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I. Call to order at 4:26 PM PST

II. NACURH Strategic Plan

   A. Presentation

   B. Q&A

      1. GL - what part of the plan are you most excited for? What part of the plan do you see as possibly challenging to implement?

          a) The services section because it’s what the NCO does. There are some really cool initiatives planned, but we managed to not add on to what NACURH Leadership is doing and tweaking the things that we currently do. I’m most excited about the culture and it’s interesting as we talk about barriers to access in terms of NACURH Leadership. It will also be one of the hardest things that we do because we are a corporation that has basis in privilege. I’m most excited for the integration of culture and structure because it combines public health and business and has the possibility to move us forward. It helps us cohesively move all of the parts together but it’s the part that I’m the most wary of.

      2. IA - are there parts of the plan you think may need to be reconsidered in two years?

          a) No, if anything, those initiatives became suggested action items. We attempted to create a plan that was an overarching goal that would be applicable year after year.

      3. CA - were there any thoughts you all had that you wanted to put in this plan that you ended up decided would be better for future plans?

          a) When we started, there were so many things that couldn’t be possible (i.e. an NRHH conference, etc.). As we continued, we were able to get a good grasp of what could be tangible in this plan, as well as the goals that we would be better able to focus on three years from now after the successful implementation of this plan.

   C. Discussion

      1. PA - appreciates the cohesion of culture and structure in the plan, also appreciates the framework this plan provides for regional platform development.

      2. NE - appreciates the time and effort put into this and can tell that the committee accurately identified where we want to go in the future. The Strategic Plan is a clear road map of where NACURH is headed.

      3. CA - appreciates the change in language to distinguish minority serving institutions and international affiliates.

      4. IA - moves to caucus for 3 minutes

          a) NE - seconds
5. SA - appreciates the seamless integration of NRHH in this strategic plan, and feel that this strategic plan will help the organization grow over the next three years.

6. SW - believes that this plan shows where our corporation wants to grow in the next three years, balances giving direction with philosophical ideas, focusing on all campus, region, and NACURH level ideas and services.

7. IA - appreciate the focus on access within NACURH, do have a couple of areas of concern, had questions on standardization points throughout the plan, wonder how this would impact regional identity and think that will need further consideration.

8. PA - would like to reflect for the future NACURH Leadership is to critically look under increasing access via time commitments, the incoming Leadership take into consideration meetings, their length, their timing, and potentially omitting meetings.

9. GL - appreciates all of the growth that has occurred in the strategic plan since reviewed at Semis, feel like the inclusive foundations section is a strong addition, wondering about ensuring buy-in with the plan for the next three years but know this would be a concern regardless of the way the plan is designed, feel there are supplemental here that will help ensure buy-in.

10. MA - is inspired by the thought of impact around impact all aspects of the corporation, especially the timeline because it will help collaboration.

11. SA - calls the question

12. Vote
   a) 8-0-0, strategic plan approved

III. NBD MM18-73 | LeaderShape Lunch
    A. CA - moves to bring MM18-73 to the floor
       1. SA - seconds
    B. IA - moves to waive the reading
       1. CA - seconds
    C. Proponent Speech
       1. A LeaderShape Catalyst session is being planned and implemented for the first time at NACURH 2018, there are 150 people participating in this session, the day-long session will occur over the lunch hour, wanting to provide and cater lunch for people in attendance, currently have $4,000 set aside for the incoming Leadership transition retreat happening on Monday, proposing that $1,000 be allocated from the $4,000 to this expense.
    D. Q&A
       1. SA - how much money is being utilized for the NACURH transition?
a) Less than $1,000, just need to buy breakfast and lunch.

E. Discussion
1. CA - we are in support of this piece, lunch on Friday will be necessary to ensure participants have a positive experience.
2. GL - think this is a great use of NACURH funds.
3. PA - in support of this piece and ensuring the well-being of our LeaderShape participants.
4. NE - calls the question

F. Vote
1. 8-0-0, motion carries

IV. Called to order at 8:39 PM PST

V. Regional Plan Presentation Updates

VI. NBD MM18-83 | Executive Vacancies
A. MA - moves to bring MM18-83 to the floor
   1. SA - seconds
B. PA - moves to waive the reading
   1. SA - seconds
C. Proponent Speech
   1. This piece pertains to the process for filling NACURH Executive positions should vacancies occur following the close of the Annual Conference, last year at Pre-Conference, a piece of legislation was passed and discussed making it so that both the Chairperson and the NAF would have to be elected by the close of the Annual Conference in order to ensure the signing of financial documents, the Chairperson being selected by the close of the Annual Conference is important because there needs to be someone on the Executive Committee who can carry on the operations of the corporation, however with the NAF position we would like to have further conversation about whether or not it is better to select someone with both the skills and interest in the NAF position, or to have someone selected in a timely manner, in recent history there was a vacancy in the NAF position, had the NAF-emeritus maintain the position until a new NAF could be appointed, proposing removing the current NAF components and adding the policy that, should the NAA, NAF, NAN, or NAD positions be vacant following the annual conference, the incoming NACURH Chairperson will have the option to expand the eligibility pool to those who have served in a NACURH Boards position previously and who have previously attended a Semi-Annual Business Meeting (people from past NACURH Leaderships), still think the context of attending the most recent Semi-Annual Business Meeting is important, but should no person in this pool be interested in the Executive positions, we would hope to then look for people who can bring a balance of context and content (skills), still would mean that the
Chairperson would have to be elected by the close of the Annual Conference, and that the stars would have to align for this policy to be used (no person bids originally and a past person be found to be more prepared for the position than any person currently on NACURH Leadership during the appointment process), think that this will present great opportunities for NACURH in the future, and helps to reflect the reality of a student’s experience and that college and NACURH Leadership positions should/cannot always be linear experiences.

2. Q&A
   a) SA - can you talk more about how this process would work and how we would connect with past NACURH Leaderships?
      (1) In the past two years, the NAA and NAF, and the NAN positions were left vacant after the Annual Conference, the incoming Chairperson emails all of the people who served on the NBD and attended Semis in the last year, notifying them of the vacancy, their eligibility for the position, think this in the future would happen more on a case-by-case basis, but I would imagine the Chairperson reaching out to the most recent two NACURH Leaderships using email information we already collect, feel like the conversation the last two years has centered on “waiving the most recent Semis requirement” in policy, if that policy is something we continuously consider waiving I am interested in considering why we still have it as a policy at all.
      (a) SA - follow up, you have a list of past NACURH Leadership emails?
          (i) Yes

   b) IA - what do you see as possible implications if the Chairperson is not selected by the close of the Annual Conference?
      (1) The Chairperson would still have to be selected by the close of the Annual Conference, think that part is important, just removing the requirement of selecting an NAF.

   c) NE - when is the last time that something like this has happened/that this piece would have been utilized?
      (1) There have been four vacancies in the last three years, three years ago we had a NAN vacancy, two years ago there was an NAA and NAF vacancy, last year we had a NAN vacancy, this year we will also have an NAA vacancy, if people are not running maybe that means people are not willing/best for NACURH Executive positions, need to consider how the current policy and its restrictions impact NACURH.

   d) SW - do you think that this could similarly apply to people who have served in NACURH Board positions but not attended Semis (open this up to people who have attended a Pre-Conference meeting)?
(1) No, I do think there is value in having someone who has served in a NACURH Board position for a full/mostly full term, instead want to explore what makes someone ineligible after a year away from NACURH Leadership, think it’s even possible that a year off from NACURH could be what’s best for that student and the corporation.

(a) SW - what about people who are currently in the room who have served on the NBD?

(i) If they did not attend Semis then they have not been in the position for a full year.

e) CA - moves to end Q&A

(1) GL - seconds

3. Discussion

a) CA - are in full support of this piece, think that the sentiment behind this and opening the pool to more qualified people will be a healthy step for the corporation, better than forcing people into NACURH Exec positions they are not interested in or prepared for.

b) PA - agrees with comments about people who have attended Semis in the past becoming eligible under this piece, if they are dedicated to NACURH to go for an Executive position, they should be considered as candidates.

c) GL - believe this piece could increase the stability of NACURH in the future, think it will be helpful not to force people into positions they are not ready for and hopefully lead to fewer vacancies, like that this makes rejoining NACURH Leadership a possibility.

d) SW - are also in support of not forcing the NAF position to be selected at the Annual Conference if no one is interested in running for that position or if there is a no confidence vote.

e) SA - calls the question

4. Vote

a) 8-0-0, motion carries

VII. MM18-60 | Host Site Insurance Update

A. SA - moves to waive all readings for the rest of Pre-Conference

1. SW - seconds

B. Proponent Speech

1. We want to ensure that the liability practices we have for conferences align with what institutions need, ultimately institutions are the ones bearing responsibility when hosting conferences, some institutions (not many) have the proper insurance we are looking for already and some institutions have in their policies that they are not allowed to purchase additional insurance policies for conferences, feel like if the institution’s insurance policy already covers what NACURH needs, per the CRC, then
purchasing additional insurance does not need to be a required
corference hosting expectation, think this will create more positive
hosting experiences for some institutions.

C. Q&A

1. SA - can you talk more about how institutions would be able to verify that
   their insurance meets requirements prior to bidding?
   a) CRC - they send their policy information to the CRC, already have
      to communicate with the CRC about the host acknowledgement
      form.
      (1) SA - follow up, would you like us to encourage our
           institutions to do this?
          (a) Yes, and to reach out to the CRC if they have
              questions.

2. PA - so we are not forcing institutions to buy duplicate insurance, what
   happens if they do not meet requirements but also have an institutional
   policy that limits them from purchasing additional insurance?
   a) CRC - all conference hosts have to hold liability insurance.

3. IA - if this piece passes and there is an institution who purchased double
   insurance, would they be able to get a refund?
   a) No, this piece would go into effect for any future conference
      selections.

4. GL - moves to end Q&A
   a) MA - seconds

D. Discussion

1. SW - supports this piece, believe that institutions should not be forced to
   buy additional insurance policies if their current policies meet all
   NACURH requirements.

2. MA - calls the question

E. Vote

1. Consensus, motion carries

VIII. MM18-72 | NACURH 2018 Photographer

A. GL - moves to bring MM 18-72 to the floor
   1. PA - seconds

B. Proponent Speech

1. We have been hiring a photographer and videographer to produce
   promotional videos of the NACURH Annual Conference for the past four
   years, work with Josh Coppenbarger, former MACURH Director, really
   love the videos Josh has made but would also really like more photos
   that we can use for marketing and publications throughout the year, do
   get some photos from Josh and RBDs but have not ever before hired a
   specific NACURH photographer, want to hire someone for this
conference, have worked out an agreement with Max McCarthy, current CO from GLACURH, has his own camera and knows the shots we are looking for, drafted a contract and schedule, are planning to pay him $250, this piece moves $50 to the advertisement line item to keep some money in that line item in case the Executive Committee next year want to put that toward possible other promotional items.

