work authorization, hindering them from paying for school. Similar to these opportunities, many undocumented students are unable to obtain internships. The Evergreen State College recognized this, and President George Bridges published a statement pledging support for undocumented students and implementing changes including removing

barriers for undocumented students wanting to carry out internships (Huerta and Ocampo 2017, 3). The increase in financial aid and opportunities for undocumented students is incredibly beneficial to their ability to receive a higher education. It also removes much of the stress of finances and contributes to their general well-being.

Preventing school officers from acting as immigration enforcement agents

Another major policy implementation found in the literature was preventing school and campus officers from acting as immigration enforcement agents. According to a DOJ report, 92% of public colleges and universities have sworn and armed campus officers; nationally, 81% can patrol off-campus areas and 86% can make arrests (Saftrom 2018, 1542). Various schools, such as New York University, the University of Florida, and the University of Michigan, made statements assuring that their campus officers would not participate in immigration enforcement actions of any kind. Officers often play an important role on campuses. Green shares, “Some universities have enacted policies preventing campus police from acting as extension of ICE. For example, some prohibit campus law enforcement from honoring detainer requests issued by federal immigration officials” (Green 2019, 1062). Making sure that campus officers do not go beyond the bounds of their responsibilities is critical in creating a safe environment for undocumented students. The administration for Colorado State University “issued university-wide notices clarifying that CSU employees hold no role in reporting or inquiring about students’ immigration statuses” (Ishiwata and Muñoz 2018, 571). Similarly, the University of California took several measures to support their undocumented students including “directing campus police not to contact, detain, question or arrest individuals based on suspected undocumented

status or enter agreements to undertake joint efforts to make arrests for federal immigration law violations” (Chen 2018, 1376). The literature illustrates an increase in policies preventing school officers to engage in immigration enforcement actions.

Public support for immigrant students

The final theme found repeatedly in the literature was the demonstration of public support for undocumented and DACA students. This was the quickest response by colleges and universities and by December of 2016 “at least 30 colleges and universities had issued public statements in support of impacted students, with eighteen institutions adopting the ‘sanctuary campus’ designation” (Ishiwata and Muñoz 2018, 564). This type of support from educational institutions is beneficial for undocumented students’ feeling of belonging. As Green explains, “By expressing support of undocumented students and providing services that meet their unique needs and concerns, colleges and universities can ensure they are living out their special relationship to students and commitment to promoting equity and diversity on campus” (2019, 1065). Messages of support for undocumented students often partnered with rebukes of former President Trump’s immigration policies. Green demonstrates, “The day the Trump administration rescinded DACA, UC President Janet Napolitano called on Congress to create a permanent solution for DACA recipients and denounced the decision to cancel the program” (2019, 1065-1066). Penn State followed closely behind, and the University of California and Princeton University challenged DACA’s rescission in court. Janet Napolitano, the President of the University of California system, and former DHS Secretary stated, “The University and the state of California stand together in our belief that students should be admitted to U.C. and other

institutions of higher education based on their records of achievement and without regard to their immigration status” (Chen 2018, 1375). These public indications of support demonstrate that institutions of higher education care about their undocumented students and will work to protect them.

Consequences of the Sanctuary Narrative

A topic of conversation in the literature was whether sanctuary policies do more harm than good. There are consequences for schools who label themselves as sanctuaries and for their undocumented students. Huerta and Ocampo explain that many colleges and universities declared support but didn’t use the word sanctuary “due to legal concerns specific to possible violation of federal law, the fear of losing federal funding, the lack of state resources and the difficulties associated with maintaining a well-trained staff and faculty” (Huerta and Ocampo 2017, 2-3). Certain colleges and universities have different ranges of ability when it comes to social activism. From the literature, it appeared that many truly did support their undocumented students but were fearful of the repercussions of using the term sanctuary.

Green explains that certain colleges and universities refused to use the term sanctuary “for fear that it would place students at greater risk of immigration enforcement or result in the loss of federal funding” (2019, 1035). President of New Mexico State University, Garrey Carruthers, would not declare the university a sanctuary or ban ICE officials from campus because it could jeopardize federal funding and the institution’s ability to issue visas for visiting scholars and international students (Dukic et al. 2018, 30). President Trump issued Executive Order 13768 “Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States” on January 25th,

2017. This executive order intended to withhold federal funding for sanctuary jurisdictions. This meant that schools could be punished and lose funding simply for using the label of sanctuary.

