

Division Unit Report for the Summer Institute Advisory Board (Name of Advisory Board or Committee)
Submitted by Kathy Stockwell (Name and email of Advisory Board or Committee Chair)

Please complete **Columns 1 through 6** and return by **November 1, 2015**, to Administrative Division Reps Kerry Kincanon, kerry.kincanon@oregonstate.edu , and Brett McFarlane, bmcfarlane@ucdavis.edu , with a copy to Administrative Division Liaisons Maxine Coffey, mcoffey@ksu.edu , and Jennifer Joslin, jejoslin@ksu.edu . Please copy your unit's Executive Office Liaison as well.

Two columns have been added to the November 2015 report form, providing a place to indicate which other units (if any) your group will collaborate with in achieving its 2015-16 outcomes, and what challenges (if any) you anticipate in achieving those outcomes. The Executive Office will compile a summary of the Administrative Division reports and provide it to all Division chairs for their use in identifying possible areas of future collaboration.

Columns 7 and 8 are included only for reference at this time, as they will not be completed until the progress report due August 15, 2016.

NACADA Strategic Goal(s) (List strategic goal(s) to which the outcome is related)	Specific desired outcome (What you want to occur as a result of your efforts; what you want someone to know, do, or value)	Actions, activities or opportunities for outcome to occur (What processes need to be in place to achieve desired outcome)	Outcome measurements & related data instrument(s) (How you will specifically measure for the outcome and any instruments you will specifically use e.g. survey, focus group)	Other groups or individuals (if any) to connect with in achieving this outcome (List any plans or opportunities for collaboration with other Committees, Advisory Boards or units regarding this outcome)	Challenges (if any) anticipated in achieving this outcome (How you plan to address difficulties that may arise as you work to achieve the outcome)	Progress toward achieving outcome (Only completed in August 2016 report)	Future action(s) based on data (Data-informed decisions) (Only completed in August 2016 report)
Provide professional development opportunities that are responsive to the needs of advisors and advising administrators	Complete phase 2 of the curriculum update to be responsive to our participants' needs. Rethink the small working group structure of the institute to better serve the needs of both the individuals and the teams in attendance	1) Review faculty and participant comments from the 2015 SIs to determine what further updates are required to institute structure and curriculum to assure current advising theories and practices are adequately addressed and individual/team needs are met 2) Develop participant learning outcomes that communicate the	Feedback from participants as well as faculty will be our gauge for success. Topical session evaluations, daily feedback shared during small working groups, verbal comments solicited by faculty, the end-of-institute survey, and input from faculty will provide the feedback to guide us in this effort	Technology Advisory Board to assure that our session on advising tech is on-target	N/A	Changes were made to both the curriculum and the institute schedule based on participant and faculty feedback. Several additional changes will be implemented during our second	Feedback from participants as well as faculty will be our gauge for success. Topical session evaluations, daily feedback shared during small working groups, verbal comments

<p>Create an inclusive environment within the Association that promotes diversity</p>	<p>Expand our faculty base for SI to ensure diversity and appropriate expertise at every level</p>	<p>purpose and depth of the institute</p> <p>Consider joining with the other institute and seminar management teams to create a pool of diverse, qualified faculty from which all can draw</p>	<p>Balance at each of the two institutes in terms of diversity and expertise</p>	<p>Management teams for the Administrators' and Assessment Institutes and the EO liaison</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>SI in Norfolk based on feedback received during the first SI in Reno.</p> <p>Participant learning outcomes were developed and posted on the SI web site for potential attendees to review.</p> <p>We were able to attain a better balance of diversity and expertise for both SIs this year based mainly on availability of potential faculty. Verbal feedback received at the Reno SI indicates</p>	<p>solicited by faculty, the end-of-institute survey, and input from faculty will be reviewed to determine if further changes need to be made to curriculum, the schedule, or the learning outcomes.</p> <p>Working in collaboration with the EO liaison and the other institute and seminar chairs, the faculty interest process was very recently put solely on-line. Each event has a link to the</p>
---	--	--	--	--	------------	---	--

						<p>that participants were satisfied with the diversity and quality of the faculty.</p>	<p>“Serving as an Institute Faculty Member” web page. Because there are some differences in the events, individual interest forms still exist but much consistency has been achieved. The number and quality of applications received will be the determining factor in what, if any, changes to the process need to be made.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---