Recap of Administrative Division, October 2, 2010

During the beginning of the meeting, Josh and Susan facilitated reports from Advisory Boards and Committees. During this time, AB and Committee Chairs reported on activities of the past year, as well as, discussion of any issues they faced. Nothing of note, in terms of issues, was really brought up. After reports, Susan paired AB and Committee chairs together, based on compatibility of their measurable goals and actions, and each group was charged with discussing among the pairs how to answer Josh had asked on the division’s report, and to set some measurable goals for the next year and how those goals can be reached. The consensus, after the pairs discussed goals and action plans, was that better collaboration would benefit all members of the division, as each of the groups can work together to achieve their independent goals. The discussion that followed was quite productive as the chairs discussed collaboration, how each group can help each other, how the listserv could be used more effectively, and how chairs can use the other chairs in the division as a sounding board.

No action items were put forward for the Council, but the following information items were collected to be given to the Council.

- The Division is working with the chairs and executive office to develop “outcomes” to assist with setting targets and benchmarks in planning for future work of the Division.
- Pacesetter Award Criteria Revision – The Awards Committee is looking at revising the criteria for the Pacesetter award so that the guidelines reflect the roles of administrators in today’s higher educational communities instead of only those with the title of Chief Executive Officer, etc.
- Possibility for a unified marketing plan (potentially external).
- Mentoring Incentive Plan to encourage leaders to participate in the ELP program.
- Increasing use of technology for professional development (skype, tape keynote session, etc.).
- Need for Development Officer for the purpose of finding new revenue streams.

After Josh left for Board orientation, Susan and Nathan facilitated a discussion on the AB and Committee charges, as listed in the PowerPoint Josh provided, and the discussion was quite productive. Any of the chairs had not seen their charges or had not looked at it in a very long time. The discussion consisted of chairs asking questions as to the specificity of the charges. Terry Musser brought up a great point that the chairs agreed with: the charges can not be too specific, as it will prevent future growth, but need to be specific enough that actually measurable outcomes can be written. The chairs were quite receptive to the idea that their charges should better reflect what they actually do, be less vague, and should be more in line with the strategic goals of NACADA.

The following was discussed as a template for committee and AB charges. Each charge should have a statement about how their group increases diversity, that group’s connection to the strategic goals and how they work to meet them, how they collaborate with other members of the division, a reference to data gathering and assessment of that data, defining more specifically what they do. This discussion lasted about an hour, and each chair planned to take this to their respective groups and discuss making alterations to their charges.