Another consequence of labeling a campus as a sanctuary is that it might put a larger target on the students who attend that college or university. Green explains, “universities that publicly announce bans of ICE from campus may run the risk of becoming targets for increased enforcement” (2019, 1061). The Trump administration had demonstrated their desire and willingness to target ‘sanctuary’ jurisdictions so declaring campuses as sanctuaries would make students feel more viewed by the outside world and thus less secure. Those campuses may even be targeted for enforcement activity.

From the literature, it was highlighted that sanctuary campuses are simply symbolic, as there are plenty of legal procedures that prohibit certain sanctuary policies. Saftstrom explains that public colleges and universities that seek to establish themselves as sanctuary campuses may be in violation of INA section 1373 which mandates that “a Federal, State, or local government entity or official may not prohibit, or in any way restrict, any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful, or unlawful, of any individual” (2018, 1536). The president of Lewis & Clark College stated that the college would fight ICE to the full extent of the law but refused to use the word sanctuary because it “made a false promise to protect students since the college could not really prevent ICE from arresting students if they possessed a legal warrant” (Young 2019, 171-172). The idea behind the concept of sanctuary is positive but on technical and legal grounds, it may not be effective.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses predict different aspects of the policies at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University that protect undocumented and DACA students.

Hypothesis one looks at how the policies at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University protect their undocumented and DACA-status students compared to other similar institutions. The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University have traditionally kept quiet or stayed neutral in matters affecting students of marginalized communities. In recent years, the schools have shown more interest in being active to defend and celebrate all of their students. Another key point is that there are certain worries to establishing sanctuary status at the schools. These include legal barriers (Safstrom 2018 and Young 2019), losing funding (Huerta and Ocampo 2017 and Dukic et al. 2018), and creating more of a target for undocumented or DACA students (Green 2019). The idea of sanctuary campuses is new, and the factors previously stated may hinder schools from declaring sanctuary or establishing sanctuary policies.

H1: The policies regarding and resources available for undocumented and DACA students at the College of Saint Benedict and St. John's University are more likely to be subtle.

H1.1: It is likely that the clearest policy to protect undocumented and DACA students will be the non-disclosure of student information.

The Federal Education Rights and Privacy Act already in place would encourage the schools to protect student's identity.

H1.2: There will not be a set policy on allowing immigration officials onto campus.

I believe that a warrant may be needed to get on campus or receive any information from the schools but there may not be any message from administration explicitly stating this.

H1.3: CSB+SJU will be less likely to have any type of financial aid opportunities for undocumented students.

The population of undocumented and DACA students at CSB+SJU is small, and they often remain invisible on the campuses so I do not think that the schools will prioritize any scholarships or financial aid for them.

H1.4: It is likely that CSB+SJ/u will have some sort of information about preventing school officers from acting as immigration enforcement agents.

In more recent years, there have been some changes to any type of enforcement authorities' roles on campuses. While there may not be a policy explicitly preventing school officers from exerting authority outside of their roles, it may be stated in their training.

H1.5: CSB+SJU will be more likely to issue messages of public support for immigrant students.

This is a more harmless and safer step for schools to take to express their commitment to their students.

Hypothesis two examines how staff and administrators feel about the policies that the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University have implemented. As previously mentioned, the school community has started opening up and raising their voice in the face of injustice. The literature demonstrates that there has been a great response from college faculty, staff, and administrators in support of their undocumented and DACA students (Chen 2018, Green 2019, Ishiwata and Muñoz 2018). Schools such as Penn State, University of California, and Princeton have voiced their support for these students (Green 2019). Based on these types of responses, staff and administration at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University will demonstrate a desire for more protective policies for their students.

H2: Staff and administration will be more likely to demonstrate a desire for stronger protective policies at CSB+SJU.

Methodology

I utilize a mixed methods approach to my research. Similar to Ishiwata and Muñoz's case study of Colorado State University (2018), I use the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University as a case study. I will begin with a content analysis of the websites from various private colleges and universities in Minnesota including the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University. Content analysis is a qualitative research method used to analyze text data (Hsiej and Shannon 2005, 1). It is most appropriate for this part of my research because I analyze various texts and statements on the website search. For my data, I look at search results on these websites using the keywords "sanctuary campus", "undocumented", and "DACA". I analyze and compare the policies and resources that appear from the CSB+SJU search results with those of four other few private Minnesota colleges and universities' websites; Carleton College, St. Olaf College, University of St. Thomas, and Bethel University. I found information from various bigger public and private institutions but keeping it centralized to private Minnesota institutions will be a novel aspect to this research.