C. Q&A

1. NCO - did you have any concerns about paying a student leader from NACURH Leadership when they also serve as a CO?
   a) No, we are paying Max for a very specific service separate from his NACURH Leadership position, we also wanted to make sure that this was very clear in his contract, not concerned about liability, did talk to Max and the Great Lakes to make sure that we created a schedule that will work for him and allow him to fully carry out his regional duties, for example, attending other regional breakout sessions but also attending his own, Max will not be photographing all conference events just catching key moments.

2. SA - what motivated your decision to hire a current member of NACURH Leadership rather than seeking out a past member of NACURH Leadership?
   a) This is an option we are excited about but was not our first option, considered other alternatives first, several logistical things that made this option the best, we prioritized getting a photographer at a low cost this close to the conference as well.

3. SW - what would your idea be for a long-term solution?
   a) If this works this year then the next Executive Committee can think about photo options earlier and make a more clear plan for the conference before April/May.

4. IA - yield

5. CA - how did you come to the amount of $250?
   a) Figured it would be a reasonable amount per hour we are expecting Max to “work” and was also an amount we were comfortable spending.

6. PA - in regard to the $50 that will be left in that line item, will that be enough for NACURH’s needs for the year?
   a) Always hard to know for sure, the advertising line item has been used for the videographer and other small things, $50 is the general amount we leave in line items, could also always hear future financial legislation if needed but feel like this will be sufficient for now.

7. GL - since the only resolution statement in this piece is the moving of $50, what is actually being approved with this piece passing?
a) To move the funding.

8. SA - so is this person being hired either way?
   a) If the sentiment of the rom is that this is not a good use of NACURH funds then we will not, no, again, this was not the first iteration of this idea, sought out someone we could hire in Tempe, asked about a conference staff volunteer, asked about possible ASU students, other options did not work out and then as the conference got closer this seemed to be the most feasible option, think this is the best option for having our goals met at this conference and can seek out other options in the future if needed.

9. GL - moves to end Q&A
   a) IA - seconds

D. Discussion

   1. IA - we are in support of this piece, are excited that a member of NACURH Leadership will have the opportunity to take these photos.

   2. Annual Conference - are extremely excited to have pictures from the conference, most of our conference staff will be very busy throughout the weekend but will value having the memories to look back on.

   3. SA - in support of expanding our marketing efforts and having photos to support our brand, hope that future iterations will have options where NACURH Leadership members aren’t pulled away from their conference obligations.

   4. PA - calls the question

E. Vote

   1. 8-0-0, motion carries

IX. MM18-76 | Revamping the LEAD Links

A. CA - moves to bring to the floor 18-76 to the floor
   1. GL - seconds

B. Proponent speech

   1. As we started hosting the Office this year we identified LEAD links as an area of development we were interested in, the CO for Resources and Development has worked on this project throughout the year, see value in connecting the LEAD program to an educational theory, the Social Change Model, the SCM is really about using community and leadership to enact positive change, feel this reaches our advocacy and programming priorities, began by forming learning outcomes and then connected all of the questions/requirements to the learning outcomes, all requirements and outcomes align with the SCM, feel this will strengthen learning and participation in the LEAD program as well as assist in marketing the benefit of this service, if people have completed Link 1 and 2, will reach out to people and offer the option to complete
their current plan or start on the new plan, will be implemented following this conference.

C. Q&A

1. GL - has anyone worked on marketing plans for the LEAD program?
   a) Christine is excited to transition this and will still be working with Alyssa on this project, will include more social media blasts, will expand outreach to those who have completed previous links, and we will try to do a LEAD presentation for NCO at the different conferences.

2. NE - since it is being revamped, will those who have completed previous links be communicated with and be required to update their links?
   a) We would take the approach that they have already completed the LEAD program so they would not need to redo anything but could if interested.

3. SA - moves to end QA
   a) NE - seconds

D. Discussion

1. IA - excited about this piece, feel that this gives the LEAD program the facelift it needs, think the LEAD program will be more meaningful and attainable for members.

2. CA - thinks the system that has been developed by Christine and the task force is excellent, this is a great step forward for NACURH to provide transferrable skills and outcomes, this makes up a great facet of our leadership development services.

3. MA - in full support of this piece, it is very clear throughout the aspects of the Links that the topics surround the goals of the strategic plan and existed NACURH priorities.

4. SW - a disconnect that we found was that link two had the most importance to it and with this new system, it will have an equal amount of questions and work and will be more accessible.

5. SA - calls the question

E. Vote

1. 8-0-0, motion carries

X. NACURH Executive Committee Expectations

A. NACURH Chairperson

1. Deep knowledge of upcoming strategic plan
2. Support of Directors
3. Support of regions
4. Ability to articulate vision
5. Reinforces but also challenges positive changes
6. Good communication
7. Growth mindset
8. Work well in diverse groups
9. Willing to discuss opposing views
10. Embraces challenges
11. Willing to acknowledge weaknesses of corporation
12. Willingness to acknowledge personal barriers of weakness
13. Passion and time to devote to position
14. Conflict and crisis management
15. Open minded and approachable
16. Role models professional boundaries
17. Understands and expresses implications of being the face of a nonprofit corporation
18. Intentions to develop professional partnerships
19. Demonstration of involvement within NACURH

B. NACURH Associate for Finance
   1. Interest in innovation
   2. Competence in finances
   3. Understanding of implications of financial responsibility
   4. Continuation of ongoing projects
   5. Can explain finances
   6. Financing strategic plan
   7. Active engagement in ADAF relationships
   8. Understanding student limitations
   9. Enthusiasm
   10. “Account”ability
   11. Understanding of limitations and challenges of a nonprofit structure
   12. Understanding of conference budgets
   13. Plan for holding ADAFs accountable
   14. Organization

C. NACURH Associate for NRHH
   1. Push for service learning
   2. Understanding NRHH history
   3. Implementation of NRHH initiatives within NACURH SP
   4. Willingness to take a stance for NRHH
   5. Support of ADNRHH’s
6. Work to better the honorary
7. Vision for the use of the term honorary
8. Consolidation of regional efforts to NACURH vision
9. Goals encompassing of NRHH Values
10. Able to advocate for NRHH within the exec committee
11. Exploration of avenues for NRHH collaboration within executive committee
12. Ideation of NRHH’s growth and development
13. Willingness to coordinate new relationship with NAD

D. NACURH Associate for Development
1. Goals for helping COs find place in NACURH
2. Previous experience as a CO
3. Flexibility in new position
4. Understanding of student development theory
5. Experience with various leadership development opportunities
6. Goals for working with the NCO to implement the LEAD program
7. Understanding that they’re the foundation, but is not the perfect NAD
8. Autonomous self-starter
9. Excitement
10. Understanding of various CO roles
11. Embracing position adaptability
12. Informed decision making
13. Role models good time management
14. Down for collaboration
15. Demonstrates vulnerability
16. Ability to make CO’s feel included
17. Promotes collaboration within COs
18. Experience building community within teams
19. Good facilitation methods (experience with facilitating)

XI. SA - moves to adjourn for the night
   A. MA - seconds

TUESDAY, MAY 22, 2018
I. Call to order at 8:04 AM PST
II. Executive Committee Elections
   A. NACURH Chairperson
1. Nominations
   a) NCO - moves to nominate Megan Jimmerson
      (1) SA - seconds
      (2) Accepts
   b) CA - moves to close nominations
      (1) GL - seconds

2. Megan Jimmerson
   a) Presentation
   b) Q&A
      (1) GL - we started this year with asking our “whys” at the transition retreat, what is your “Why”?
         (a) Overall I would not be here if I didn’t see this opportunity as mutually beneficial, I like working with NACURH Leadership, it is a great responsibility to focus on the work you all do and create educational experiences for our Leadership members, I am excited to continue cultivating relationships and making an impact on NACURH as a whole.
      (2) SW - can you name a time when you were ADAF or NAA that you supported the Regional Director?
         (a) Yes, specifically in my two terms as an ADAF I worked with two different Directors and had close relationships among Board representatives, collaborated a lot with the Directors in projects as well as decision making, think my experience as an ADAF and NAA will bring a unique perspective to the Chair position, I currently advocate for ADAFs and other members of NACURH Leadership better because I have known what it’s like to feel left out of conversations, I have done a lot in my time in NACURH to support Directors with different working styles and strengths, and bring all of that with me in my candidacy.
      (3) PA - with the unique circumstances of being in a mostly virtual organization, how do you intend to hold members accountable?
         (a) Holding myself accountable first and foremost and leading by example, generally value servant leadership and do not like to set expectations that I would not also be willing to uphold, as far as strategies, I like to send reminders and follow up when necessary, more than that want to work with
NACURH Leadership members to find the why behind the work, if you don’t like or care about what you’re doing you won’t want to do it.

(4) NE - in what ways do you see yourself growing in this position?

(a) Primarily the professional competencies I can strengthen through this position, thought a lot about even wanting to return to the Executive Committee, feel like the Chairperson position will help to challenge me in new ways, specifically as it relates to corporate decision making, strategic plan implementation, and relationship building.

(5) CA - what is one thing you have been proud of in your experience working with COs, how will you take that experience and apply it to working with Directors?

(a) I was nervous working with COs this year because there was a lot of people to support in NACURH Leadership, going to conferences and getting 360 feedback was a highlight because it was good to see COs did feel supported based on the care and support I was providing, I don’t meet 1:1 often, but was committed to sending out updates and COs were offered to meet 1:1 as needed, this will actually be incredibly helpful to apply to working with the Directors, meeting too many times can be exhausting and not always possible, helpful to know I can bring unique levels of support to the Chair position and Director relationships.

(6) GL - moves to extend Q&A

(a) MA - seconds

(7) NCO - there has been discussion about moving services to ACUHO-I, such as the affiliation process or the Store or generally having more services with ACUHO-I, what are your thoughts on this?

(a) Have spent a lot of time already exploring this and thinking about what might be possible, however we did make a three year strategic plan and that partnership was not included, think this could present some unique opportunities like not having the NAF be a student leader, but also think this connects to further conversations about NACURH structures and our identity as a primarily student-run corporation, having professionals within NACURH would change our structure but could also offer more support, would also mean
giving up some control, don’t think any of that can be decided in one year but do think we can continue intentional exploration of this idea in general.

(8) IA - how will you help cultivate buy-in with the NACURH Strategic Plan?

(a) Ultimately the strategic plan is very long, 207 pages, and has a lot of incredible goals and initiatives, think that this is exciting but can also be overwhelming to members and even NACURH Leadership, would like to focus in on the four strategic goals as that can be much more manageable, these four goals are meaningful and are the four things we want NACURH to improve on over the next three years, for example focus on centering services around these four goals rather than the 24 initiatives and hundreds of action items, buy-in also comes from the way we talk about the plan, if regional leadership does not care about the strategic plan then none of NACURH will care about the plan, the Executive Committee will need to set a strong example of buy-in that can then translate down to members.

