Introductions

Attendees:
- **Division Representatives**: Victor Macaruso, Jennifer Joslin, David Spight
- **Executive Office Liaison**: Julia Wolf
- **Commission Chairs and Incoming Chairs**: LaDonna Bridges, Shannon Burton, Stephanie Crouch, Jackie Dana, Teresa D'Urso, Cindy Fruhwirth, Cornelius Gilbert, Amanda Hatton, Dan King, Tim Kirkner, Christine Lancaster, Jeff McClellan, Vicki McGillin, Sandy Meyer, Amanda Owens, Lisa Peck, Kristi Quiros, Janice Robinson, Steve Schneider, Clay Schwenn, Nora Scobie, Kathleen Smith, Janet Spence, Bobbi Thomas, Jennifer Varney, Mark Vegter, Dana Zahorik
- **Interest Group Chairs**: Scott Amundsen, Marcia Bimmel, Mutlu Citim-Kepic, Peter Freitag, Lisa Keenan, Joe Murray, Kelly O'Sullivan, Marion Schwartz
- **Potential Interest Group Chairs**: Joyce Ellenwood
- **Division Steering Committee**: Lee Kem, Ila Schauer, Peg Steele
- **Absent**: Renee Babcock, David Benz, Pat Folsom, Sarah Naylor, Deb Noll, Richard Ribb, Leslie Staggers

I. Minutes Approval — The [minutes for the CIG Division Meeting](https://example.com) on September 30, 2008 in Chicago were approved. Chairs were e-mailed a direct link to the minutes and asked to review them prior to the meeting.

II. Overview of Meeting Folders — Julia Wolf briefly reviewed the contents of the meeting packets.

III. Chair Roles and Responsibilities
   A. **Chairperson Expectations** ([Commission, Interest Group](https://example.com)) — Victor provided a brief overview of the Commission and Interest Group Chair Expectations, which are posted online.
   B. **Reports** (Post-conference, Annual)—Timelines, Relation to Strategic Plan, Budget Requests, Report Feedback — Jennifer
      The value of organizing steering committees was discussed. Chairs were encouraged to plan only a few realistic goals that could be achieved within the next year. Incoming Chairs were encouraged to meet with their respective outgoing Chairs to work together to plan goals and activities for the next year for the post-conference report. Chairs were reminded of the importance of inclusiveness and diversity while planning their activities and goals, and to be sure to include these plans in the applicable section of their post-conference reports. It was noted that funding for conference calls with their steering committees needed to be requested in the post-conference reports.
   C. **Annual Commission & Interest Group meeting** (solicit potential Chair nominees, committee volunteers, proposals) — David
      Chairs were reminded that the annual meetings provided an excellent opportunity to solicit potential Chair nominees, ask for volunteers to help with activities, share ideas, and encourage members to submit conference proposals.
   D. **Conference Programming and Proposal Review** — Jennifer
      Chairs were encouraged to provide comments for all proposals read to help the conference committee with the review process and filling open slots in addition to those commission-sponsored.
   E. **List serves and Network Etiquette** — Julia
      Chairs were reminded that members had to personally subscribe to the open list serves managed by NACADA, and NACADA could not add members to these lists automatically. The only exceptions were those members signing up at the CIGD Fair and annual meetings for addition to the lists, which is completed by the NACADA Executive Office (EO). Chairs and members post messages to the list serves personally. To send an e-mail to all members of their unit, Chairs send the text to the EO to send out (since only a small percentage of unit members are typically subscribed to the unit's list serve).
   F. **Commission-sponsored Surveys and Dissertation Research** — Charlie Nutt
      Charlie explained to the Chairs that NACADA recognizes the importance of the data generated by these surveys. At the same time, NACADA must also be selective in the surveys sent to members, and be careful not to send out too many and to space them apart.
IV. Small Group Discussion #1 — Sharing of Best Practices as Chair ("What I Learned I Didn’t Know & Wished I’d Known Before Serving As Chair") — sharing best practices of past activities, including review of conference proposals, articles written, incorporation of diversity and inclusiveness of membership, working with a unit steering committee, collaboration with other units, recruitment and involvement of volunteers, use of technology forums for discussion and communication with members (i.e., wikis, blogs, list serves, Facebook, Twitter, etc.), other?

