Research Committee 2013 Meeting Agenda
Sunday, October 6, 8:15 - 9:45 a.m.
Checkerboard Room, Salt Palace Convention Center

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Administrative Division report (Wendy Troxel)
   o See attachment for Research Committee report from August
   o Consider our outcome measures as we discuss our committee work
     ▪ What we’ll do (connected to NACADA Strategic Goals)
     ▪ How we’ll measure success

3. Sub-Committee Reports and Discussion
   o Conference Speaker (Ryan Tomasiewicz)
   o Common Reading (Sarah Champlin-Scharff)
     ▪ Monday, Oct. 7 from 5:30 pm – 7:00 pm in 251 EF
   o Research Agenda and Research Listserv (Jenny Bloom and Wendy Troxel)
   o Research Workshops (Janet Schulenberg and Peter Hagen)
     ▪ Sunday, October 6 from 3:15 pm – 5:15 pm in 250F
   o Research Symposia (Kathleen Smith)
   o Student Research Awards (Wendy Troxel)
   o Research Grants (Wendy Troxel)
     ▪ Reminder: 2013-14 first round reviews began Oct. 1, 2013 and will close on November 1, 2013
     ▪ Consideration of changing “multi-year” award option to “two-year” award option. Or only allow one-year award with an option for application for continuation.

4. Discussion of Subcommittee structure

5. Subcommittee assignments, new subcommittee chairs

6. Other business
   o Regional representation
     ▪ Pre-conference workshops at regional conferences- Volunteers?
     ▪ Common Reading at regional conferences- Ideas? Volunteers?
   o Research symposium/track at annual conference – Ideas? Volunteers?
   o New chair nominations due soon for 2014-16!
   o New membership possibilities- send to Leigh and Wendy

7. Adjourn!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NACADA STRATEGIC GOALS</th>
<th>NACADA RESEARCH COMMITTEE GOALS</th>
<th>INTENDED OUTCOMES</th>
<th>NACADA RESEARCH COMMITTEE STRATEGIES (Level of Expertise)</th>
<th>MEASURES OF ACHIEVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Address the academic advising needs of higher education globally</td>
<td>Communicates the value of scholarly inquiry, promotes its use in enhancing advising practice, and supports efforts to conduct new research;</td>
<td>Provide support and training to individuals conducting scholarly inquiry</td>
<td>Pre-conference Workshops (Foundational)</td>
<td>2013 Annual Conference in SLC Regional Conferences in 2014?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advance the body of knowledge of academic advising</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide support and training to individuals conducting scholarly inquiry</td>
<td>Research Symposium (Conceptual/Operational)</td>
<td>Research Symposium at Region 1 in Spring 2014 Proposed symposium at annual conference in Minneapolis??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide support to individuals conducting scholarly inquiry</td>
<td>Research Grants (Operational)</td>
<td>Round 1 in November 2013 Round 2 in March 2014 Add “what does a good proposal look like?” to the NACADA grant guidelines website?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate the selection of a scholarly article to be discussed by association members at the annual conference</td>
<td>Common Reading (All)</td>
<td>2013 Annual Conference in SLC Regional Conferences in 2014?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Promote the publication and presentation of research from the association’s membership in an effort to increase the representation of scholarly inquiry across all NACADA venues. | Research Keynote Speaker (All) | 2013 - Dr. Al Bowman  
2014 – Proposed: Dr. Terrell Strayhorn, Ohio State University |
|---|---|---|
| Encourages scholarly inquiry that addresses contemporary and emerging issues in academic advising and higher education from a wide variety of perspectives and methodologies; | Facilitate discussion of critical topics in advising, including potential research designs ..... | Research Agenda and Research Listserv (All)  
Disseminate “Critical Questions in Advising” on website and elsewhere . . . maybe use for a “monthly topic” on the listserv? “Topic of the Month” on the listserv? How can we move to a more systematic use of this tool? |
| Provide support and training to individuals conducting scholarly inquiry | Research Grants (Operational) | Report on grants awarded, including follow-up on conference presentations and journal publications resulting from projects completed |
| Contribute to process to review requests for distribution of surveys to NACADA members | NACADA Member Survey Guidelines | Report on survey requests received and requests approved. Describe common elements that result in denials. |
| Promotes conditions that empower advisors as contributors of | Facilitate discussion of critical topics in advising . . . | Research Agenda and Research Listserv (Foundational)  
Pull it all together . . . tracking system for NACADA members who participate in multiple |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Research Grants (Operational)</th>
<th>Add “what does a good proposal look like?” to the NACADA grant guidelines website?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote NACADA research grant opportunities to increase the number of competitive grant applications</td>
<td>Student Research Awards (Operational)</td>
<td>Last year we revised the guidelines to promote the description of research findings (even if preliminary). That resulted in more polished submissions with clearer implications for contributions to the field. Anything else we can do? Partner with the graduate student group, perhaps?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Champion the educational role of academic advising to enhance student learning and development in a diverse world