(9) SA - what do you think are some of the greatest threats to the organization? How will you work to make sure these don’t impact NACURH in the coming year?

(a) One threat I have observed over the past year is the fact that NACURH is a primarily virtual organization with impacts that are mostly experiential, intangible, and anecdotal, this is why we have focused so heavily on learning and connection NACURH services to educational priorities, NACURH also costs a lot of money, our services all come at a cost, if we are not able to effectively communicate our value to our stakeholders then we cannot expect people to continue to invest in our organization.

(10)MA - moves to extend Q&A

(a) CA - seconds

(11)CA - what do you want your legacy to be when you leave this position?

(a) Have thought a lot about this, first of all, my first year on the NACURH Board was the first year of the past NACURH Strategic Plan, know that the Strategic Plan will be THE thing that defines the
Exec’s term next year, I am concerned about buy-in and the level of work we are taking on and want to do everything I can to ensure a successful first year of this next strategic plan, which is how I think I can leave the most positive impact, more personally, “bold” is my favorite word and is something very important to my leadership style and perspective, hope that I can be remembered as being bold in my actions, commitment to NACURH, leadership, decision making, and relationship building.

(12) PA - can you elaborate how you intend to collaborate with corporate partners?

(a) I am in a unique position where I work as a professional on campus, the past ACUHO-I President is my Director of Residence Life, Department has a strong connection to ACUHO-I and regional branches, have been presented with opportunities to connect my experiences to professional partners, also plan to represent NACURH at conferences and work with the NACURH Advisors to strengthen professional relationships, want to ensure that relationships with professionals are mutually beneficial.

(13) IA - in the strategic plan we talk a lot about what it means to be a member of NACURH Leadership as it relates to personal impact and self-care, what does self-care mean to you?

(a) I think often about what self-care means and the ways NACURH approaches self-care, think self-care is more about small, intentional, daily actions, rather than bubble baths and Netflix, need to focus on ongoing healthy practices, personally I like taking walks by the lake on my campus, hanging out in coffee shops, spending time with friends, and doing other small things each day that I enjoy, self-care can feel like an overwhelming responsibility but should be an ongoing habit, demonstrating healthy but individualized self-care will be important in the Chair position, I wouldn’t be here without the support of my institution, NACURH support, and support from friends/family outside of NACURH, self-care looks different for each person, I want people in NACURH Leadership to know this and be able to pursue self-care practices that make the most sense to them.
(14)NE - what is one new or unique thing you hope to bring to this role?

(a) My goals for ongoing education, want to strengthen educational experiences for NACURH Leadership members, think we talk a lot about social justice but do less to actualize this value, was excited to help bring a consultant to Semis and help plan social justice training sessions for incoming Leadership members, but also think these things can’t just happen once or in one day, want to work on implementing ongoing education and professional development sessions for things like social justice and other training connected to the existing NACURH Leadership core competencies.

(15)NCO - moves to extend Q&A

(a) NE - seconds

(16)PA - in your bid you list an example of developing relationships by opening one NBD chat per month to all NACURH Leadership, what are your goals to develop those relationships?

(a) That is the chat I referred to in my last answer, would like to be realistic about the amount of chats we can add to the NACURH Leadership schedule, would propose one professional development session per month to increase opportunities for connections, networking, training, and education.

(17)MA - you mentioned the importance of cultivating buy-in with the NACURH strategic plan, how do you plan to support regional platforms in this new structure?

(a) Two things, my experience with regional strategic planning, had a lot of members involved in the development of the plan which helped to increase buy-in, with the regional platforms I expect that Regional Boards develop the framework, but that the actual goals and ideas included are still connected to member feedback, needs, and input, want to ensure that data drives decision making, generally hope to communicate these values to NACURH Leadership members, also want to use the NSPA and new RSPAs to increase connection to member perspectives in planning.

(18)GL - you touched on the importance of social justice, can you talk about what social justice means to you? What
does statement making look like to you? What do you think this should look like in NACURH?

(a) A couple of things, first NACURH overall could do better in many areas connected to social justice, would like NACURH to move in the direction of approaching all services and actions from a social justice lens rather than making single initiatives social justice initiatives, I want to work with NACURH Leadership next year to develop Corporate Priorities, or key values that our organization holds, specifically values that can then be formalized and shared with members and values that can be connected to social justice, think that having Corporate Priorities that can be understood and relied on by members will be helpful in statement making, want to connect this to the outcome of the case study, overall think this is an area that will need continued attention throughout the year.

(19)SW - can you tell us about a time where you fell like you didn’t meet your goal or fell short in your position, and how you overcame that?

(a) When I began the NAA position, one of the first things Emily (predecessor) told me was that the position was too big and that there isn’t time to do it all, with such a large position, there are a lot of ways I feel like I fell short this past year, for example wanted to do more with NACURH U but didn’t have enough time, the NAA position was so big we turned it into two positions, think generally to overcome prioritizing my goals was important, considering the things that other people were counting on me for, being realistic, will apply this same mentality when making decisions between competing priorities next year.

(20)NCO - moves to exhaust speaker’s list with additions

(a) IA - seconds

(21)SA - in your bid you talk about the expectation for NACURH level involvement for NACURH Leadership, now that Conference Chairs are in Leadership and COs are becoming increasingly involved, how do you intend to support these members and engage them in NACURH Leadership?

(a) Specifically with Conference Chairs, I will want to yield to the CRC and recognize that the experience
of the Conference Chair position is unique while also recognizing the CRC cannot work directly with each of the 16 regional conference chairs, would like to work with the Executive Committee to ensure that clear levels of support are offered to Conference Chairs from NACURH regardless of regional structure, Conference Chairs can swap and participate in task forces, etc., being realistic about conference chair goals, if a conference chair wants to be more connected to their campus/conference and that is where their frame of focus is, I would not work to add more work to their plate just because I feel like they need to do more, if Conference Chairs do not want to be super involved with NACURH level can be okay with that, for COs, this past year I tried to limit tasks and focus more on their goals and experiences, example lessened task load of catalysts (still some work to be done here), COs were more able to be involved in other NACURH-wide projects, changing culture to know that NACURH level involvement doesn’t always mean creating a PDF document or guide, could mean showing up and engaging in conversation.

(22)IA - wondering what your thoughts are on support of NACURH vs. support of regions, what do you think NACURH should control and what do you think regions should control?

(a) We talk a lot about “One NACURH,” see a lot of benefits as well as drawbacks with concept, the reality is this language has negative connotation with some members of NACURH Leadership, would like to reframe One NACURH in a way that keeps the positive things and maintains the same general philosophy, but aligns more with what NACURH Leadership members are looking for at this time, opportunities to connect work to the strategic plan and to the mission, developing corporate priorities to give framework, in practice we need to be more realistic about the time commitment of NACURH Leadership, a lot of time is spent recreating services and resources and reframing existing ideas in each region, doing things nine times takes an immense amount more time than doing something collaboratively once, idea is that members will feel less overwhelmed and have more time to contribute to regional
goals, as far as regional control, think that regional culture and regional experiences can be unique, invest in regional traditions, for example, mascot and regional identity pieces.

(23) NCO - I appreciated the curricular approach to learning outcomes, how do you intend to make this actualized? How would this impact programming?

(a) We have charged forward with the idea of connecting learning outcomes to each of our services, something I am excited for, want to connect education to the services we are providing, once we have these learning outcomes think it will be important to connect learning outcomes to the strategies Leadership members implement to achieve learning, don’t know that we will get to a full curriculum but want to work to identify learning strategies, with programming, think that is a good example of a learning strategy that could be used to target specific learning and development for members, but would apply this approach to more than programming.

(24) GL - yield to redundancy

(25) IA - can you pinpoint a specific challenge Directors face in their roles and how you intend to support that challenge?

(a) The balance of the Regional Director position of holding people accountable but also being a part of the team, peer leadership, specifically throughout the year I would like to have ongoing conversations about what it means to support peers and help Directors learn more about how to work with different people and leadership styles, help Directors navigate the 360 evaluation process, provide better training and expectations, want to empower Directors to feel like they are the people in their entities who can hold others accountable.

(26) NE - would the professional development you have planned be more internal or would you bring in people outside of NACURH to help facilitate?

(a) I hope both, think education is everyone’s responsibility, don’t think we can expect every member of NACURH Leadership to be a content expert on the areas we need training on, would like to rely on advisors and outside professionals.
(27) CA - touched on external threats, what is one internal weakness NACURH is facing and how do you think we could address that?

(a) The perception of what it means to be a successful leader in NACURH Leadership positions, have learned that NACURH Leadership members feel like they have to perform 110% all of the time, but we would be doing great work if everyone performed at 90% or even 100% all of the time, have an interesting perspective on what it means to have meaningful experiences, create a lot of pressure for ourselves because of the way we perceive success in our corporation, want to focus on better work that is balanced for members.

(28) CA - going off that idea, what do you feel your greatest weakness is and how do you intend to overcome that?

(a) Wouldn’t say this is a weakness but a challenge, I crave structure and prefer organization, want to have flexibility and adaptability in the Chair position, know that I like things a certain way but if they are not a certain way they can still be excellent, will prioritize extending trust to others, can provide support and structure which will help but will need to be balanced.

(29) NAF - we have talked a lot about self care, how do you plan to balance self care with running the corporation?

(a) The reality is there is a lot of work that needs to be done, the Chairperson is responsible for being the primary steward of the corporation, being realistic about the fact that there must be balance and systems of accountability, ultimately NACURH Leadership members will need to do the work, need to care about ourselves and practice healthy behaviors but also need to accomplish the work that NACURH needs to have done, personal strengths here, needs to be balance, NACURH Leadership positions are big responsibilities, prioritize self care on an ongoing basis, can’t check out of positions for months at a time, practice care for others but also know that if responsibilities are not being met on an ongoing basis further conversations may need to be had.

(30) IA - when workshopping the fifth Executive position, talked about the Chairperson or other Execs not attending
conferences, how do you intend to maintain relationships with regional Leadership if not attending conferences?

(a) Don’t know if that was ever a formal part of the decision making, do think it will be important for the Chair to attend conferences, see that as an opportunity to work with the fifth Exec to attend some events, talked in my bid about increasing outreach efforts, there is already a wall and perception of inaccessibility, will be important to show up in other spaces that already exist, maximize other opportunities for relationship building.

(31)IA - you talked about helping regional Leadership dealing with crisis management, what is your plan for Directors specifically?

(a) Ultimately working with the CRC and NACURH Advisor, having conversations leading up to conferences, making sure everyone understands the systems in place, first we need to educate everyone on what a crisis is and help Directors to understand when and how to respond, serve on-call currently on campus and have been taught that doing something is always better than doing nothing, giving the training needed and procedures to follow, and then also following up after crises to reflect and discuss how things went and what could/should have been done differently.

(32)SW - do you have examples of how you want to support Leadership outside of conferences?