Chairs shared the following ideas and comments:

- Approach presenters to ask for articles as an extension of their presentations
- Ask conference committee for copies of proposal review comments for commission-sponsored sessions or all sessions in a particular track. Or, ask for summaries of comments on the evaluations from conference sessions to be sent to Chairs, which could help provide authors for articles.
- Commission or Interest Group Chair could offer to review draft of AAT article being written by another member.
- Send monthly probes on the list serve to generate discussions.
- Generate more activity on the CIG Division list serve - send requests for ideas, etc.
- Investigate the value of a co-Chair and/or regional liaisons for interest groups. Hold IG meeting at each regional conference.
- Having a co-chair or assistant chair is helpful. Perhaps select a person who is close to the annual conference location for the next year.
- Regional liaison volunteers are great for bringing diversity to commissions and interest groups, and for distributing/sharing leadership responsibilities.
- Send letter to regional liaison's supervisor for recognition purposes, as well as for other unit volunteers.
- Since elected positions cannot have co-chairs, commission chairs are encouraged to better utilize their steering committees.
- Outgoing Chair could prepare binder of information to pass along to the incoming Chair.
- Wimba is an online communication tool available through the NACADA Executive Office for use by commissions and interest groups to connect with their steering committee members. Wimba is currently used by NACADA for the webinars.

V. Activities Overview, Updates, and Logistics — Julia provided details for the following items.

A. Commission and Interest Group Fair details and logistics — Chairs were notified that they could pick up display boards and push pins after the leadership dinner or any time the next day in the conference registration area. After the Fair, they can leave the display boards and push pins on the tables, but should take any display items with them that they wanted to keep. Chairs could keep the boards if they wanted to use them at their annual meetings. Chairs were reminded that the Fair would be a great place for networking and recruiting volunteers for activities, such as readers for conference proposals, steering committee members, authors for AAT content articles, etc. Sign-up sheets for individual social gatherings could also be provided.

B. Annual Meeting Head Counts and Feedback Forms — Each chair was provided a special form to report the actual attendee head count at their respective annual meeting, and asked to turn it in at conference registration before leaving the conference. Each Commission and Interest Group Chair is responsible for providing their own form if they want to gather feedback and other information from their members at their annual meeting regarding the meeting agenda, unit activities, or other issues. Chairs were asked to forward the templates of their meeting feedback forms to Julia after the conference so they could be posted online to serve as samples for future use by other chairs.

C. AAT articles and updates (content articles, CIG activity updates) — Chairs were asked to volunteer to write content articles for future issues of Academic Advising Today, and encouraged to collaborate with other units for these articles. The difference was explained between topical content articles written by commission and interest group chairs and updates on unit activities provided by chairs.

D. Certificates for Presenters of Commission-Sponsored sessions — Printed certificates were distributed to Commission Chairs to give to the commission-sponsored session presenters. This presentation could be done during their respective annual commission meetings or at the actual session prior to the beginning of the presentation.
E. **Commission Chair Signatures** – Signatures were collected from the incoming Commission Chairs, which will be scanned and printed on applicable commission-sponsored session certificates next fall.

F. **Service to Commission Awards** – Commission Chairs were reminded to request $50 in funds in their post-conference reports if they planned to solicit nominations for a Service to Commission Award next year. It was mentioned that it might be time for the nomination procedures and process for these awards to be reviewed. It was also suggested that perhaps these awards should be awarded for a specific “activity” completed by the commission rather than to a person, which would recognize the commission and be awarded by the CIG Division.

G. **Elections in Spring 2010** – Chairs were asked to solicit and submit nominations for the leadership positions being elected next year, and the Commission Chair positions, in particular. It was pointed out that a printed nomination form was in the back of conference program and was also available online.

H. **One-on-One Meetings** – Julia offered to meet one-on-one during the conference with incoming or continuing Chairs who might want to meet to discuss questions they may have, or ideas and activities planned for their units.

### VI. Division Overview and Resources for Chairs

A. **Overview of NACADA Web Pages and Online Resources** – Jennifer provided a brief overview.

B. **Online Leadership Orientation Modules and Chair Feedback** — Victor encouraged all Chairs, both new and continuing, to complete these leadership modules at their convenience. Chairs felt this online orientation tool was helpful.

C. **Board of Directors, Council, and Division Representatives** – Victor provided a brief overview of the association and noted that the CIG Division is represented on the Council.

D. **CIG Division Steering Committee structure & purpose** – David recognized the members of the CIGD Steering Committee in attendance and thanked for their service. Chairs were encouraged to contact their assigned steering committee member when needing assistance.