The content analysis takes an "at a distance" approach to understanding if and how the university portrays itself as a defender of the rights of this specific vulnerable population. To best analyze the consequences of university policies, it is also important to directly ask those involved in the decision-making process for those policies. After conducting the content analysis, I

interview five key administrators and staff members who are involved in policy discussions at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University. The interviews dug deeper into the policies available and their impacts. Inspired by Muñoz, Espino, and Antrop-Gonzalez (2014), I asked about the policies (or lack of policies) regarding undocumented students, changes in policies after the 2016 election, and possible policy implementations. This project is relevant because the sanctuary campus movement appeared recently. It has become apparent that policy regarding DACA can change with a new federal government administration. I hypothesize that the policies regarding and resources available for undocumented students at the College of Saint Benedict and St. John's University will more likely be subtle. The lack of strong policy may be an indication of the stand the schools take as well. The consequences for schools taking a stand may instill fear and keep these schools from implementing sanctuary policies. When it comes to staff and administration's thoughts regarding policies, I hypothesize that there will be a desire for stronger protective policies at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University because schools are continually making progress and policy influencers care about protecting their students.

Content Analysis

I examined the school websites for The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University, Carleton College, St. Olaf College, University of St. Thomas, and Bethel University. The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University have separate campuses but function together as one and, beginning in the fall of 2022, will be served under one president. I chose CSB+SJU as my case study because I am a student at these institutions, allowing for a closer examination of their policies. These policies impact my classmates and I found that they had not

yet been systematically explored. I chose Carleton, St. Olaf College, University of Saint Thomas, and Bethel University as comparisons because they are all private institutions of higher education in Minnesota. These institutions have much in common, helping to balance out their differences in location (rural versus urban). All of these institutions, except for Carleton, are also Catholic institutions. Carleton is located in a small town similarly to CSB+SJU, however, having that difference in religious background would highlight a different type of observation between the institutions.

I utilized the keywords “sanctuary campus”, “undocumented”, and “DACA” in the search bar and took note of the number of results, the type of information found, whether it discusses policy protections or specific campus policies, and if it proposes policies. I also looked for any mention of the five main policies identified in the literature review. The school with the most results and most relevant results was Carleton College, a private college in Northfield, Minnesota. The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John’s University fell at the bottom with the least search results, alongside Bethel University, and the University of St. Thomas. Some factors that may play into these results include the number of undocumented people in the city’s population where the institution is located, the religious background of the institutions, and political history of the institution and the area it is located in.

Appearance of the Five Main Policies

Non-disclosure of student information

Three out of the five institutions had a clear policy stating that they would not disclose student information regarding immigration status unless legally necessary. The president of

Carleton College, Steven Poskanzer, Dean of the College, Beverly Nagel, and Vice President for Student Life, Carolyn H. Livingston, stated in a message to the school community, “consistent with past practice and commitment to student privacy, we will only share information about individual students when obligated to do so by court-ordered subpoena” (Carleton College n.d.). Similarly, the other schools utilized FERPA to ensure protection of student’s immigration status. St. Olaf’s Vice President of Equity and Inclusion, Maria Pabón Gautier, stated, “If approached by immigration authorities or other law enforcement agencies and requested to provide personally identifiable information about any member of our community, we will comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act” (St. Olaf College 2022). This allows them to decline to cooperate unless required by a subpoena or court order. The utilization of FERPA to prevent disclosing identifying information is consistent with what was found in the literature and can be a strong tool to protect undocumented and DACA students.

Disallowing immigration officials onto campus

Three out of the five schools also highlighted their policy disallowing immigration officials onto campus without proper documentation. The president of Bethel University, Jay Barnes, along with the Executive Vice President and Provost, Deb Harless, and Chief Diversity Officer, Ruben Rivera, sent out a message to the college community announcing, “We will expect appropriate legal documentation such as warrants when information is requested by outside authorities” (Bethel University 2022). St. Olaf College also emphasized that they would decline to cooperate with immigration authorities unless required to do so by law. (St. Olaf

2022). Just as with the non-disclosure of student information, requiring documentation for immigration official to come onto campus sends a strong message.