(a) About providing that ongoing education, reality is we work together way more virtually than in-person, often times only talk about risk as it relates to conferences on in-person times, need to investigate what it means when someone says or does something of concern over Zoom or other electronic communication, need to investigate and consider moving forward to provide better more clear support.

(33)NE - as of now, what would you identify as NACURH’s core competency (what sets NACURH apart from everything else)?

(a) Ultimately we create unmatched experiences for student leaders, give opportunities but also put people in positions where they can be seen as content experts in their positions, capitalizing on
our opportunities, truly unique and empowering positions, marketing the unique experiences NACURH Leadership positions provide.

(34)IA - we have seen an unfortunate amount of tragedies that have affected members of NACURH, what steps do you intend to take following tragedies?

(a) Corporate priorities can help with this, something we have talked a lot about, high stakes situation, when things come up on campuses there is no real training or direction provided, need better understanding of when and how NACURH should respond to current events and what our scope of impact really is, could do better about when and how we respond, specifically individualized communication can be impactful, reaching out to schools directly impacted first and foremost.

(35)SW - do you foresee pushback for the winter Leadership retreat? Since this would be post-Semis while people are opening halls and NACURH Leadership are preparing for RBCs?

(a) Maybe overly optimistic, think this could be successful with the right planning and commitment, would want to plan for the end of January or early February, beyond that would want to have this in place of regularly scheduled chats, being aware of time we ask from Leadership, use this space to talk about RBC preparations or other timely issues.

(36)PA - you touched on this a bit, but NACURH is not intrinsically political though our conversations can be political in nature, can you elaborate on where you think activism belongs in NACURH? Particularly passive and active?

(a) I don’t necessarily because NACURH is entirely not political, know there is a political history for NACURH and think maybe there could be a political future, should focus more on civic engagement, that is what NACURH is, we create space for residence hall students to come together and advocate for the needs of their community, don’t have to specifically focus on politics but create opportunities for students to understand the ways that their actions represent civic engagement and connect to others.
PA - in your position, how would you handle conflict within NACURH Leadership?

(a) Stages of team development, forming, storming, norming, performing, some conflict is a natural part of team formation, with teams, you have 24 hours (or some specific amount of time) to address a conflict or concern or you have to move on or let it go, don’t keep grudges, there are things that can be addressed and there are different formats for addressing those concerns, help Leadership members connect to accountability measures in place, empower others to address conflict, provide equitable support, and present challenge when necessary.

c) Pro/Con

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● NACURH corporate knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Authentic relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Passion for NACURH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Discussion

a) MA - appreciate Megan acknowledging her own weaknesses, believe this can create connection with NACURH Leadership and form authentic relationships.

b) IA - really appreciates Megan’s knowledge of NACURH and the strategic plan and would like to commend her experience.

c) SW - something Megan didn’t touch on in the presentation but did include in her bid is communication, she did well at streamlining communication this year, appreciate her approach of making sure all of Leadership is on the same page regardless of position.

d) NCO - appreciates Megan’s curricular approach to learning outcomes, but suggest learning rubrics overall to make sure that there is consistency and buy in across NACURH, would have liked to hear more about NRHH in her presentation, is in her bid, but appreciative regardless.

e) SW - believe Megan is competent and prepared to fulfill the Chair role, she has a strong vision for the corporation, appreciated her honesty about relationship building and her understanding of its importance.
f) SA - wanted to touch upon Megan’s bid and appreciate plans to create better relationships between Advisors and Directors.

g) CA - loved Megan’s authenticity about relationship building, think honesty and forthcomingness is evident in the way she builds relationships, believe her experience supporting the Chairperson and Directors will be helpful, like that she can innovate in the way she supports others and not impose her own style or needs.

h) IA - appreciate Megan’s depth of experience, we need a Chairperson to be fearless, felt her answers were somewhat vague and worry about her definitive vision.

i) GL - have full confidence in Megan, she was questioned for almost an hour but was very present and thoughtful, appreciate her focus on meaningful experiences, like that she touched on corporate priorities, like her focus on social justice and reaching out to our members, any of our concerns were met in her presentation, worry about the innovation piece but recognize that with the strategic plan there are already a lot of new ideas in place and maybe less room/need to innovate.

j) PA - appreciates that Megan has had a stake in the current strategic plan, was helpful in seeing good and bad throughout planning process, think she will be able to implement the strategic plan successfully, would like to see more goals around standardization of NACURH and regions.

k) SW - in relation to the next strategic plan, appreciate that she is realistic that not everyone will remember everything and her intention of focusing on the four strategic goals, including framing services around those goals.

l) MA - appreciate that while Megan put a focus on services, she also put a focus on enhancing the student experience which can often be forgotten.

m) PA - want to recognize Megan’s energy toward creating and using current resources, would like to suggest a thorough analysis of services before implementation.

n) SA - appreciate Megan’s introspection on weaknesses, felt there wasn’t a clear vision on building relationships.

o) SW - coming from a region that had to deal with risk and crisis we appreciated Megan’s goals to support regional members through those issues.

p) PA - moves to end discussion
   (1) NE - seconds
      (a) IA - dissent, need more discussion on the Chairperson position
   (2) Withdrawn
q) CA - appreciated Megan’s outlook on self care and think this would be a positive shift in culture.

r) GL appreciate Megan’s tenacity to refine NACURH structures, feel like this will expand the range of leaders that could be supported by NACURH, creating more fluid structure could help to get rid of some of the perceived barriers to NACURH Leadership and Executives.

s) MA - would like to recognize that though Megan has not served as a director, she has the clear ability to serve as Chair.

t) IA - appreciated Megan’s thoughts in general on what it means to be One NACURH, however wish she would have expanded beyond mascots when asked about specific things that regions can keep individualized, want the Chair to be able to clearly articulate what should be uniform and what should be unique.

u) SA - is concerned somewhat about Megan’s focus on standardization of the level of engagement that is expected from NACURH Leadership without the data to see what they want, but appreciate the efforts to engage members.

v) NCO - appreciate that Megan’s presentation seemed to be about more than just her being Chair, talked about utilizing future partners and the outcomes of the case study this week.

w) CA - would like to note that though Megan was forthcoming about how she builds relationships, we would have liked to see anecdotal evidence, think though she will be supporting Directors across the board, Directors may approach this in different ways and don’t think that Megan fleshed out completely how she would approach this.

x) IA - when Megan was asked about CO support throughout her role she shared that she received positive feedback on her support, have received feedback from my COs that they were not supported by her and worry about how that will transfer to Directors.

y) GL - acknowledges the concerns of IACURH and SAACURH around regional standardization, but also acknowledge that there is a lot of assessment that needs to be done once stepping into the position before making decisions, believe that Megan has the ability to make decisions with context.

z) SW - something in Megan’s presentation and bid that will support her in her relationship building was her goal for learning first, learning about Director’s individualities will help her to build strong relationships.

aa) NCO - has felt supported by Megan when she supported NCO COs, there are many meetings in NACURH in which she always shows up, offers 1:1 meetings, some people felt 1:1s were
excessive at points, appreciate Megan’s approach to support and believe this was useful for my team.

bb) PA - believes Megan’s administrative strengths will serve her well in supporting Directors, this may look like a different support but we have full confidence that she will be able to support them, she shared she is less feelsy but will still provide the support that is needed in the Director role.

c) GL - calls to question

4. Outcome
   a) Megan Jimmerson is elected as the 2018-2019 NACURH Chairperson

B. NACURH Associate for Finance

1. Nominations
   a) IA - moves to nominate Greg Vass
      (1) SA - seconds
      (2) Accepts
   b) SW - moves to close nominations
      (1) NE - seconds

2. Greg Vass
   a) Presentation
   b) Q&A

      (1) NCO - have you thought about initiatives to make finances more electronic?
          (a) Actually this past year we thought about moving to electronic transaction binders for ADAFs, I think this is one of the projects we could continue on for next year, could also build community in ADAF’s.
      (2) PA - in part of your presentation you talked about allocating funds, from your current position, what do you think would have to happen in order to relocate those funds?
          (a) I think this would require assessing what schools actually need, and where they do and do not have funding, using some money we don’t need could help schools come to conferences, etc.
      (3) MA - do you have other project ideas for ADAFs? Such as binders?
          (a) Not entirely sure, don’t want to force anything, hoping the ADAFs can identify passion projects
and collaborate with one another, would like to guide them through areas of improvement.

(4) NE - what would you like to take away from the NAF position personally?

(a) Personally I would like to further improve my leadership skills, still struggle with being open and speaking out about what I believe in, think this position will help me be more vocal about what I believe in and will hopefully push NACURH in the right direction.

(5) SW - you mentioned ADAF task forces, how do you plan to hold task forces accountable?

(a) Would like to follow up with the ADAF task forces regularly and set deadlines for task forces and responsibilities, also check in on tasks during other ADAF meetings.

(6) NE - yield to redundancy

(7) IA - what is your understanding of the implications for being a CFO to NACURH? Can you explain your thoughts around how this would impact you as an individual?

(a) The NAF position is a big responsibility, would want to be very intentional about my plans and communicate with others before making big decisions, balance the stake and needs of the corporation, want to make informed decisions and help to ensure the stability of the corporation.

(8) PA - understand that not everyone comes to the ADAF role for finances, how comfortable are you explaining complex issues in simple terms and how do you plan to keep ADAFs up-to-date on all information related to their position?

(a) In my role as ADAF I have had to explain CAACURH and NACURH finances to members and the RBD, I made sure to simplify terms for others, have this background and think this will translate to the ADAFs, will have monthly reports for ADAFs and will start looking at the possibility of quarterly reports to send to NACURH Leadership to help with financial transparency.

(9) MA - moves to extend Q&A

(a) SA - seconds
(10) NCO - the NAF position is dependent on a lot of things, have you thought about establishing expectations with Advisors?

(a) Recognize that this will be a learning process for myself and for the incoming NACURH Advisor, maintain ongoing communication, the NAF and Advisor both have an important responsibility to the financial well-being of NACURH.

(11) MA - how do you build relationships and how will this correlate to how you build relationships with the ADAFs?

(a) Having bi-weekly 1:1 meetings, form personal connections and relationships with ADAFs related to their experiences/priorities in an outside of NACURH, practiced this when working with conference finance chairs.

(12) SW - have you faced any challenges in the finance roles you’ve held and how have you learned from them?

(a) Biggest issue I tried to address was clarifying regional policies on specific finance issues, worked with finance chairs to address legislative issues, had issue with RLC Advisor training, was able to work with Advisor to reach compromises and effectively implement the conference.

(13) SA - can you talk about the training the Chair and Directors will have around finances?

(a) The Chair will be the primary support person with Directors, would consider attending Director chats and discussing challenges and support providing to Finance Officers, training for Directors generally in the case the ADAFs need additional support.

(14) NCO - you talked about creating a partnership with a merchandising company, how do you see this impacting NACURH?