E. **Role of Executive Office and Liaison** – Julia provided a brief overview on the role of the Executive Office Liaison to the CIG Division, and referred Chairs to the handout in the meeting folder for a more detailed explanation. Due to increased responsibilities in her position, Julia announced that Jenifer Scheibler in the Executive Office would be taking over the Liaison role and the transition would occur over the next several months.

F. **Special Discussion – Potential “Members Only” Sections on the NACADA Web Site**

Chairs were asked to provide feedback on whether certain sections of the NACADA web site should be accessible by members only, such as the Clearinghouse and the list serves. This feedback will be forwarded on to the Board and Council for further discussion.

Below is a summary of the feedback and comments:

- Restrict the areas of the web site that require the most work to maintain.
- The Clearinghouse should be for members only. Provide “teasers” for articles and then charge a fee to access the entire article. Members would have full access to the Clearinghouse.
- Many faculty advisors are not NACADA members (are members of organizations within their own disciplines) but rely on the resources provided on the web site as their source for advising information. Having areas for members only would restrict their access to this information.
- Provide the option of “institutional memberships” in which all advisors at that institution would have access to the members-only areas of the web site.
- Charge a “research fee” or short-term membership fee for temporary access to the Clearinghouse.
- There are two perspectives — organization viability and service to the profession.
- Should think of service to the profession before the viability of the organization (especially in light of the current economic situation). Having areas of “members only” would shut off people who can no longer afford to attend events.
- Graduate students use the Clearinghouse for research. If accessible by members only, this would cut them off.
Do more research before making this decision. Survey non-members to ask why they are not members.
Obtain data on who is using the Clearinghouse. Track users and who they are (positions, institutions).
Ned to consider how restricted access to the web site would affect our allied associations.
Depending on which areas are restricted to members only, this could restrict access by undecided students who may want to research careers in advising.
Look at the NACADA Strategic Plan -- keeping the web site open to the public applies to all goals.
Perhaps the list serves could be for members only. They take time and Chairs respond to the issues, even if not posted by members.
Since subscription to a list serve is voluntary, it may be hard to manage whether all subscribers are members or not.
Provide an option on the membership form to indicate automatic addition to a particular list serve, such as for a commission or interest group.

INTERMISSION

VII. Small Group Discussion #2 — Leadership Reports and Relation to NACADA Strategic Plan
Implementation ideas, examples of future goals and activities that would meet mission strategies, use of list serves, possible collaborations on activities among commissions and interest groups, assessment of goals and activities, incorporation of diversity and inclusiveness of membership into the planning of goals and activities.

Chairs were asked to share how they addressed the NACADA Strategic Plan in setting their goals and activities. The following comments and suggestions were shared during the small group discussions:

- It was felt that NACADA should have a presence on social media formats, including Facebook, Twitter, blogs, etc. (Jackie Dana offered to assist Chairs in this area.)
- Chairs could discuss the NACADA Strategic Plan with members for ideas and feedback.
- Have meeting between the incoming and outgoing Chairs of a commission after its annual meeting to facilitate transition of ideas and plans.
- You don't have to fill out every part of the report. This is important for Chairs to know!
- Decide what is really important and reasonable to accomplish in the coming year.
- The magic word is "ongoing".
- Make sure to take meeting notes or have someone else take meeting notes, which are helpful in writing report.
- Work on annual report alongside the outgoing Chair. Perhaps this should be the outgoing Chair's responsibility.
- Have members assist with generating responses, ideas, direction as it relates to the Strategic Plan.
- Responsibilities for outgoing chair -- there are none. Perhaps old and new chairs have a transition meeting after the commission meeting and walk through the report. This transitional meeting would assist incoming chairs and clarify practices.
- It is important to recruit volunteers and to delegate in order to get things done.
- One of the most difficult issues to address is "diversity" because it seems both ambiguous and broad.
- It is difficult for a first-year Commission Chair to meet the November 15th deadline for reports. Not enough time to synthesize things or to get volunteers. December or January would be great.
- It would make sense to have the follow-up (August) report after the annual conference and then the initial report at the beginning of the year.
- Not a good way for collaboration among commissions or among interest groups to occur. The opportunity to interact over a distance is a challenge in this regard. Technology could help -- wikis, blogs, Google.docs, chat, etc.
- Could there be joint meetings -- e.g. an interest group and a commission, or two commissions, to meet together at the annual conference?
- Is there a way to get commission chairs together more than at the division meeting? Might this go on at the regional meetings or at the state level?
- There is a need to forge better and stronger relations between the commissions and regions.
A. Applications for Commission Status — (vote by current Commission Chairs only) — each group petitioning for commission status presented the highlights of their applications.

