Division Unit Report for the_____Global Awards Committee___ (Name of Advisory Board or Committee)
Submitted by: Alexander Kunkle, (Alexander.Kunkle@nsc.edu) (Name and email of Advisory Board or Committee Chair)

Please complete **Columns 1 through 6** and return by **November 15, 2017** to Administrative Division Reps Cecilia Olivares (olivaresc@missouri.edu) and Steve Viveiros (viveiros_steven@wheatoncollege.edu) with a copy to Admin Division Liaison Jennifer Joslin (jejoslin@ksu.edu). Please copy your Executive Office Liaison as well.

This report will reflect items from your unit's 2017-2018 plan of work. (*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, 2018.*)

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 oppor-tunities 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 2018 report)	Future action(s) based on data (Data-informed decisions) (Only completed in August 2018 report)
Provide professional development opportunities that are responsive to the needs of advisors and advising administrators Develop and sustain effective Association Leadership	Expand and solidify an "example packet" or PPT of guidelines of quality awards/ scholarship submissions and develop concurrent sessions to be held at Regional Conferences. (i.e. ELP program, publications, etc…)	Develop a sub-committee focused on working with awards committee members to identify key components of successful awards submissions and translate those components into an easily accessible document on the NACADA webpage.	Development of documents and posting on website. Yes/No?	Region Chairs Executive Office	Time constraints at regional conferences limits opportunities for extra "EO" sessions. While the information is relevant, taking time away from someone presenting may not be feasible.	**Various rubrics were piloted in 2018 awards cycle including Administrator, Primary Role, Faculty, and New Advisor.** **Sub-committees have been formed to refine and further expand awards rubrics.**	Next Steps include the continued development of rubrics (in progress with sub-committees), the development of a presentation which highlights key areas of review within each

		Communicate with EO and regional leadership to determine feasibility of regional presentations included within limited concurrent sessions.				**These rubrics would create consistency between awards categories. The goal is to review these rubrics at the Annual Conference for the awards 2019 cycle. May be delayed until awards 2020 based on review process.** **Presentations within regions should not be formalized until rubrics and new guidelines are set.**	**rubrics, and post/present the presentation on the NACADA website and at Regional Conferences for review.**

Develop and sustain effective Association leadership Engage in ongoing assessment of all facets of the Association Provide professional development opportunities that are responsive to the needs of advisors and advising administrators	Develop an Awards Committee Guidelines to define rules, requirements, functions, and roles for committee.	Create sub- committee to address committee membership requirements, timeline of service, and roles. Work with Executive Office to ensure charter aligns with rules of NACADA broadly.	Has the guidelines been written and voted upon by the awards committee and in effect by member elections 2019? Yes/No	Executive Office	None anticipated.	**Award Committee Guidelines have been drafted and reviewed. The final review will occur at the annual conference 2019, with a vote and publication.** **These guidelines will focus on scope, continuity and training of new committee members and chairs to create consistency of process and transparency.** **Ideas were brainstormed with the EO and EO liaison, and final language will be reviewed with the EO before publication.**	**A formal vote will be taken following discussion at the 2019 Annual Conference. If adopted/amended, final language will be posted on the Awards Committee webpage.**
Foster inclusive practices within the Association that respect the principle of equity and the diversity of advising professionals across the vast array of	Formalize rubric for guidelines, including rubric point scale to separate Certificate of Merit and Award winners with clear distinction, addressing what warrants COM and	Enact previously developed rubric as pilot in 2018 awards cycle. Create "point scale" which would formalize differences between no award, COM, and Award.	Based on prior data, does the new rubric change the number of awards granted in pilot category? Based on awards committee feedback and edits, was rubric voted to be enacted across all categories for 2019?	Executive Office Region Chairs	Regional award winners are traditionally granted automatic COM, with change, what will the response be for those member institutions who expect this to be	**A sub-committee has been formed to expand and refine rubrics in the 2019 awards cycle. These rubrics will be reviewed at the annual**	**Following the completion of the rubric development, the chair and EO Liaison will set guidance for point scales to be followed in the 2019 review cycle.**

intersections of identity.	Award Winners including prior campus/regional award winners.		Yes/No		the case?	**conference 2019.** **The "point scale" cannot be established until the rubrics are formalized, but extensive discussions have begun following the 2018 awards cycle.**	**During the 2018 cycle there was an extreme amount of variance between review categories and candidates. This lead to the chair being required to randomly set scales for review. Issues included which will be addressed with subsequent rubrics include:** **Same-category with unequal number of readers, which creates unfair gap for review.** **Reviewers submit both point scale and recommendation, often which conflicts with each other.** **Point scale is set based on No Award, COM, and Award, but does not factor in max number of winners, simply threshold to meet.** **All of these areas will be addressed**

							following rubric development.