(a) This would hopefully allow NACURH as a whole to gain access to merchandise at a discounted rate, and sell merchandise back to members and NACURH Leadership at a markup, would want to lower costs.

(15) MA - moves to extend Q&A

(a) IA - seconds

(16) IA - at Semis we talked a lot about the potential removal of the NAF position, could you talk about what that would mean as you think about taking on this position?
(a) I am aware that the NAF position is in jeopardy, have thought a lot about this and the idea of trusting a corporation’s finances with a student, don’t know that we are currently in the place to hire an investment manager yet, but think we’re headed in that direction, eventually the NAD role may be eliminated, think that’s something we may have to look at seriously, will need to balance the mission and structure of our corporation with keeping our corporate finances secure.

(17)NCO - one thing we talked about at Semis was that a possible threat to NACURH could be our investments impacting our status as a non-profit corporation, do you have any thoughts on this?

(a) From what I know, we can’t get more than 1/3 of revenue from investments, when we can pull revenue from investments (which won’t happen next year but in the future) we need to make sure we aren’t breaking nonprofit laws, currently we get about 3% of our revenue from investments, so this is not a current concern NACURH should have.

(18)PA - we’re focused on ensuring that our RBD and member schools spend their time wisely, how do you plan to work with Finance Officers to ensure work is done both efficiently and effectively?

(a) A big part of the ADAF role is to manage time wisely; there are many deadlines to be aware of, I would encourage ADAFs to reconcile accounts as soon as transactions come in, as opposed to at the end of the month, because this will minimize the amount of time ADAFs need to spend in their positions.

(19)GL - you mentioned educating Directors and Advisors on finances and financial practices, how would you work to educate members?

(a) I would work with the NAA to try to make NACURH U programs around NACURH finances for those interested as well as Zoom sessions around NACURH finances, I could also encourage having ADAFs be teachers for this since they would realistically know their member schools better than I would.

(20)IA - move to exhaust speaker’s list with additions

(a) NE - seconds
(21) IA - you talked about the NACURH strategic plan, can you talk about your own understanding of the upcoming strategic plan and the action items you would be responsible for as NAF?

(a) Overall my understanding of the NACURH strategic plan is that it aims to further NACURH as a corporation, would like to examine financial access and conference hosting, etc.

(22) SA - you talked about on-campus physical, emotional, and financial support standardization, what will that look like and how will you support schools with that?

(a) Think that standardization may be a strong term, looking more for a baseline of the support items regions have in common, when it comes to finances there should be more consistency to increase a unified understanding of finances, if for some reason a school is not able to host a member of NACURH Leadership, would encourage conversations with that institution to answer questions.

(23) CA - you talked about the knowledge gap between regional boards and NACURH Execs regarding finances, how do you see breaking down that financial literacy based on experiences?

(a) This would be difficult to navigate, as you said finances can be a less exciting aspect of our corporation, would work to connect finances to the other aspects of NACURH to grow engagement and connection.

(24) PA - throughout the fiscal and academic year, there are high points and low points regarding finances, how do you plan on balancing that so time can be reallocated?

(a) As you said, there are high and low points throughout the year, I have found that in the ADAF position there is more consistency in the responsibilities each month, would encourage project work in the lighter points of the year to allocate time to other priorities.

(25) NE - what are some challenges you have faced this year as ADAF?

(a) One of the biggest challenges I had was with our RLC Advisor, were looking to make a profit off of the conference, worked with the Execs, were able
to meet a compromise, taking a restorative and collaborative approach.

(26) NCO - do you think audits for entity finances are necessary?

(a) Think these are required and should continue to be practiced, would like to conduct an audit at each conference in collaboration with the other Executives, to my knowledge the audits are intended to be a developmental experience, would encourage upkeep with financial records and do check ins throughout the year.

(27) SA - do you have a plan for supporting ADAFs in recruiting successors for the following year?

(a) Would encourage ADAFs to highlight the benefits of the position and the strengths a person could gain from the ADAF role, the ADAF role can seem intimidating, want to make the position seem more accessible to members.

(28) MA - how will you ensure that the finance trainings provided to NACURH Leadership are cohesive with your goals and the current NACURH Leadership training?

(a) Would like to look at what the incoming Directors have reviewed so far as a part of the NACURH Leadership transition and supplement knowledge where needed.

(29) PA - yield

(30) NAF - you spoke around this already, but how do you plan to hold all of the relevant people accountable for NACURH finances?

(a) First I would like to set clear expectations for both parties, communicating when individuals are succeeding and where improvements may be needed.

(31) NCO - do you envision continuing research grants?

(a) Yes, thought this was a very cool experience, helped with the selection committee, we struggled to choose just one research project with the funding we had, could work with ACUHO-I to potentially increase funding.

(32) SA - what goals do you have for working with the CRC to support conference finances and minimize hosting barriers?
(a) Think that getting information out there earlier on in the year will be helpful, working to communicate with institutions regarding their needs, increasing grants and scholarships could also help.

(33)MA - what specific plans do you have around financing a investment manager?

(a) Ideally, in collaboration with the Finance Committee, could begin to seek out potential Financial Investment Managers, would want to get feedback from ADAFs and Execs before making any decisions.

(34)IA - what would you like your legacy to be if you held this position?

(a) I want to be the person who started thinking about the long term financial future of NACURH and who started implementing year one of the strategic plan.

(35)NCO - the NCO was wondering about your goals for working with the NCO?

(a) In conversations with the NCO, it was mentioned that the NCO has multiple ways to collect payment, we spoke about consolidating payment collection to make running the store easier.

(36)NCO - the NCO was wondering about the promissory note, if this is effective or if this may need to be updated to meet needs?

(a) It’s worked for CAACURH in the past, but schools tend to delay a lot, for the time being, it is okay, if that is something ADAFs would like to do, I would not be opposed to helping them work on this as a project.

(37)SA - yield to redundancy

(38)GL - yield to redundancy

c) Pro/Con

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● ADAF accountability</td>
<td>● Advisor expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Engagement and support of other finance officers</td>
<td>● Accountability practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Forward thinking</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Discussion

a) NCO - appreciated Greg’s willingness to educate people, threat of investment, and reached out about how to support the NCO, would have liked to hear more about how he would have worked with the NACURH Advisor, but overall support Greg.

b) GL - appreciated all of the ideas that Greg presented about providing support to conference finances, specifically in consideration of GLACURH’s past conference concerns, also appreciated Greg’s contributions to the conversations around the NAF position and its longevity, do wish Greg would have expanded on his goals for collaboration but do feel that he could do this successfully.

c) IA - is in full support of Greg and his plan to educate Directors on finances, supporting an ADAF as a Director with no financial knowledge was challenging and training would be very useful as well as potentially remove barriers for Directors.

d) NE - appreciated that Greg recognized his leadership experiences and areas he would like to improve.

e) GL - is intrigued by the idea of a investment manager but would’ve liked to see more plans around the fruition.

f) SW - appreciated that Greg mentioned financial aspects of NACURH as well as other common NACURH issues such as barriers to conference hosting.

g) SW - enjoys the idea that Greg is willing to meet with members of NACURH.

h) CA - appreciates Greg’s consideration of financial access within the corporation, also appreciate Greg’s ability to hold people accountable.

i) SA - supports Greg for this role and disagrees with the Corporate Office around advisors. Would have liked to see more laid out plans for training around finances.

j) IA - when looking at the list of expectations that we drafted for the NAF position, we do feel that Greg touched on most of these expectations and has clear plans for fulfilling the position.
k) SA - moves to end discussion
   (1) IA - seconds

2. Outcome
   a) Greg Vass is elected as the 2018-2019 NACURH Associate for Finance

C. NACURH Associate for NRHH
   1. Nominations
      a) SA - moves to nominate Nicole Machovina
         (1) NE - seconds
         (2) Accepts
      b) GL - moves to nominate Becky VanWychen
         (1) IA - seconds
         (2) Accepts
      c) MA - moves to close nominations
         (1) SW - seconds

2. Nicole Machovina
   a) Presentation
   b) Q&A
      (1) NE - in what direction would you like to see NRHH go in in the next year?
         (a) Would really like to focus on the implementation of the NRHH strategic planning initiatives, would like to make OTMs more inclusive and emphasize the NRHH values.
      (2) SA - what do you think is the greatest threat facing the Honorary and how will you address?
         (a) Something I have seen in my own region and know from conversations with other ADNRHHs is participation with NRHH chapters at the campus level, want to increase engagement by streamlining some of the primary NRHH services.
      (3) SW - what do you think is the biggest area of growth for NRHH and how will you go about developing it?
         (a) The amount of engagement members have in chapters at the campus level, would like to have NAN office hours to create opportunities for support between the NAN and NRHH members.
      (4) IA - how do you plan to further the discussion around grounding NRHH in Service and Recognition?
(a) The service tracker that is in the second year of the plan, other goals currently included in the first year of the strategic plan, starting initiatives will help work toward this longer term goal.

(5) GL - appreciated your goals for NRHH COs, how do you plan on working with regions without NRHH CO’s on their Boards?

(a) This is something I would like to focus on, would plan to reach out to the regions this specifically applies to and work to include more people in conversations regarding NRHH.

(6) MA - from your perspective, can you define the role of NRHH within the structure of NACURH?

(a) Have reflected on this a lot, NACURH started NRHH yes, do not think NRHH should work to remove ourselves from NACURH but rather perceive NRHH as a values-added subset of NACURH, create excellent services to our members and NACURH as a whole.

(7) PA - the NAN is the primary NRHH representative at the NACURH level, would you describe how you have advocated for NRHH in past positions?

(a) Something I have tried to do in the past is create spaces for other people to come together and talk about NRHH, want people to feel comfortable learning about and discussing NRHH matters even if NRHH is not directly in their position description, work closely with other people from a collaborative, reciprocal mindset.

(8) NE - moves to extend Q&A

(a) SA - seconds

(9) NE - how do you see yourself growing as NAN?

(a) The NAN role is huge, think that the extra responsibility of supporting nine people and other NACURH/NRHH Leadership members will be challenging in a productive way, think this is a large professional development opportunity, I have done a lot of input gathering and collaborating so this will allow me to grow in trusting my own instincts and being more confident in my own ideas.

(10) NCO - we are in the middle of transitioning between the outstanding service pin and outstanding service award, do you have any thoughts on this?
(a) Very excited for this transition, one thing I want to do is work with the ADNRHHs to ensure they are talking with representatives about the opportunity and working with the NCO to advertise and publicise this change in NACURH presentations as well as other conversations.

(11)IA - you mentioned in your bid ADNRHH monthly reports, what plans do you have for improvements to these reports?

(a) I think the monthly reports have been great, specifically like the connection to transition, with a lot of turnover it is important to include the transition elements in monthly reports, would like to give ideas about what to include in transition documents, also include roll call question ideas in the report, then ask for feedback around Semis, etc.

(12)GL - liked your idea about a resource swap shop, wondering about how initiatives like that play into your vision for collaboration within the ADNRHH position?