1. Advising High-Achieving Students (pdf format) (Marion Schwartz, Kathie Sindt) — A discussion of this application was held. It was explained that a primary goal for this group will be to develop a definition of “high achieving student”. There is not much literature in this area and a definition would help gather and characterize this info. Interest in this area has been gaining momentum, and now is the opportune time for developing this definition. The development of a more comprehensive group to include high achieving, gifted, and honors students as well as those awarded fellowships was mentioned as a possibility.

**ACTION:** A vote was taken on this application for commission status. Application was **approved**.

2. Appreciative Advising (pdf format) (Scott Amundsen) - A discussion of this application was held. It was explained that commission status would facilitate collaboration with other commissions the solicitation of more research as well as give it a more national presence. The issue was raised that current commissions represent a specific population or critical issue rather than a method or practice, which appreciate advising was considered by many to be. Various views were thrown out, including whether it would be more appropriate for this group to be a sub-group under the Theory & Philosophy of Advising Commission. The question was also asked whether granting commission status would imply endorsement by NACADA of the appreciative advising methods.

**ACTION:** A vote was taken on this application for commission status. Application was **denied**.

3. The process for seeking commission status and applicable deadlines were reviewed for any current Interest Groups considering this step in 2010. It was also noted that clearer guidelines were needed on the discussion process for commission status applications and on the voting process.

B. Potential Interest Group Applications — questions?

1. Advising Second-Year Students (pdf format) (Laura Avila, Leah Panganiban) -- neither co-chair for this group was in attendance so no discussion took place.

2. Advising at Historically Black Colleges & Universities (pdf format) (Joyce Ellenwood) -- The question was raised whether this group could be folded into the Multicultural Concerns Commission. It was explained that the HBCUs were specifically mandated by the government for a specific purpose, making them distinct in their own right. The comment was also made that HBCUs are an institutional type, such as two-year colleges and tribal colleges.

Both groups will be given the opportunity to submit formal proposals for official interest group status after the conference.

IX. Small Group Discussion #3 — Review Process for Commissions and Interest Groups

Evaluation criteria and guidelines? Timeline for the review? Ramifications of a poor review? Possible criteria — Steering Committee, mission statement, contributions to NACADA publications and resources, solicitation of commission-related conference presentations, communications with commission members, contributions to commission’s specific topical area of advising (i.e., bibliography), participation in awards programs, presentations at other association events, etc.

Discussion began on the need for a review process for commissions and interest groups, largely precipitated by the proliferation of such units over the past 4-5 years and the somewhat ambiguous process of moving from IG to commission status.

Shortly after this discussion began, it became obvious that perhaps the greater need was to review the overall structure of the CIG Division as a whole, including similarities and differences between commissions and interest groups, and whether the two different types of units were needed or if all could be put on the same level. Different ways of organizing the units would be discussed, one of which might be to divide them into sections such as special populations, issues, institutional types, and theory/practice. Chairs were asked to think of the “big picture”.
Questions to consider during this review of the current organizational structure would include how the CIG Division could better service its members and why members join commissions and interest groups in the first place. Clarifying these issues would facilitate this review process and better define the purpose of the division, thus laying the groundwork for identifying a more functional structure for the division.

A task force was established to look into the restructuring issue and identify possible options. The members of the task force will include the CIGD Division Reps (David Spight, Jennifer Joslin), Executive Office Liaisons (Jenifer Scheibler, Julia Wolf), the CIGD Steering Committee (Victor Macaruso, Chris Maroldo, Ruby Mason, Lisa Peck, Kris Rugsaken, Steve Schneider, Peg Steele, Dana Zahorik), and 5 at-large Unit Chairs (Mutlu Citim-Kepic, Peter Freitag, Jeff McClellan, Joe Murray, Marion Schwartz).

X. Announcements
   • CIG Division Meeting Feedback — Chairs were asked to complete a feedback form for the CIG Division meeting and submit it before leaving the conference.
   • Annual Town Hall Business Meeting — Chairs were encouraged to attend.
   • Door Prizes — Copies of NACADA resources were given out as door prizes.

XI. Steering Committee/Chair Meetings — Steering Committee members were encouraged to find a time to meet with the Chairs of their assigned units during the conference.

XII. Adjournment / Leadership Dinner — the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.