Increased financial aid opportunities for undocumented students

Three out of the five schools promoted financial aid opportunities for DACA and undocumented students on their website. The University of Saint Thomas encourages “students who are ineligible for the CARES ACT Emergency grants, including our DACA/Dreamer and international students, to apply for emergency grants under the St. Thomas Student Emergency Assistance Program for COVID 19-Related Financial Hardship” (University of Saint Thomas 2022). These grants are not federally funded and therefore have broader eligibility requirements, allowing DACA students to apply. Carleton went above and beyond all of the schools stating that they would continue to provide undocumented and DACA students their full financial aid package and in the event that a student’s work authorization was not renewed, they would “provide extra funding, such that the College will make up for both what would have been your summer student employment contribution and student employment during the academic year” (Carleton 2022). The school even set up an emergency fund that could be accessed by those students if necessary. On top of that, there is an opportunity for the college to receive \$50 million by the Schuler Education Foundation to support the enrollment of Pell-eligible students and students with undocumented and DACA status (Carleton, 2022). Fully funding all four years of education for undocumented and DACA students would offer the opportunity for many more of those students to attend.

Preventing school officers from acting as immigration enforcement agents

None of the schools demonstrated a policy regarding the prevention of school officers from acting as immigration enforcement agents. It is possible that there are not outstanding instances of this occurring in Minnesota, which could impact these results. After the murder of George Floyd in Minneapolis, Minnesota, the topic of law enforcement has become sensitive and controversial. While there was not a clear policy outlined in any of the websites, it is also possible that this idea of making sure school officers do not act as immigration officials appears more in their training. It would still be beneficial to see this announced somewhere on school websites.

Public support for immigrant students

All of the schools demonstrated strong public support for their undocumented and DACA students except for the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University. In her welcome back message to students and staff at the University of Saint Thomas, Dr. Julie Sullivan stated, "Today we stand with our DACA students. We will advocate for a permanent fix to this pressing problem and will ensure our current DACA students' financial aid to attend St. Thomas is not diminished" (University of Saint Thomas 2022). A simple message of support, such as this one, shows students that the administration is aware of the issues affecting them and cares about their well-being. The administration for Bethel also showed its support announcing, "As a university that was founded by immigrants and as an institution that seeks to live by the biblical mandate to love our neighbors as ourselves, we are deeply troubled by this decision [recission of DACA]" (Bethel University 2022). The message continues by expressing that the school will continue to

support vulnerable members of its community. This demonstration of public support offers undocumented and DACA students a sense of belonging.

Table One: Institution Website Searches and Five Categories of Policy Protections

Institution	Non-Disclosure of Information	Disallowing Immigration Officers	Increased Financial Aid	No School Officers as Enforcement	Public Support
CSBSJU	No	No	No	No	Weak
Bethel	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Strong
Carleton	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Strong
St. Olaf	Yes	Yes	No	No	Strong
St. Thomas	No	No	Yes	No	Strong

Interviews

I interviewed five staff/administrators at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John’s University who are most in contact with undocumented and DACA students and who are involved in conversations concerning policies that would affect those students. These interviews function as being supplemental to the content analysis of the websites. In addition to looking at what is available plainly on the school website, I wanted to dig deeper to understand what the policies and resources available are, and what those involved in policy conversations think about them.

When asked about the resources available for undocumented and DACA students on our campuses, the answer was the same all across the board: There really aren’t any.

Staff/Administrator C answered, “As far as I know, I don’t think there are any policies

implemented, if there is, it is probably some generic policy that they also have at other schools.” As visible from Table 1, other schools have implemented policies to protect undocumented and DACA students on their campuses, while CSB+SJU has not established any such policies. There was a sense of acknowledgement that seeped through the interviewees’ answers. One of the Staff/Administrators admitted, “I don’t think at Saint Ben’s or Saint John’s that we’ve done a really solid job with identifying resources on our website. I think with you asking that question, it allows me to reflect more on that” (Staff/Administrator A). The acknowledgement of a lack of work in that area is the first step towards making a change.

To get at the rise of the sanctuary movement, I asked about changes in policies or messages from administration between 2016-2018. One Staff/Administrator said, “There was a conversation happening...a big part of it wasn’t necessarily policy, it was more about you need to protect your students as a private institution. You brought them here so therefore you need to protect them in the legality of what’s going on” (Staff/Administrator D). Memories of conversations without action were a common theme in the interviews. Another Staff/Administrator highlighted, “This is a reflection of leadership, but I am aware that there were calls from a recent alum who is a DACA recipient, who called on us [College of Saint Benedict and Saint John’s University] to make a public statement of support, and as I recall I don’t believe we did” (Staff/Administrator B). This response demonstrates that the dialogue surrounding protections for undocumented and DACA students existed but did not go further than conversation. They continued, “I think that is a reflection of the leadership at that time. I don’t know what that would look like today but given the number of statements that we’ve made about other things, I would be shocked if we didn’t if something similar were to happen but at

that time there was no public support” (Staff/Administrator B). Looking ahead to the present is also an important step in figuring out what to do moving forward. It illustrates a desire for action.

