

NACADA GLOBAL INITIATIVES COMMITTEE

2017

Present

Oscar van den Wijngaard (OVW) – Chair
Ismaa Al Aloul (IA)
Mehvash Ali (MA)
Rhonda Baker (RB)
Susan Corner (SC)
Miriam Heemskerk (MH)
Chris Hutt (CH)
Catherine Mann (CM)
Charlie Nutt (CN)
Penny Robinson (PR)
Karen Sullivan-Vance (KSV)
Jarmo Virta (JV)
Wal Warmington (WW)
Yisi Zhan (YZ)

The Chair welcomed everyone, especially the guests, to the meeting, and explained that the purpose of the Global Initiatives Committee was to advise the Board and the Executive Office about policies and strategies to help NACADA to become a truly global association for advisers.

Visiting Adviser Program

A draft proposal, on which MA and SC had worked hard, had been circulated. MA spoke about the process; they had tried to keep the proposal as general as possible, so that a variety of experiences could be incorporated. It should be applicable to different institutions across the world. The aim had been to create a system whereby advisers could have the opportunity to share expertise and knowledge by visiting each other's countries and institutions. SC spoke about learning outcomes; she wanted the members of the GIC to consider if what was being proposed would make sense in their contexts.

There were many different options; self-funding exchanges were preferable, but it was possible that an institution might have funds for a special project and could bring someone in for this.

MA wondered if NACADA could be the facilitator for the project, with its website being the place where interested institutions or individuals could look for possibilities. If any funding could be associated with this, that would be good. CN said that there was already in place a process regarding internships which could be adapted for this purpose, although there was no funding attached to it at present. If the GIC wanted funding to be provided, the proposal would need to include a specific figure, which would be submitted to the Administrative Division and thence to the Finance Committee and finally to the Board. The addition of funding would create a different type of relationship; issues such as insurance and liability would need to be

considered. In the absence of a funding element, it would just be a brokerage kind of arrangement. OVW asked if the paper should be submitted as an extension of the existing system; CN thought that it would be better if it were presented as a new one.

CM expressed interest in the proposal and particularly liked the idea of the learning outcomes. She asked if it would be open to being reframed in terms of institutional benefits, as it would be important to be able to include these in a business case to the university. SC agreed, and CN said this would be important for both partners to the agreement. Of what benefit would it be to the sending institution to allow an adviser to undertake a visit, and to keep his or her position open? KSV agreed. The possibility of differing lengths of visit was discussed. SC suggested that job shadowing could come under the heading of professional development. For a longer term it would be reasonable to ask the host institution to provide the funding, and there would clearly have to be benefits for that institution. KSV asked if the exchanges would have to be mutual; MA said that they had discussed whether the two visits would have to take place at the same time or if one could be delayed. CN said that the learning outcomes would need to be clearly defined, by both the individual and the institution. MA suggested that NACADA could outline matters which both individuals and institutions should consider (eg accommodation, medical insurance, etc), and put them on the website. SC raised the question of interviewing applicants; was this idea too ambitious?

OVW liked the flexibility of the proposal. The objectives were clear. CN suggested that OVW should talk to Teri Farr to explore if this might be something in which the Professional Development Committee could be involved.

JV found the proposal very interesting. He had experience of student and teacher exchanges, but had never heard of one involving advisers. Most teacher exchanges were for a maximum of a month; for longer ones families would have to be considered.

CN felt that it would be a real advantage to an institution to have people visiting to see how things were done there. It would be a great opportunity for visitors to learn about different systems and cultures. It could be a multi-level proposal.

OVW thought that collaboration with the Professional Development Committee was a very good idea, and he invited input from GIC members; suggestions should be sent to him as soon as possible, in order to enable a submission to be made to the Administrative Division in time for their meeting. The deadline for submissions was 1 September.

JV asked if a participating institution needed to be a NACADA member; the consensus of opinion was that institutional membership would not be necessary, but individual membership would.

CN said that when the proposal came to be discussed in the Administrative Division the question would probably be asked as to whether it would cover only international exchanges or if those within a country would be included.

Publications by Non-American Members

KSV reported that at a meeting at the 2016 Annual Conference in Atlanta there had been a discussion about the need for more non-US people to write for NACADA publications. She and PR had been contacting members about this, and there had been some positive responses. Issues which had arisen included the difference between US and UK English (there were instances where conference submissions had been rejected because readers were not fully conversant with a different variety of English) and what support could be offered to individuals who felt they needed some help with academic writing. This could take a considerable amount of time.

CN said that NACADA was working on a new level of publication, between *Academic Advising Today* and the *NACADA Journal*; it would be research based but not on the level of the *Journal*. They were also looking at devising resources for people who needed support. OVW would work with Wendy Troxel on this. There was a proposal to bring in research fellows to work on projects.

KSV thought that mentoring people to write was a labour-intensive activity. Would we mentor those who were new to academic writing, and perhaps pair people? A partnership with UKAT and the Research Center might be a possibility.

PR suggested that, if readers were unsure about the English used in an article or conference submission written by a non-US member, it could be referred to someone from that country (the UK, Australia, the Caribbean, etc) for an opinion. She also mentioned that the list of readers for both *Academic Advising Today* and the *NACADA Journal* did not, as far as she could tell, include any non-US people.

IA mentioned that it was sometimes difficult for someone who had not written anything recently to find a suitable topic; perhaps there could be a list of subjects which had not been covered for a while.

KSV challenged all those present to submit something to *Academic Advising Today* this year.

Emerging Leaders Program

OVW and Emily Foster had recently begun to work on this and would report later.

Website

CN reported that a brand-new version of the website was under development; it would have the functionality to host dialogues and open discussions. It would be available in December, and he suggested that discussion of this item be postponed until then.

General Discussion

MA said that she held the International Perspective seat on the Professional Development Committee, and thought that it would be advantageous if other committees were to include a similar position. RB agreed, and said she would welcome being given more names of people who could be invited to serve on

committees; it was important that more non-Americans should remain members for at least two years, to enable them to participate in this way. OVW asked what would encourage people to do this; MH thought that it would be helpful if there could be a two-year membership option, to cut down on the paperwork. CN said that the Membership Committee was constantly looking at the benefits of being a NACADA member.

A discussion took place about institutional membership; there were doubts about its value, and CN said that NACADA was considering abolishing it.

RB asked if it would be possible for the website to include a non-American page, with FAQs and information. CN said that this had been a recommendation of the original task force.

OVW felt that we did not promote sufficiently the benefits of being a NACADA member. SC said that she had derived great benefit from being a member of Region 8; there should also be benefits for non-US members. CH asked if there had been discussions about a Region 11; OVW said that there had, but at the moment the regions made sense geographically, and CN added that this was why groups such as UKAT had been encouraged. Allied groups were seen as the way forward. Some countries, such as The Netherlands, already had their own associations; how should NACADA connect with them?

WW said that local, informal possibilities should be explored.

CN said that NACADA had grown dramatically over the last ten years, and constant hard work had enabled this to happen.

OVW raised the possibility of dual membership; perhaps those who were active in their local associations could be offered this.

There was a discussion about the danger that, as local associations grew, advisers might join them when previously they would have chosen NACADA. We needed to be mindful of this.

KSV thought that we should place more emphasis on publicizing the stories of advisers who had joined NACADA and found that it had changed the trajectory of their careers. We should think about how to share these. CN said that the videography team would be in St Louis, and he would encourage people there to participate in video clips.

The Chair thanked everyone very much for attending the meeting.