

AWARDS COMMITTEE

NACADA Annual Conference Meeting

October 5, 2016

Present: Cynthia Pascal (chair), Karen Lewis, Kathy Earwood, Kerry Kincanon (Admin Division rep), Cecilia Olivares, Pamela Stephens, Brandan Lowden, Jennifer McCaul, Alex Kunkle, Sherie Jensen, Andrew Rawlings (EO GRA and Awards Committee assistant). Guest EO Liaison: Jennifer Joslin subbing for Farrah Turner

Chair Cynthia Pascal called the meeting to order and led the group through the meeting agenda.

- I. Welcome and Introductions and overall announcements**
 - a. Awards name change (to Global Awards) to differentiate between association-level and region-level awards

- II. Data project on Awards at Global as well as Regional level**
 - a. Survey information revealed inconsistencies each year in terms of nominations and awards/scholarships, and inconsistencies in the popularity or attention different awards/scholarships receive every year
 - i. For example, some awards/scholarships receive a lot of nominations and other awards/scholarships are not pursued at all in a year, and then the next year, the trends may go in an entirely different direction
 - b. Informal discussion among meeting attendees about possible reasons why awards/scholarships are inconsistently applied for as well as why there is a great variation among the different awards/scholarships
 - i. We're all busier than ever; the packet is onerous
 - ii. Is the due date bad?
 - iii. Do all potential nominators know how to scale region awards/scholarships into Global-level nominations?
 - iv. Is the nomination process announced consistently in the same way?
 - v. Is advertising of the awards/scholarships happening consistently in the same way?
 - vi. Should we advertise the rubric for actually choosing the award so that when folks write, the standards are more clear?
 - vii. Some people just know how to write these nominations. Are we getting the tips and strategies info out there for nominators?
 - viii. Does everyone know what outstanding means? (related to posting the rubric?)

- III. Discussion of Awards packet and the Awards website**
 - General discussion on questions from the Chair
 - a. What should people who come to the Awards website see first?

- i. The awards we offer with a separate link to each award (summary)
 - ii. The awards should be defined
 - iii. There should be information about and a link to region and global scholarships
 - iv. There should be info on how you apply for the award
 - a) With screen shots, videos, tips
 - v. Criteria and eligibility should be available
 - vi. Deadlines should be high up (visually) and not buried
 - vii. There should be a tip sheet and maybe the rubric for selection
 - viii. It should be easy to go from the “About” info to the actual nomination form and back again (e.g., members will need to move between the “how to” and nom form itself)
- b. We need to update the 2005 article with tips, steps, etc.
 - c. We need to make sure that the entire process is transparent to members (e.g., who is choosing, how they are choosing, when noms are due, etc)
 - d. We want to work closely with the EO (and Michele Holaday at the EO) to make sure the website is clean, easy to use, current, accurate, and conveys the concepts we’ve discussed today.

IV. Other items for the coming year?

- a. Should we post a calendar for the year for all interested website visitors?
 - i. With deadlines for all awards/scholarships, etc
- b. What about creating peer advising awards?
 - i. For individuals or group peer advising programs or both?
 - a) There was some discussion that a group peer program is already eligible for a program award
 - b) Also discussion about how to define what is meant by peer advising and responsibilities as there is wide variation
 - c) Discussion that the peer advising commission was interested in this
- c. What about an award for advisors of graduate students?

V. Awards Ceremony details

- a. Arrival, tasks, assistance, set-up, start time, etc.