

Division Unit Report for the Theory, Philosophy, & History Commission Submitted by Drew Puroway

Columns 7 and 8 are completed for the progress report due August 15, 2017. Please send your report to CIGD Reps: Rebecca Cofer (rcofer@abac.edu), Erin Justyna (erin.justyna@ttu.edu), and Kyle Ross (kwross@wsu.edu) with a copy to CIGD Liaisons Jennifer Joslin (jejoslin@ksu.edu) and Dawn Krause (dawnkrause@ksu.edu). Please copy your unit's CIGD Steering Committee Member as well. Thank you!

NACADA Strategic Goal(s) (List strategic goal(s) to which the outcome is related)	Specific desired outcome (What you want to occur as a result of your efforts; what you want someone to know, do, or value)	Actions, activities or opportunities for outcome to occur (What processes need to be in place to achieve desired outcome)	Outcome measurements & related data instrument(s) (How you will specifically measure for the outcome and any instruments you will specifically use e.g. survey, focus group)	Other groups or individuals (if any) to connect with in achieving this outcome (List any plans or opportunities for collaboration with other Committees, Advisory Boards or units regarding this outcome)	Challenges (if any) anticipated in achieving this outcome (How you plan to address difficulties that may arise as you work to achieve the outcome)	Progress toward achieving outcome (Only completed in August 2016 report)	Future action(s) based on data (Data-informed decisions) (Only completed in August 2016 report)
Provide professional development opportunities that are responsive to the needs of advisors and advising administrators Create an inclusive environment within the Association that promotes diversity Expand and communicate the scholarship of	Commission members will value the activities organized by the active steering committee	Increase steering committee members from 8 to at least 10 Continue brown bag series and follow through on TED Style talks not accomplished in 2015-2016 Send brownbag links to the listserv after the event Openly reflect upon and discuss	Size of steering committee Count of events that happened Feedback ratings on post brownbag and other survey's of participants	We will need contact with the EO Staff – especially Elisa.	The most significant challenge will continue to be to take on tasks in the midst of the busy lives of steering committee members as well as those from whom we solicit leadership for programmatic events	Steering Committee remained the same size as the past, and was a bit less active. We had Four really excellent Brownbag Discussions, but couldn't get any in during the late spring or summer. The ratings that we collected were limited	In the case of this year, it didn't seem like size particularly mattered so much as leadership and engagement. We accomplished roughly the same amount of work, but there wasn't a lot of connection after the April Brownbag which came on the heels of session

academic advising		<p>diversity of presenters, authors and other contributors in events during planning</p> <p>Update information on the website (especially resources pages)</p>	<p>Number of links on the site</p>		<p>Elisa mentioned last year that if we were clear about what we wanted she and a grad were happy to assist.</p>	<p>as the participation greatly exceeded survey response, but for each of the four their was stronger agreement than disagreement to the effectiveness of the session. We did not have enough people of color involved in planning events, but our presenters represented a fairly diverse set of background and ideas.</p>	<p>reviews for the annual conference. A large part of this is on Drew as Chair for not arranging meetings. It seems important to somehow keep connected over the late spring and summer.</p> <p>Given the generally solid reviews of the events and more or less steady attendance (20-30 per session), it seems prudent to continue the brownbag series in some form. Having polished visuals and open ended</p>
-------------------	--	--	------------------------------------	--	--	---	---

						<p>Work continued on TED style “asynchronous” content and that could still be developed and experimented with in the next year.</p> <p>The website updates have not yet happened.</p> <p>Elisa has been an incredible support to our group, there are not enough thanks in the world for her positive attitude and dedication.</p>	<p>questions seemed to get more favorable reviews than more direct lecture sorts of presentations.</p> <p>Diversity of planners and presenters should continue to be a consideration for future web events and other attempts at extending the connection of the commission beyond annual conference.</p> <p>We may be at a point where the commission could either continue to experiment with new</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

							venues of connection OR focus energies on engaging more with what has been established in the last two years (i.e Facebook & Zoom Brownbags)
<p>Create an inclusive environment within the Association that promotes diversity</p> <p>Expand and communicate the scholarship of academic advising</p>	<p>Bring ethics of advising (and its social justice implications) into the conversation around Theory, Philosophy, and History.</p>	<p>Follow-up the discussion from Annual in Atlanta in one of the first two steering committee meetings</p> <p>Consider a Brownbag on ethics in advising</p> <p>Contact the Ethics & Legal Issues IG to discuss collaboration</p>	<p>Did the conversation happen or not?</p> <p>Was contact made with ethics & legal IG?</p>	<p>Ethics & Legal Issues IG</p> <p>Steering committee member from CIGD</p>	<p>Tactfully engaging with this part of our purview with ethics as a branch of Philosophy in a way that doesn't duplicate efforts of other parts of CIGD</p>	<p>These objectives were completed. We had two brownbag discussions that fit in these topics. Advising and Social Justice with CJ Venable on March 29 and Erin Donahoe-Rankin presented on Ethics on April 25, 2017. Drew</p>	<p>There was a lot of energy around both of these topics. It is difficult to say what we do moving forward especially as the CIG Division undergoes thoughtful review. The overlap of ethics with Philosophy with continue, but certainly the legal issues piece</p>

						<p>did extend an invitation to the Ethics and Legal Interests IG via email to the chair. However, it was unclear the extent of participation from this other interest group.</p>	<p>may not fit quite so well. It seems prudent for leadership in the commission to keep listening for ideas on how to incorporate ethics and how that might fit as the division changes.</p> <p>The expansion of the scholarship of advising is a point of connection that should continue in the commission. There have been some really important scholarship that has been published lately (e.g.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

							histories in <i>Beyond Foundations: Burton, 2016; Xyst, 2016; and Lieberman, 2017</i>) that deserve the attention of the commission.