My final question to the interviewees was about the five main policies identified from the literature; choosing to not disclose student information with regards to immigration status, not allowing immigration officials on campus unless legally necessary, increasing financial aid opportunities for undocumented students, preventing school officers from acting as immigration enforcement agents, and the demonstration of public support for undocumented and DACA students. I asked the interviewees if they noticed any of these policies in their work. The answers varied between not noticing any at all to identifying a few vague policies that have appeared on the campuses. With regards to not disclosing student information, one of the staff/administrator’s brought up FERPA saying, “We don’t share information outside. We don’t have to, to the extent that we don’t share information like that [immigration status]” (Staff/Administrator B). This point was consistent with what was identified in the literature as well as found in the website content analysis from other schools. One Staff/Administrator echoed, “I do remember between 2016 and 2018 we had robust conversations about protecting our DACA students. I remember, and we still do this, expressly doing training on not revealing students’ residences” (Staff/Administrator E). It appears that the non-disclosure policy exists but is not stated clearly anywhere on the CSB+SJU website and may not necessarily include immigration status.

The conversation on disallowing immigration officials on campus unless legally necessary was much shorter than the other policies. Staff/Administrator D mentioned, “The one about police on campus...especially with the killings in Minneapolis...there is a bit of conversation with security...about playing school security and not allowing that” (Staff/Administrator D). There is a policy that if there are going to be any signs of law

enforcement on campus, they need to be visible so that students know that they are law enforcement. They are also not called upon for protests on the campuses. On the topic of security, there was also some mention of preventing school officers from acting as immigration officials, “I think institutionally, we’ve made a point not to be the immigration police and not to get involved in these issues and we really don’t see it as our role to police that aspect” (Staff/Administrator A). This policy is not clearly stated on the school website and would be beneficial to have it be. It would allow students to place more trust in school officers.

In discussing financial aid for undocumented and DACA students, Staff/Administrator B stated, “On the increasing aid, no, there has not been to my knowledge any effort to increase aid specifically for DACA students. That’s why there are so few DACA students here. To be a DACA student here, you pretty much have to have an outside funding source.” As discussed in the literature review, access to financial aid is a significant factor in access to higher education for undocumented and DACA students. Increasing financial aid for these students would remove a major barrier and allow them a pathway to higher education. The interviews conducted examined the knowledge of staff and administrators at CSB+SJU on policies that protect undocumented and DACA students. They also revealed if the staff/administration feel as though they are enough.

Results/Discussion

The data collected from both the websites and interviews support my thesis that staff and administration would demonstrate a desire for stronger protective policies at CSB/SJU. They don’t, however, support my thesis to the full extent that the policies regarding and resources available for undocumented and DACA students at the College of Saint Benedict and St. John’s

University would be subtle. The policies at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University were almost entirely non-existent. The school website did not include any policies regarding the non-disclosure of student information, disallowing immigration officials onto campus, increased financial aid opportunities for undocumented students, or prevention of school officers from acting as immigration enforcement agents. Public support for undocumented and DACA students also appeared to be weak based on the website alone.

In the interviews, staff/administrators discussed the lack of policies and resources for undocumented and DACA students. Staff/Administrator E illustrates, "I think we did a little bit of outreach to DACA, but I don't think...we're certainly, I don't think we're anywhere near as active and invitational for DACA students as we should be." There was much confusion expressed by the all the interviewees. Another interviewee said, "The school has limited understanding of who they [DACA students] are, how they are, and what they can do to support these students" (Staff/Administrator C). DACA and undocumented students walk around campus invisibly for fear of their status. This contributes to the lack of knowledge by the administration about the issues those students face. On the other hand, DACA and undocumented students also share in the confusion. Staff/Administrator E stated, "I just don't know, I wonder if DACA students know what their resources are. I just don't know if we've done a really good job of helping students know what their resources are." DACA and undocumented students may fear revealing their status by asking for help and for resources. It is the institution's job to make those resources more visibly available.