   - Encourages scholarly inquiry that addresses contemporary and emerging issues in academic advising and higher education from a wide variety of perspectives and methodologies;

4. Educate university and college decision-makers about the role of quality academic advising in higher education

   - Promotes conditions that empower advisors as contributors of knowledge.

5. Ensure the effectiveness of the NACADA organization

   | Research Grants | Research Keynote Speaker |
NACADA 2013 Common Reading Discussion


SUMMARY

Lowenstein expresses a “vision” of what advising might be like at some unspecified time in the not-too-distant future. He does not claim to describe what advising is like now, nor to predict what it will be like in the future. In this way, the essay is very different in its technique from most other writings about advising that are usually found under the heading of “research.” It is not based on a qualitative or a quantitative study, or any kind of survey or interviews. At first glance it appears to be based on nothing more than the author’s imagination. But there is more to it than that.

The essay does primarily four things:

- It proposes a philosophy of advising—an account of “the essential nature and purpose” of advising. More implicitly than explicitly, it presents a view of what advising ought to be and what its central goals should be. Lowenstein summarizes this philosophy by saying that “advising is a fundamentally academic activity focused on teaching and learning as well as the integration of each student’s curriculum” (p. 257);
- It argues that (provided advising is viewed in the way the author views it) advising is absolutely central to the academic mission of any college or university;
- It issues a call to action for individual advisors and for the profession as a whole to “think big and aim high” in aspiring to the leadership role that the essay proposes; and finally
- It invites advisors (who may or may not agree with Lowenstein’s ideas) to formulate their own ideas about the philosophy of advising and what they would like advising to be in the future, and to debate these ideas among themselves.

In selecting this essay as the common reading, the Research Committee is not only recommending Lowenstein’s ideas as being worthy of discussion, it is also signaling that there are types of scholarship about advising other than quantitative or qualitative studies which may be worthy of our attention. This kind of scholarship does not seek to present us with any facts or findings that we did not previously know, but it may benefit us in other ways by inviting us to consider – and debate – ideas about the nature of our profession.
POSSIBLE DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Are there features of the advising profession, as Lowenstein describes it, that you find particularly attractive? That you find particularly unattractive?

2. Lowenstein says (p. 257): “Advisors cannot permit themselves to be characterized as handmaidens to the ‘real’ work of universities, but must insist that they are central to it.” At your own institution, with regard to this distinction, how do you think advising is perceived by the leadership? By the faculty? By you and your colleagues?

3. Lowenstein claims (p. 256) that even if his vision cannot be attained in real life, it can still have value as an end to seek, or a standard against which to measure our actual practice. Do you think it is indeed useful in that way? If you don’t agree with Lowenstein’s vision, do you think a different unachievable vision might be valuable in the way he describes?

4. Do you think it is within the capability of academic advisors individually or collectively to raise the stature of the advising profession within colleges and universities or within academia as a whole? Is this a worthwhile goal?

5. Do you think it would be worthwhile for you and other advisors on your campus to meet on a regular basis to discuss ideas about what advising should become?