(a) I attempted this earlier this year, I think it will be more successful in smaller groups, if there is low interactions I would ask ADNRHHs to work on resources together so we can make more quality resources together, generally believe in quality over quantity to eliminate regional duplication.

(13)GL - moves to extend Q&A

(a) MA - seconds

(14)SA - you stated in your bid and presentation that you believe in what NRHH is and what it can be, what do you believe NRHH can be?

(a) Saying this without a strong timeline, my overall vision is that NACURH and NRHH continue to work together, which would be for the benefit of institutions, having a stronger view of NRHH as a values-added subset of NACURH, and an organization that presents experiences for leadership development and learning, would like to continue investigating the GPA requirement of NRHH and consider moving to a more recognition and service oriented membership system.

(15)NCO - what tangible ways will you go about shifting the NRHH mentality of being a little sister organization?
(a) The NRHH mentality of being a little sister organization starts from NACURH Leadership and translates down to members, would like to open up spaces for individuals to talk about the values and purposes of NRHH, increase social media engagement and buy-in with NRHH at the campus level, work with the NCO to affiliate chapters, and create consistency in recognition and service efforts.

(16) NAN - next year we won’t be continuing with the separate NRHH strategic plan, with it being included in the NACURH strategic plan instead, how do you plan on holding non-NNB accountable for NRHH initiatives?

(a) One idea is my goal for NRHH vision chats, would like to create spaces for all NACURH Leadership members to discuss progress and accomplishments within NRHH specific initiatives.

(17) IA - how would you support an ADNRHH who is going through struggles with chapter engagement?

(a) I have gone through this myself, would remind ADNRHHs that the best you can do is be a resource and support for members, can also create tangible resources for them and keep on implementing the initiatives that will create buy-in for members, would like to work with the NNB to see if it’s the best for just one standardized candidate membership form, could help with engagement, also an education template for membership statuses.

(18) GL - how do you plan to update the NRHH scholarship?

(a) The scholarship is great but it didn’t get that many applications, maybe lowering the GPA requirement from 3.3, which is a bit high, to something closer to our standard of 2.5.

(19) MA - over the past couple of years, NRHH has seen various levels of engagement at the corporate level, how do you perceive this change in corporate culture for the Honorary and how do you see the Honorary moving forward?

(a) I’m a fan of legislation when it is needed, I think NRHH boardroom at the Annual Conference would be just as useful with roundtables or discussions between NRHH members, using that space to talk about future legislation and just larger open conversations would be helpful, also using that
opportunity to work on chapter engagement, supporting engagement at NACURH could help with regional issues as well.

(20) PA - following up on NRHH COs, how would the support you mentioned for regional NRHH Advisors apply to regions with no NRHH Advisors?

(a) My initial thought is involving NRHH and Regional Advisors in conversations, just reaching out and make sure there is support for regions regardless of advisor structure, Regional Advisors would also be welcome in any NRHH Advisor space.

(21) CA - what does it mean to you for NRHH to be called an Honorary?

(a) Would have said academic focused, but now I think it is about dedicating time to helping others, not necessarily formal recognition but trying to bring little hoy to people’s days.

(22) SW - NRHM is constantly developing, what would your vision for NRHM be going into next year?

(a) I know the Chairperson and NAA are the primary people who work with NRHM but have ideas I would like to contribute, see NRHM as an opportunity to connect RHAs and NRHH Chapters.

(23) NAN - NRHH is a very big part of the NAN role, but there are more responsibilities beyond NRHH to the position including serving as a member of the Executive Committee, what goals do you have for NACURH beyond NRHH?

(a) I included a lot of NACURH initiatives not related to NRHH in my bid, really intriguing to me and are passion areas of mine, would love to support those initiatives, also plan to attend other chats beyond NRHH ones, don’t want to step on toes but would like to work with other task forces, would offer to take minutes and provide insight, work to find solutions for those larger philosophy conversations, and also be available to others for support.

(24) SW - in reference to the NNB training topics mentioned in your bid, how do you foresee those trainings being implemented?

(a) At the retreat at the Annual Conference there is limited time, but would like to make a form to ask ADNRHHs what they need more time or information for, find themes to work on, if no
themes emerge I would like to work on the OTM database in this initial training as it is complicated, also would like to work with the new NCO ADNOA for affiliation.

(25) GL - what was your favorite experience as ADNRHH this year?
(a) The amount of interactions I have had with NRHH representatives in my region, as an NRHH CO from the following year I did not work directly with NRHH Representatives, have appreciated the opportunity to form connections and provide support on resources.

(26) SW - why is service important to you?
(a) It’s fun, I like it, it’s important because you can’t control what happens in other people’s lives but can spend time helping, worked with Habitat for Humanity and working on an end project to help people who you don’t have to.

(27) MA - what do you want the incoming NNB to have learned at the end of your term if elected, what are some of your intended learning outcomes?
(a) Want NNB members to know that it’s okay if not every single NRHH Representative is actively engaged on the regional and NACURH level, need to meet people where they are at and make contributions where possible.

(28) SA - yield to redundancy

(29) IA - you have a lot of research on OTMs in your bid, what would be your process for working to consolidate the programming OTM categories?
(a) I forget the specific categories for programming OTMs but there is an origin and a summary, think those could be consolidated, add a general section about the program, would like to make program OTM requirements more similar to general OTM requirements.

(30) PA - you mentioned you want to be more active on social media, how will you work to expand NRHH’s presence on current platforms?
(a) Highlighting regional NRHH chapters, incorporating chapters in the LINK, including NRHH more on existing NACURH platforms, add OTM competitions on social media, try to increase engagement from members.
c) Pro/Con

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Clear definition of NRHH in NACURH</td>
<td>• Unclear plans to collaborate with NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OTM knowledge</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment opportunities</td>
<td>• Tangible ways to shift NRHH mentality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goal to work on service grant</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NRHH Advisor selection plan</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Becky VanWychen
   a) Presentation
   b) Q&A

   (1) PA - what is your plan for the NACURH NRHH Diamond Chats in consideration of feedback that chat participation is already low throughout the year?
      (a) I want to blast across social media and through different communication platforms, also ask questions about how we can improve chats.

   (2) CA - what does it mean to you for NRHH to be an honorary?
      (a) I feel an honorary is a group of people dedicated to something, typically they have a high GPA, NRHH doesn’t fit that structure, it’s a 2.5 GPA which is really low, I want to assess if NRHH is an honorary and what that means.

   (3) IA - how do you plan to collaborate with other NACURH Executives?
      (a) I want to collaborate with the NAD, incorporate them into the NNB structure, along with that work with the NAA to make marketing for NRHH, work with the Chair ro ensure NRHH is being considered.

   (4) NCO - as you may know, NACURH has an elephant mindset where things are not forgotten easily, what plans
do you have for transitioning to the Outstanding Service award?

(a) Education is important here, Jacob and I are presenting a NACURH U this weekend on NRHH, educating on membership statuses, different awards, pins, etc., showing the benefits of the new changes.

(5) NE - how do you see yourself growing as NAN?

(a) I am always looking to grow in experiences, this position will give me more experience, specifically with more direct support of other people, also will learn about Exec position and corporate mindset.

(6) SA - what do you think is the greatest threat facing our Honorary and how will you address this?

(a) The greatest threat is the perceived value of it, people have come saying ‘why should we join/start NRHH?’ I plan on showing people the value and impacts of NRHH through a new service tracker and OTMs, show why service and recognition are important.

(7) GL - what has been your favorite experience in your ADNRHH term?

(a) Favorite experience has been connecting with students I worked with, know that NAN doesn’t get to work with representatives but want to connect with NNB, connecting with people has been my favorite experience.

(8) SA - moves to extend Q&A

(a) IA - seconds

(9) SW - you mentioned NRHH Pen Pals, we had a NACURH Neighbors task force last year that was unsuccessful, how will this be different to ensure success?

(a) Marketing, showing the value of Pen Pals, demonstrating experience as low time commitment with high value.

(10) MA - can you define the role of NRHH within the corporate structure of NACURH?

(a) NRHH was founded to provide financial support to NACURH, has progressed from there, supplemental organization within NACURH, students get involved in when they are specifically dedicated to recognition and service and looking to extend beyond RHA involvement.
(11) GL - how do you plan incorporating the NACURH OTM selection committee into your OTM initiatives.
   (a) Would like to incorporate them into the different assessments planned for the OTM categories and reach out for ideas around the OTM database.

(12) PA - you mentioned wanting to increase social media participation from NRHH, what are your goals with this focus?
   (a) I feel people forget about NACURH outside of conferences, dealt with that in the Great lakes, since people follow us on social media we can keep them updated through it, I feel like we have an awesome NRHH Facebook page that is being underutilized for example.

(13) NE - do you think lifelong members are not engaged because they aren’t contacted? If so how do you plan to deal with that?
   (a) Lifelong members are not involved because we don’t keep track of them, we have a lot of forms and administrative processes but nothing for lifelong members, want to strengthen connection through database.

(14) NE - in your bid and presentation you talk about standardizing OTM selection, what do you see this looking like?
   (a) Truly feel that every region excels in different aspects, want to investigate the ways that regions engage with members through OTMs, work with ADNRHHs to determine practices for consistent selection committees, strengthen OTM selection rubric.

(15) MA - moves to extend Q&A
   (a) NCO - seconds

(16) SA - in your bid you talk about NRHH being its own entity, can you talk more about how you see that becoming a reality in the next year?
   (a) In that description I talk about NRHH being perceived as a little sister/side organization/etc., want to form NRHH’s identity in its values, I envision this happening through a variety of goals, in service and recognition, need to continue to demonstrate NRHH’s value.
(17) PA - can you describe a time you have advocated for NRHH within your position and how would this translate to your role within the Executive Committee?

(a) I haven’t been able to advocate for NRHH much this year, my Board are all NRHH members, when I proposed several larger NRHH structure pieces of legislation I had to talk with my Board and advocate on why that was the best move, would like to continue to remind people how things could impact NRHH as well as NACURH.

(18) NAN - one of the reasons we are moving the NRHH plan into the NACURH strategic plan is to ensure more people care about the success and advancement of NRHH, how do you plan to hold all NACURH Leadership members accountable to this?

(a) Through reminders and accountability measures, encouraging people to focus on the strategic plan, want to expand beyond the Execs, want to have NRHH Cos and ADNRHHs focus on NRHH initiatives, through that lens hope progress will be made.

(19) SW - you talked a lot about how you see the NRHH plans working within the strategic plan next year as well as your plans for assessment, do you think year one is the right time for this assessment?

(a) I want to start the assessment and see if things are impacting both NACURH and NRHH, keep assessment going through transition, I want to do this near the end of my term and at least start data collection.

(20) NAN - NRHH is a very big component of the NAN role, but needs to be balanced with other aspects like serving as a member of the Executive Committee, what plans do you have for this?