Staff and administrators also demonstrated an eagerness to make a change moving forward. Staff/Administrator A said, "I think for our DACA students in particular something that I need to be as attentive to is kind of making sure that those barriers or channels that may not be

open are opened or barriers are broken down.” This illustrates that there is a desire within the school community to think more deeply about the well-being of all the students. Another staff/administrator stated, “I think if students were identified we would try to figure out what some of their needs are like sometimes there’s housing needs, sometimes there’s financial need, and sometimes there is confidentiality needs that a student might have, if they identify, we just have to be sensitive to and just accommodate that” (Staff/Administrator E). Responses such as this may offer comfort to undocumented and DACA students and hope for positive policy changes.

Conclusion

Based on the interviews, there appears to be a desire by staff and administration at CSB+SJU for stronger protective policies for undocumented and DACA students. One policy that could potentially be implemented is clarifying the role of law enforcement and how to approach them coming on to campus. Also, detailing the role of school officers (Life Safety/CSB Security) to ensure that they do not step out of the bounds of their job responsibilities. As one of the Staff/Administrators mentioned, there could be a page available on the school website dedicated to resources for undocumented and DACA students (Staff/Administrator A). This could include information about FERPA, outside scholarships that DACA students are eligible to apply for, and legal resources through the school. Another step in the right direction would be increasing financial aid opportunities for these students. There are many financial barriers to attendance, so creating scholarships could break down some of those barriers. The strongest stance the school could take would be declaring themselves a sanctuary, however, it may take time to get to a point where the institutions feel strongly enough to label themselves as a

sanctuary. There are implications that come along with the label of sanctuary such as potentially losing funding or making the college/university a bigger target for law enforcement. Regardless, the safety of all students is vital for their learning experience. This issue should not be ignored and as Staff/Administrator A highlights, “this is one of those issues that has not gone away which is why we need to pay more attention to it.”

After diving into college and university responses to the efforts to get rid of DACA and the surge of the sanctuary movement, I think it would be beneficial to explore the impact new policies have had on students. I would like to see their perception of the policies and whether they actually help. In order to continue supporting undocumented students through programs and policies, there is a need to have administration, faculty, staff, and students involved in the process. Financial aid, school resources, programs, and concrete policies are significant but so is the voice of the people. That voice is key in identifying changes needed and demanding them. As Huerta and Ocampo state, “important for this work to move forward, will be the involvement of the broader campus community, which must collectively take on the daily, persistent work of welcoming undocumented students; directing them to resources; and listening to, guiding, advising, and protecting them” (Huerta and Ocampo 2017, 5).

Bibliography

- Allard, Elaine C., Jonathan Hamel Sellman, Brandon Torres, Sydnie Schwarz, Freddy Bernardino, and Rebecca Castillo. 2018. "A Promise to Support Us': Undocumented Experiences on a Sanctuary Campus." *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal* 12 (3): 53–75.
<https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1200601&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Allen, Elizabeth. 2016. "What's the History of Sanctuary Spaces and Why do They Matter?" Accessed November 2, 2021. <https://theconversation.com/whats-the-history-of-sanctuary-spaces-and-why-do-they-matter-69100>
- Barron, Kyle. 2017. "Sanctuary: A Movement Redefined." *NACLA Report on the Americas* 49 (2): 190–97. doi:10.1080/10714839.2017.1331825.
- Bethel University. 2022. Accessed December 4th, 2021. <https://www.bethel.edu>
- Cade, Jason A. 2018. "Sanctuaries as Equitable Delegation in an Era of Mass Immigration Enforcement." *Northwestern University Law Review* 113 (3): 433–503.
<https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=133263446&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Carleton College. n.d. Accessed December 4th, 2021. <https://www.carleton.edu>
- Carney, Megan, Ricardo Gomez, Katharyne Mitchell, and Sara Vannini. 2017. "Sanctuary Planet: A Global Sanctuary Movement for the Time of Trump." *Society and Space*, May 16th, 2017. <https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/sanctuary-planet-a-global-sanctuary-movement-for-the-time-of-trump>
- Chen, Ming H. 2018. "Sanctuary Networks and Integrative Enforcement." *Washington and Lee Law Review* 75 (3): 1360-1391. <https://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/wlulr/vol75/iss3/6>
- College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University. 2022. Accessed December 4th, 2021. <https://www.csbsju.edu>
- Dukic, A., Gold, S., & Lisa, G. 2018. "Key legal considerations relating to sanctuary campus policies and practices." *Journal of College and University Law*, 44(1), 23-47.
- Flores, Stella. 2010. "State Dream Acts: The Effect of In-State Resident Tuition Policies and Undocumented Latino Students." *The Review of Higher Education* 33: 239-283.
doi:10.1353/rhe.0.0134.
- Gonzalez O'Brien, Benjamin, Elizabeth Hurst, Justin Reedy, and Loren Collingwood. 2019. "Framing Refuge: Media, Framing, and Sanctuary Cities." *Mass Communication & Society* 22 (6): 756–78. doi:10.1080/15205436.2019.1685106.

