
II. Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting – Torgler moved and Kincanon seconded to approve the minutes of the 2011 Administrative Division annual meeting; motion carried.

III. Updates – Committee and Advisory Board chairs gave updates of their group’s activity during the past year.

a. Professional Development Committee: Scobie reported that the committee wants to do a needs assessment for the entire membership in the coming year, and also to determine how the CIG realignment could affect professional development by identifying any gaps and evaluating delivery modes. Marchesani noted that the Membership Committee-conducted survey of non-renewing members identified some gaps in NACADA offerings for faculty and graduate students. Data from the survey will be shared to identify hits and misses.

b. Membership Committee: Marchesani and Jensen indicated the guidebook for affiliates among international institutions has been drafted. It will be of assistance for international institutions wanting to establish an affiliate organization. Three stages of work were described: laying the foundation for relationship-building with graduate students including having a graduate student information contact on each campus; survey analysis of non-renewing members; and discussing open access to the NACADA Journal. The committee also has established a more formal relationship with the Diversity Committee, and established an ex officio member on the committee to increase communication and diversity across the association. Some findings from the survey of non-renewing members were shared.

c. Awards Committee: Kincanon reported the committee had a very good first year utilizing the electronic nominating and review system and has
received some positive anecdotal information. Reviewers who used the system were surveyed, with good feedback that inspired programmatic changes to the system. Being closely looked at are the advising administration categories.

d. Research Committee: Schulenberg and Troxel reported that the research registry has been less effective and the group is working with the EO to set up a research listserv as an interim solution to make connections between research partners. There are about 200 on the listserv. The quality of grant applicants is still increasing, and more research funding was approved to award. Support for scholars to bring research to publication is needed. The Research Committee will now include a Journal editor as a member. Helping members submit grant proposals that also address needs of the EO (such as training and development) is a priority, as well as assisting researchers in getting their proposals successfully through their own campus’s process.

e. Annual Conference Advisory Board: Norris noted that more than 100 pages of post-conference responses are received each year; all of it is closely reviewed. Two-thirds of respondents are first-, second- or third-time attendees. Also being analyzed are trends in data and in comment types.

f. AACSS Advisory Board: Hones and Drake reported that a 2011 precon identified members who are interested in consulting through AACSS and addressed ways to become qualified, build expertise, etc. The group is working on a rubric to select speakers, and is now using a resume template to make information clients utilize in selecting speakers more uniform. Work on assessment has begun, including evaluation forms, indexing the most popular services, and developing rubrics for both.

g. Summer Institute Advisory Board: Huber gave an overview of the 2012 Summer Institutes, including the Austin SI which was the first time applicants over capacity actually had to be turned away. The group is evaluating whether to adjust content, structure, etc.

h. NCAA/NACADA Advisory Board: Darling and Russell explained the background of the NCAA-NACADA contractual agreement, and that the growth of the programs necessitated the addition of an advisory board. Lots of legislation is coming regarding transfer students and continuing eligibility issues. The online course needs to be updated, including more recent research and new issues coming to the forefront.

i. Assessment Institute Advisory Board: Robbins indicated that Texas law now requires all academic advising to be assessed, resulting in a 2 ½-day NACADA mini-institute in Texas which drew the chancellor of the Texas system, the president and many advisors. The group also is working to update the assessment section of the Clearinghouse and ensure that it stays current going forward with the new content management system. There was discussion of adding an upper level of instruction to the Institute to meet the needs of members who are advancing in expertise.
j. Publications Advisory Board: Jordan noted the group is at a point where they are having to identify new publication topics, and are updating the transfer, peer advising, and national survey monographs. The handbooks will be updated in the future. E-publication is being discussed.

k. Webinar Advisory Board: Cunning reported for Rodriguez on the Adobe Connect platform now being used for web events; feedback is unanimously positive, with a few technical issues. The new 60-minute events also are being well received. Next year will bring more collaborative projects (such as with assessment, international students, etc.). The Advisor Tech week-long series of free events was over capacity every day.

l. Technology Committee: Steele explained the committee was recommended by the Technology Commission to help the EO with technology issues and communication of technology to members; and discussed the new EO association management and content management systems currently in the works.

m. Administrators’ Institute Advisory Board: Torgler reported that the Institute in San Diego reversed the downward attendance trend of 2010-2011. Holding the National Seminar between AI and AS has had a positive effect on attendance as well. There was discussion of how to address repeat attendees and curriculum, and incorporating an aspiring advisor track into programming in the next year.

n. Finance Committee: Killingsworth and McFarlane reported that 2011 was a good financial year. Last year the committee encouraged the Administrative Division chairs to make supplemental funding requests as needed, and several were received and funded. Killingsworth noted that 30 percent of net income has been earmarked for technology over the next three years.

o. Diversity Committee: Doyle reported the group focused this year on diversifying membership, using the very broad NACADA definition. She encouraged conference presenters (and descriptions) to address how sessions could relate to international audiences.

p. ELP Advisory Board: Waters and Pollard pointed out that by looking at the attendance of the Administrative Division meeting, one can see in the leaders present the success of the ELP. The past year was the first one in which securing mentors was easier. The group is creating a video to help recruit mentors, keeping in mind that one does not need to be in the top level of NACADA leadership to mentor.

q. Member Career Services Committee: Laugher indicated that much of the group’s work takes place at annual conference, including reviewing resumes, advising on how to conduct a job search, presenting sessions on careers, and staffing the career services booth. AAT article authors have been assigned for the coming year. New ideas include enhanced job postings on the web site, more effectively connecting employers and potential employees, mock interviews, internships, and graduate student issues in collaboration with the Membership Committee.
IV. General Discussion – Musser conducted a group discussion of goal setting for the Administrative Division for 2013. General topics included the many different areas encompassed by the division, how to set goals and determine when/if they have been reached, revising charges of the committees and advisory boards, how to evaluate your group’s work, and the need for a common terminology. The nominal group process was used to discover what the division’s goals are as a group to accomplish in the next year. Feedback included:

- Identifying how committees and advisory boards are connecting and collaborating – and if they aren’t collaborating, how might they?
- Continuing the great collaboration that goes on at the annual conference and the Division meetings throughout the year.
- Identifying financial synergies, such as between the Research and Awards committees for scholarships, etc.
- How to share goals and work and create synergy rather than working in silos.
- Considering the time limitations; what can we accomplish in a year toward the grander scheme of things; taking small bites; moving in increments.
- Being open to adding additional people if it suits a purpose, such as the Technology Committee and the NCAA/NACADA Advisory Board.
- Increased visibility of the higher level conversations going on in the Administrative Division.
- Streamlining communications in preparing for meetings across the board at NACADA.
- How to retain and address the needs of members beyond the first and second year of membership.
- Better articulate how the committees’ and advisory boards’ work relates to the strategic goals.
- More visibility on who the leaders are.
- Maybe a retention task force or group, kind of like an “FYE for NACADA Leaders.”
- Look at each committee and advisory board; do any need to be added, changed, or repurposed?

Several common themes emerged:

- Better communication and collaboration within the Division,
- There are different types of goals for committees than for advisory boards,
- The need for innovation, and
- Focusing on what can be influenced and improved.

Group feedback was positive regarding the meeting’s discussion structure and its focus on big picture issues and goals for the future. An Adobe Connect after the annual conference could be helpful in revising the ideas percolated during the current discussion and working them into plans and goals for the year’s work. Musser indicated she, Marsh-Williams and Coffey will condense the information gathered to four or five major points and distribute it to the group.
V. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.