(a) Want to be involved in all of the chats, know what everyone is doing, be involved in any transition processes, contribute my prior experience, would be NAN but also a NACURH Exec, want to support the group as a whole.

(21) IA - what are some ways you will recognize both nominees and nominators for OTMs?

(a) I want to recognize both nominators and nominees, the nominator puts in a lot of time to write an OTM, trophies or prizes for the most
winning OTMs won, making sure nominators are being announced with the winner.

(22) CA - moves to exhaust the speaker's list
   (a) SA - seconds

(23) IA - you mention a customer service mindset in your bid, can you expand on this?
   (a) In my on-campus position I have gained a lot of experience working with customer service, want to use this mentality to meet member needs.

(24) NCO - for affiliation, who is responsible for recruiting new chapters? What are your plans for supporting NRHH affiliation?
   (a) Reaching out to new institutions and chapters, would work with the ADNOA to put together a marketing plan and a list of values of affiliating.

(25) SW - why is service important to you?
   (a) Feel that through service we can expand our leadership skills, can make unique impacts, love making impact and helping other students, love helping those in need, recognize privilege.

(26) MA - what are some of your learning goals for the incoming NNB members?
   (a) Listed in transition section of my bid, want to focus on those areas on Monday as well as the OTM database, how to affiliate, and what NRHH means to all of them.

(27) GL - can you please explain why you are an advocate for a NACURH-wide philanthropy?
   (a) Feel like this is something we have talked about since NACURH 2016, but then stopped talking about it, want to assess, I am an advocate because I feel like that is one thing that is missing, many regions have philanthropies but we don’t have a NACURH-wide philanthropy.

(28) GL - yield to redundancy

(29) NCO - a struggle for Chapters is putting effort into both values of NRHH, how do you plan to encourage chapters in supporting both values?
   (a) Show the value in both values and the impact that can make on the campus level, showing values will help people focus on them.
CA - in what way do you feel that the Honorary at this point may have grown beyond its current mission and vision?

(a) Through the transition from pillars to Values we can focus on the two Values, with the new membership statuses we are expanding beyond on-campus students, would like to examine the mission and vision statements in consideration of those changes.

c) Pro/Con

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● NRHM plans</td>
<td>● Plans for collaboration with Execs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Focus on support for all levels</td>
<td>● NACURH philanthropy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Expansion of recognition</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● New membership statuses</td>
<td>● Plans for expanding participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● NACURH NRHH chats</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● X</td>
<td>● Lack of collaborative ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Consolidation of chapter level resources</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) NE - believes both did a fantastic job, Nicole has a letter of support from her members, which shows her impact on people she has worked with.

e) MA - thanks both candidates, feel that Nicole’s ideas for assessment of the ADNRHH bids for this year was great, showed intentionality of her goals for the position and ideas for support.

f) GL - feels the major difference between candidates is that Nicole is more relationship focused and Becky is more goal focused, wanted to note that Becky got support from her NRHH and RHA members as well, believe both candidates have great goals that are grounded in recognition and service.

g) SA - appreciates both candidates, feel that NRHH needs candidates who will advocate for the needs of NRHH and not sure about either of these candidate’s ability to advocate for NRHH in NACURH.

h) PA - would like to follow up on previous discussion point, feel as if NRHH is more in need of structure next year and believes Becky is more prepared to provide this structure.

i) SW - appreciates the intentional thought Becky put into building relationships as well as her goals and planned direction for the Honorary.

j) MA - wanted to acknowledge that both candidate’s goals are rooted in the plan, both served on the strategic planning committee, appreciated Nicole’s goals outside of the strategic plan.

k) NE - feel that Nicole has a lot of strong long-term plans for the Honorary, Becky’s more short term goals will help NRHH to grow throughout the next year.

l) NE - believe that even though Becky did not have goals for collaboration in bid/presentation, goals are centered in an NRHH alumni image.

m) NCO - appreciate both candidates, appreciated Nicole’s specific timeline of goals, feel that Becky’s goals were more innovative for the next year.

n) MA - would like to acknowledge the amount of research Nicole had done on the OTM database.

o) CA - would like to echo the sentiment of the Great Lakes, feel that the candidates did have overlap in goals but what sets them apart of their plans for collaboration, feel that Nicole focused more on people whose positions are not directly connected to NRHH.

p) IA - believe in collaborative leadership, Becky mentions wanting to be the specific person for NRHH, at this time we feel that the
NAN should be more open to educating others and working with others as opposed to being the only person in charge of NRHH.

q) PA - would like to provide feedback to whomever elected to focus on incorporating NRHH COs and other positional structures, would like NACURH to also focus on regions without these specific positions and be cognizant of that impact.

r) GL - want to acknowledge IACURH concerns about Becky being the only NRHH content expert, in her bid, she speaks about wanting to educate other people about NRHH.

s) SW - appreciates both candidates, acknowledges the difficulty of this decision, both candidates had goals for relationship building in their bids.

t) SA - was impressed with the time that Nicole went through all the ADNRHH bids and do agree Nicole had more collaborative goals/plans than Becky.

u) MA - would like to further consider the boardroom culture question posed to each candidate, feel like NRHH boardroom has been stressful for representatives in the past, we hope that these concerns can be addressed for NRHH Representatives in the next year.

v) GL - would also like to commend Becky’s promise and why, as well as some of the innovative ideas Nicole discussed in her bid.

w) IA - would like to point out distinct things that differentiate what is good in a NAN, Nicole has a very broad vision where Becky has very task oriented things that reflect that of an ADNRHH position, believe that Nicole is much more suited for the NAN role.

x) MA - would like to highlight Becky’s focus on membership status and her passion for NRHH.

y) SA - calls to question
   (1) CA - dissent; would like to continue discussion

z) SW - believe that both candidates will do justice for the position, Nicole focuses more on NACURH Leadership experiences where Becky wants to focus on campus level goals.

aa) IA - moves to caucus for two minutes
   (1) NE - seconds

bb) SA - at this time would like to reiterate one of our voting options is no confidence, just passed a new piece of legislation allowing us to have more people eligible for this role, think that these candidates could come back to this position after taking in this feedback.

cc) IA - would like to reiterate our expectations for this role, we stated that we believe NRHH collaboration within the Executive Committee is important, Nicole had stronger goals for this within
her bid, Becky’s plans for collaboration were limited to the NAD position.

dd) SW - a voting option is no confidence, but should be reserved for when we don’t think that either candidate would fill the responsibility, both candidates have expressed being able to fulfill these duties, think this decision is between who is a better fit for the position.

ee) PA - while the Pacific recognizes that no confidence is a voting option, acknowledge that this would create opportunities for new candidates but that Becky and Nicole would still have an advantage in that selection.

ff) PA - moves to end discussion
   (1) NE - seconds

2. Outcome
   a) Becky VanWychen is elected as the 2018-2019 NACURH Associate for NRHH

D. NACURH Associate for Development

1. Nominations
   a) SA - moves to nominate Gracie Smith
      (1) GL - seconds
      (2) Accepts
   b) PA - moves to nominate Megan Brown
      (1) NE - seconds
      (2) Accepts
   c) GL - moves to nominate Alisha Mohammed
      (1) IA - seconds
      (2) Accepts
   d) PA - moves to close nominations
      (1) NCO - seconds

2. Gracie Smith
   a) Presentation
   b) Q&A
      (1) NE - what do you hope to gain from this experience?
         (a) One of the places that I do stand to gain a lot from is exploring ideas for academic initiatives, I do have a lot of experience for transition and leadership development, but I will have to explore more about academic initiatives, I would grow within that interaction with the organization.
(2) PA - what kind of resources do you feel are necessary to standardize NACURH U?

(a) First need to increase buy-in, assuming we have that buy-in, especially based in the strategic plan, think examining what common themes are and then introducing them to the regions, strengthening guides and presentations, goal is that everyone gets the same information, would be helpful resource for implementation on the regional level.

(3) GL - do you currently have your LEAD links?

(a) No, I do not

(i) GL - follow up, would you be willing to get them?

(a) Yes absolutely, LEAD has taken off this past year, was great having the NCO at our conference talk about LEAD, as well as in chats, campus was not involved at all.

(4) IA - can you list specific challenges you think COs face and how you can support them through those challenges?

(a) One of the biggest challenges I have seen is the connection to the NACURH level and the impact they have on NACURH level decisions and services, often a lot of COs are responsible for overseeing our Representatives, but when you see that difference of passing legislation versus developing people, they are different and they should be prepared, everyone has different measures of success, goals should not be the same, Directors and COs should have different goals.

(5) CA - the NAD position is new, what do you want your legacy to be in your role as well as your personal legacy?

(a) In the role, something I am hoping for is an increased value in and investment to developing people in their leadership journey, excited about our focus being brought there, you can give someone a task but do you like working with them? Do they advance? Do they innovate? Personally, I would like my legacy to be that I was someone who cared, would say that I have really invested a lot in the experience of my regional board and specifically my COs, we’ve had a lot of success and they feel valued, I have had a lot of
conversations about that on the regional level, want NACURH Leadership members to know their worth.

(6) SA - could you talk a little about the ways you have educated yourself on student development theory?

(a) I don’t have the school experience, not in classes or education program, would have to continue to research and explore, as I am continuing within student affairs I will learn these things but I will have to search that information out in the meantime, have to collaborate within the Exec Committee to make sure I am applying the right concepts to the right services.

(7) IA - what goals or plans do you have to engage COs on the NACURH level?

(a) Think that this is a two-way street, there needs to be a lot of communication with COs, advocating for themselves, being self-motivated, COs oversee our direct representatives and play an important role, need to work with COs, would like to explore talking with Directors about how they’re facilitating those conversations within their Boards, need the motivation to want to participate.

(8) Chair - based on the expectations set by the Boards last night, can you talk about a theory, idea, concept, or framework you plan to apply to this position next year?

(a) Specifically, I wasn’t on this task force but was talking to those in my region about Bloom’s taxonomy and the LEAD program, don’t have a booklet of possible theory but will do the research and be able to learn.

(9) NCO - regarding your goals related to CO competencies, can you explain why you chose competencies, where these competencies are coming from, and if they will be applicable to all COs?

(a) Really, I feel like rather than thinking of this as competencies, think of it more as intentionality, want COs to be developed in the same ways, they’re going to need to be individualized and developed through time based on specific needs and what is next within their development journey, want this development to happen rather than just seeing what happens next.

(i) NCO - follow up, you have five competencies listed, are these the ones you
hope to develop or are you planning personal ones to be developed as well?

(a) Those are general competencies, think they would be relevant to all COs, during 1:1s and catalyst chats as well as group chats, are going to be developed as well once in the position.

(10) MA - how will you develop relationships with those you may not see eye to eye with?

(a) Something that is really important to me is empathy, don’t think empathy is something that you are born with, need to learn and practice, when I don’t see eye to eye with others I try to practice empathy and do the necessary research to understand others perspectives.

(11) IA - you said you want to work with COs to have them advocate for themselves, how would you advocate for COs on the Executive Committee?