- Green, Kristen. 2019. "Sanctuary Campuses: The University's Role in Protecting Undocumented Students from Changing Immigration Policies." *UCLA Law Review* 66 (4): 1030-1076.
- Huerta, Grace, and Catalina Ocampo. 2017. "Daring to Dream: Sustaining Support for Undocumented Students at the Evergreen State College." *Learning Communities: Research & Practice* 5 (1).
<https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1150386&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Hsieh, Hsiu-Fang & Shannon, Sarah. 2005. "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis." *Qualitative Health Research*. 15. 1277-88. 10.1177/1049732305276687.
- Hugo, Victor. 1892. *The Hunchback of Notre Dame: A Novel*. United States: F. M. Lupton
- Ishiwata, Eric, and Susana M. Muñoz. 2018. "'They Tried to Bury Us': Scholar Advocacy in the Wake of the DACA Rescission." *New Political Science* 40 (3): 558–80.
 doi:10.1080/07393148.2018.1489093.
- Kaushal, Neeraj. "In-State Tuition for the Undocumented: Education Effects on Mexican Young Adults." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 27, no. 4 (2008): 771–92.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30163562>.
- Lippert, Randy, and Sean Rehaag. 2012. "Sanctuary Practices in International Perspectives: Migration, Citizenship and Social Movements" *London: Taylor & Francis Group*, ProQuest Ebook Central.
- Little, Becky. 2019. "Claiming 'Sanctuary' in a Medieval Church Could Save Your Life - But Lead to Exile." Accessed November 2, 2021. <https://www.history.com/news/church-sanctuary-asylum-middle-ages>
- Lloyd, Jens. 2018. "'I Never Intended It to Become a Symbol of Resistance': An Interview with Xavier Maciel about the Sanctuary Campus Movement." *Reflections: A Journal of Public Rhetoric, Civic Writing & Service Learning* 18 (2): 151–65.
<https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=135838223&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- Malik, Sanam. 2015. "DACA Helps Undocumented Students Access Higher Education." Accessed November 2, 2021.
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/news/2015/04/07/110558/daca-helps-undocumented-students-access-higher-education/>
- Mallet-García, Marie L., and Lisa García-Bedolla. 2021. "Immigration Policy and Belonging: Ramifications for DACA Recipients' Sense of Belonging." *American Behavioral Scientist* 65 (9): 1165-79. doi:10.1177/0002764221996777.

- Muñoz, Susana, Michelle M Espino, and René Antrop-González. 2014. "Creating Counter-Spaces of Resistance and Sanctuaries of Learning and Teaching: An Analysis of Freedom University." *Teachers College Record*, 32.
- Paik, A. Naomi. 2017. "Abolitionist Futures and the US Sanctuary Movement." *Race & Class* 59 (2): 3–25. doi:10.1177/0306396817717858.
- Paik, A. Naomi, Jason Ruiz, and Rebecca M. Schreiber. 2019. "Sanctuary's Radical Networks." *Radical History Review* 2019 (135): 1–14. doi:10.1215/01636545-7607797.
- Presidents' Alliance on Higher Education and Immigration. 2020. "Undocumented Students in Higher Education: How Many Students are in U.S. Colleges and Universities, and Who Are They?" *New American Economy*. April 2020.
- Potochnick, Stephanie. 2011. "How States Can Reduce the Drop Out Rate for Undocumented Immigrant Youth: The Effects of In-State Resident Tuition Policies." University of North Carolina Chapel Hill.
- Safstrom, Jennifer. 2018. "An Analysis of Sanctuary Campuses: Assessing the Legality and Effectiveness of Policies Protective of Undocumented Students and of Potential Government Responses." *Georgetown Law Journal* 106 (5): 1523-1557.
- Serrano, Uriel, Andrea Del Carmen Vazquez, Raul Meneses Samperio, and Allison Mattheis. 2018. "Symbolic Sanctuary and Discursive Dissonance: Limitations of Policy and Practice to Support Undocumented Students at Hispanic Serving Institutions." *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal* 12 (3): 169–90. <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1200681&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
- St. Olaf College. 2022. Accessed December 4th, 2021. <https://wp.stolaf.edu>
- Steil, Justin Peter, and Ion Bogdan Vasi. 2014. "The New Immigration Contestation: Social Movements and Local Immigration Policy Making in the United States, 2000–2011." *American Journal of Sociology*, 119(4): 1104–1155. <https://doi.org/10.1086/675301>
- Suárez-Orozco, Carola, Dalal Katsiaficas, Olivia Birchall, Cynthia Maribel Alcantar, Edwin Hernandez, Yuliana Garcia, Minas Michikyan, Janet Cerda, and Robert Teranishi. (2015). "Undocumented Undergraduates on College Campuses: Understanding Their Challenges and Assets and What It Takes to Make an Undocufriendly Campus." *Harvard Educational Review*. 85: 427-463. doi:10.17763/0017-8055.85.3.427.
- Villazor, Rose Cuison and Pratheepan Gulasekaram. 2018. "The New Sanctuary and Anti-Sanctuary Movements." *U.C. Davis Law Review* 52 (1): 549-570.
- Young, Elliott. 2019. "From Sanctuary to Civil Disobedience: History and Praxis." *Radical History Review* 2019 (135): 171–80. doi:10.1215/01636545-7607908.

