

**Admin Division Annual Report for the Research Committee**  
**Submitted by Drew Puroway ([dwpuroway@stthomas.edu](mailto:dwpuroway@stthomas.edu))**

Please complete **Columns 7 and 8** (based on the content in Columns 1-6 as listed in your November 2018 report) and **return by August 15, 2019**, to Administrative Division Reps, Steve Viveiros, [viveiros\\_steven@wheatoncollege.edu](mailto:viveiros_steven@wheatoncollege.edu), and Teri Farr, [tjarr@illinois.edu](mailto:tjarr@illinois.edu), with a copy to Interim Administrative Division Liaison Charlie Nutt, [cnutt@ksu.edu](mailto:cnutt@ksu.edu). Please copy your group's Executive Office Liaison as well. Thanks!

<b>NACADA Strategic Goal(s)</b> (List strategic goal/s to which the outcome is related)	<b>Specific desired outcome</b> (What you want to occur as a result of your efforts; what you want someone to know, do, or value)	<b>Actions, activities or opportunities for outcome to occur</b> (What processes need to be in place to achieve the desired outcome)	<b>Outcome measurements &amp; related data instrument(s)</b> (How you will specifically measure for the outcome and any instruments you will specifically use, e.g. survey, focus group)	<b>Other groups or individuals (if any) to connect with in achieving this outcome</b> (List any plans or opportunities for collaboration with other Committees, Advisory Boards or units regarding this outcome)	<b>Challenges (if any) anticipated in achieving this outcome</b> (How you plan to address difficulties that may arise as you work to achieve the outcome)	<b>Progress toward achieving outcome</b> <b>(Only completed in Aug. 15 report)</b>	<b>Future action/s based on data</b> (Data-informed decisions) <b>(Only completed in Aug. 15 report)</b>
<b>#1 - Expand and communicate the scholarship of academic advising</b>	It is an exciting time for research in the field. Our committee believes that there is the potential to bring some important ideas to the audience of the Annual Conference from researchers who might be otherwise unable to participate (could be due to financial obstacles or due to the competitiveness and type of session that makes it into the program). We hope to provide both recognition	1 – Convene a subcommittee  2 – Clarify process and other constituents involved (ie. Region Chairs; Annual conference planners; etc.)  3 - Prepare a detailed proposal for the program  4 – submit proposal to the correct governing entities necessary  5 – refine and support the proposal as	The first phase of this will be measured in whether the work is completed to the proposal stage (it will either have been accomplished or not)  The measurement of actual impact is more complicated, but numerically we could simply count the number of sessions brought to the annual conference (or if there is another means used besides that outlined here, we may be able to count it). However, to truly measure the outcome, we could do reasonable assessment of the impact based on	Region Division Leaders; Council & Board; Finance committee (assuming there is an ask for funding); conference planners of regional and annual; possibly awards committee if the recognition gets rolled into other processes;	Fitting in time to convene a sub committee, decide on a programmatic direction, understand the process necessary for implementation/proposal, writing and submitting proposal.  Measuring the impact might be difficult beyond counts and the reports of presenters regarding their connections.  Assuming that we are choosing “best of” presentations of scholarly inquiry, we may run into the problem of who votes	<b>Previously, I had learned that the proposal will need to go through the finance committee. However, that is about the extent of progress on this award. We would need clear criteria and a system for judging regional awards.</b>	<b>Report this relative inaction in achieving this goal to the whole committee in Louisville and determine if there is still energy and ideas for developing this program.</b>

	<p>and support for scholarly inquire presented on the regional level to the annual conference. The desired outcome would be that a wider audience within the association could connect with the new knowledge of the inquiry in ways that further research and practice in the field</p>	<p>necessary through the process.</p>	<p>the reporting of the presenters via asking if they made connections with audience members after the session and if those connections resulted in plans for future research or novel advising practices.</p>		<p>and how do we make it as objective as possible. We will need a rubric.</p> <p>The umbrella of scholarly inquiry may make it challenging to determine what constitutes research with the level of significance that we desire to bring forward.</p>		<p><b>Beyond that it would be working on the proposal for the finance then awards committee</b></p>
--	--	---------------------------------------	--	--	---	--	---