Yukich, Grace. 2013. "Constructing the Model Immigrant: Movement Strategy and Immigrant Deservingness in the New Sanctuary Movement." *Social Problems* 60 (3): 302–20.
doi:10.1525/sp.2013.60.3.302.

Appendix 1. Research Methodology

This appendix describes the research methodology used for this research on school policies at institutions of higher education that protect undocumented students.

A. Overview

The research had two stages of data collection:

1. Content analysis of school websites including those of The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John’s University, Carleton College, St. Olaf College, University of St. Thomas, and Bethel University.
2. Interviews with staff/administration who are involved in policy decisions at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John’s University.

B. Website Data Gathering, Coding, and Analysis

I looked at the school websites for The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John’s University, Carleton College, St. Olaf College, University of St. Thomas, and Bethel University. I utilized the keywords “sanctuary campus”, “undocumented”, and “DACA”. I noted from the results the type of information found, whether it discusses policy protections or specific campus policies, and if it proposes policies. I also looked for any mention of the five main policies identified in the literature review.

Table Two: Number of Search Results Utilizing Three Keywords

College/University	Number of results for “Sanctuary campus”	Number of results for “Undocumented”	Number of results for “DACA”
College of Saint Benedict/Saint John’s University	2	27	17
Carleton College	2	264	331
St. Olaf College	1	289	36
University of St. Thomas	5	401	46
Bethel University	0	33	5

C. Research Approach to Staff/Administration Interviews

Questions for administration/staff:

1. Tell me your position’s role and how it connects to undocumented students and DACA students.
2. Do you interact with undocumented and DACA students on a regular basis, and how so?
3. Can you tell me about the resources available for undocumented and DACA students, particularly through your department?

4. If you were at CSB/SJU between 2016-2018, did you notice any difference in policies or messages sent by the administration regarding undocumented and DACA students, and what are they? If not, are there any related policies that have been implemented since you arrived, and what are they?
5. In conducting a literature review and through the content analysis of the websites, I found five main policies that campuses have adopted to protect undocumented students. These include **choosing to not disclose student information with regards to immigration status, not allowing immigration officials on campus unless legally necessary, increasing financial aid opportunities for undocumented students, preventing school officers from acting as immigration enforcement agents, and the demonstration of public support for undocumented and DACA students.** My last question is, have you noticed or encountered any of these policies in your work, and how so?

D. Details of the Interviews

Interviews with staff and administration were conducted in person and over zoom. I utilized a digital audio recorder to record the interviews for later transcription. When transcribing, I utilized code names for each person such as Staff/Administrator A, Staff/Administrator B, etc. In order to protect the identity of any undocumented students, interviewees were not allowed to use student names in the interviews. I focused on questions directly related to DACA university policies and their perceptions of them. Participants were asked five questions in a structured interview format. The interviews took between 15 minutes and 30 minutes. The benefits gained through participation include engaging in conversation about how the policies at CSB/SJU benefit undocumented and DACA status students. My hope is to inspire discussion on these policies that can hopefully influence future policy decisions and better protect students. Other benefits may include suggestions for administration as how to better serve and protect students.