(a) Think in terms of advocating for COs, I would need to apply similar themes and tactics I used as a Director, for example during Semis I checked in with my COs to represent them, will bring this experience, need to examine a different scope in general, definitely have the general desire and drive to provide support here.

(12) CA - you mentioned you supported COs this year, how do you envision the way in which you support COs within this new role being different from that?

(a) In general, my scope has been meeting regional needs, mentioned in my bid as well but our conference chair structure means that I served in a position similar to a CO, wanted that additional involvement and found it for myself through advocacy, every regions’ needs are going to be different, have specific competencies for development and being able to meet needs.

(13) PA - part of the NAD position is to implement service and recognition initiatives, how would you work to develop the relationship with the NAN to accomplish these goals?

(a) In general, there are a lot of recognition-based leadership development opportunities, within my own NRHH Chapter, we did our own recognition and leadership development opportunities that they have continued, have the experience of
connecting these things together, will also need to have intentional discussions about what both parties want things to look like, have a lot of NRHH campus level experience and chapter involvement, will need to have more conversations for the corporate level.

(14) SA - what are your time commitments? How will you demonstrate good time management for self care?

(a) I do volunteer for peer panels at the LGBT resource center, am an active member of my campus NRHH chapter, my main involvement has been class and MACURH, need to continue to develop healthy self care practices with a different scope.

(15) NE - yield

(16) Chair - can you talk more about experiences you have innovating through ambiguity?

(a) This year on my Regional Board we had one positional vacancy that occurred, had to re-innovate a new transition process, was certainly not prepared to do that so I needed to rethink original plans, was able to develop my own system when I was unsure what to do and was able to condense experience that was impactful in a shortened timeline.

(17) SA - what experience do you have supporting or working with RHA Presidents?

(a) We have had boardrooms and RHA chats that I have attended within my region, also had one on ones with members about larger questions within NACURH, I think it will definitely be a new scope doing it in this way, in every region RHA presidents have a different context and history, I am coming from a region with a strong RHA presence.

(18) CA - you have had a lot of experiences in NACURH, what is the most important thing that you’ve learned?

(a) One of the biggest things I have learned is about finding your own measures of success, we’ve all fallen victim to comparing ourselves to others (regions, people before you, peer leaders in NACURH), have had to figure out how I measure my own success and focus on my own development to be successful.
IA - you touched on working with RHA this year but what is your vision for RHA Presidents within NACURH?

(a) I come from a region where our current representatives say that they want full involvement, not necessarily the case for all of NACURH, need to examine roundtable opportunities, I am certainly not coming in her with new ideas yet, but moving in the direction of allowing people to share ideas and will always be in favor of going in that direction, how this year goes will help shape RHA President involvement in the corporation.

NCO - in your bid you have cultural competency four different times, are there other things you want to talk about besides the intercultural development inventory?

(a) When we went to the strategic planning retreat, my experience was diversity training, so it is referred a lot and is applicable to many areas, I am not an expert, there needs to be other experts brought in, I am definitely willing and wanting to pursue this and thing it will be important to bring in other voices.

GL - yield

c) Pro/Con

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Acknowledged CO weakness</td>
<td>• Lack of NRHH goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CO competencies</td>
<td>• Existing knowledge of Development Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Willing to complete LEAD links</td>
<td>• Specific plans to fulfill all positional duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Familiarity with strategic plan</td>
<td>• Proficiency in student development theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• X</td>
<td>• Vague competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Experience with RHA presidents</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NSPA data analysis</td>
<td>• Vague goals and responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Megan Brown
   a) Presentation
   b) Q&A
      (1) NE - you have a lot of CO experience, what do you want to gain from this new position?
          (a) The new NAD position will help me see what it can do in NACURH, gain more leadership opportunities, will be able to see more of the corporate structure, will see a new side of the corporate structure since I haven’t been able to see that from being in an education perspective.
      (2) IA - can you describe some specific challenges COs face and how you plan to support them through those challenges?
          (a) Yes, a lot of times COs feel as if their voices are not heard, they are the regional voice, running the region, some COs want to get involved and some do not, want to work with them to get them to a place where they feel comfortable and feel like they belong, think that sometimes COs struggle with seeing the value of CO chats, heard that a lot when I was a CO, want to make those meaningful experiences, not just about them hearing NACURH updates.
      (3) GL - how will you work to incorporate social justice and inclusion in this position?
          (a) The biggest way is by using learning theory and outcomes, this corporation is moving toward social justice models, will pave the way to better using social justice in NACURH.
      (4) IA - can you share how you will advocate for COs as a member of the NACURH Executive Committee?
          (a) Would want to make sure we remember that COs are also NACURH Leadership, their leadership is very valuable, remind the Executive Committee of the purpose of COs and how they are feeling.
      (5) MA - how would you develop relationships with individuals who may not see eye to eye with you?
(a) My conflict style is “collaborative,” I like to work with people to make sure that if we can’t see eye to eye that’s fine, I don’t expect everyone to agree with me, understanding that people come from different perspectives, regions, backgrounds, different places of life, I can still work with someone without being 100% on the same page.

(6) NCO - what theories are you hoping to implement in this position? How will you ensure these theories are practiced?

(a) Social change model, this is what we talked about with the changes to the LEAD program, wouldn’t want to make decisions alone on theories, I would want to do this in coordination with the Executive Committee, want to ensure that whatever theories we choose we are being accessible to the people we expect to use these theories.

(7) PA - in your bid you talk about creating a relationship with the NAN, how will you work with the NAN to advocate for NRHH?

(a) I can serve the NNB, have a lot of regional NRHH experience, being the other person on the Executive Committee thinking about NRHH, alternative breaks directly relate to NRHH, how can we involve the NNB, bring people in NRHH to different services, be there for the NNB and for the NAN.

(8) Chair - based on the expectations set by the Boards last night, can you talk about a theory, idea, concept, or framework you plan to apply to this position next year?

(a) First thing is differentiated instruction, talking about people learning things differently, might need to articulate things differently for different people, how can we make sure everyone is reaching learning outcomes and understanding what we are doing.

(9) NCO - how would you engage people with this educational theory through the Leadership Cup? From our understanding this initiative is meant to be for fun and relationship building?

(a) Fair point, would point out that education is fun, have had fights with my students about this, education is more than just talking to everyone, think that it is important to make things more meaningful, still would be a competition and be
engaging, should connect to something more, if it is called the Leadership Cup it should have more behind it, things should be purposeful.

(i) NCO - follow up, what theory would you back it in?

(a) I would research this in the future because I don’t want to choose a theory randomly, but it may be a social change theory because that model fits NACURH best.

(10)CA - you have had a lot of experience in NACURH, what was the most valuable thing you learned and how will you use that to be successful in the NAD position?

(a) You have to be flexible, can plan everything out but you need to be prepared for everything to change, I was planning to be ADNRHH and had to push this aside to become Director, learning to be flexible is important and learn to think on your feet has been important.

(11)Chair - what experience do you have innovating through ambiguity?

(a) I have worked in ambiguity all of the past year, I was unsure as to what my role was because I was doing the work of two CO positions last year, felt like I wasn’t doing enough but I was also doing too much, I have been able to take on ambiguous roles and change them to what fit me since it wasn’t done before, even being Director I was able to take what I knew as ADNRHH and apply it to new position.

(12)IA - can you talk more about your experiences with RHA Presidents and how you plan to support RHA Presidents in NACURH?

(a) Actually helped complete the CO for RHA position in my region for about two months this year when we had a vacancy, have a little experience working with RHA Presidents, thinking making sure RHA Presidents in NACURH feel valued but also talking about NCCs’ power and voice and making sure we are developing both NCCs and RHA Presidents, RHAs are important, the roundtables at NACURH this year could really work and be developed, can make RHA Presidents feel supported through this, would like to work with them to help RHA Presidents find their voice within NACURH and
their region and make sure that they also see the value in NACURH and their region, really working to develop their leadership and let them see how we can help them.

(13) NCO - you’re talking about learning outcomes, can you identify what learning outcomes NACURH needs right away? Why do we need learning outcomes?

(a) We need learning outcomes because we need a reason to be doing certain things.

(14) GL - can you explain how post RLC/post Semis burnout would impact your planned virtual retreat in January?

(a) I think it would impact it, again we’d have to be flexible, everyone is human and we do need breaks after things, I would not want it to be directly after Semis or RLC, would want it to be later on (February or March), but also think this winter opportunity might help people to cure that burnout, for me personally there has been times where this year specifically I did not know why I bid for Director, and then I talked to someone in my region or my RBD and remembered my “why,” so this may help re-energize people and help them understand their own why.

(15) SW - what do you believe to be the biggest threat to the NAD position?

(a) Think that the fact that it is working in ambiguity and is a new position, feel like it might (if it’s not a strong start) not be as important as its thought to be, might not be everything it was envisioned to be.

(16) NE - not every CO position is the same, how would you work with similar CO positions?

(a) I think that it is really important, specifically with the CORE positions planned, that we do have things that make us different, I think that working with the NBD, NNB, and COs and having conversations about needs and priorities will be important, on top of catalysts and sch, I want to make GroupMes for each specific CO group with similar duties regionally and ask questions about the work being done in regions.

c) Pro/Con

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Self-professed love for uncertainty
• Understanding of theory

• Growth mindset for position
• Understanding of learning outcomes

• Extensive positional experience
• Incorporation of NRHH initiatives

• Plans for LEAD
• Social justice and inclusion plans

4. Alisha Mohammed
   a) Presentation
   b) Q&A

1. PA - in your presentation you talked about wanting to develop a relationship between the NAD and the NAN, what do you think this would look like?
   (a) The position can support in the assistance of enhancing recognition and service initiatives.

2. MA - wondering how you plan to work on building relationships with COs you might not see eye to eye with?
   (a) Think that if I don’t see eye to eye I would try to be devil’s advocate, if I show the other side and they still stick to their perspective, I should challenge what I am thinking and play devil’s advocate for my own ideas as well.

3. GL - you have a lot of CO centered goals, how do you intend to support COs in reaching these?
   (a) I think first and foremost starting with learning and sharing about different leadership styles in the beginning of the year and that they should know at this point, I want to give them perspective about past experiences and let them know that the way that they can lead and the way that they can have an impact.

4. GL - if elected, the NAD will be the point person for the LEAD program on the Executive Committee, would you be willing to get your LEAD Links?
   (a) Don’t actually have my LEAD links yet, for SW I have chaired a task force and done many of the
requirements but have not turned everything in, do believe in the mindset of the LEAD program and would be excited to work with the NCO.

(5) IA - Can you list some challenges you think COs face and how you’ll help COs navigate them?
   
   (a) Speaking more so on the NACURH side of things, one challenge is COs feeling like they even matter when it comes to legislation, COs have to partner with an NBD member if they really want legislation heard because NBD members are the ones who get to be in the room, think they could be content experts, if they want to be supported by other members they can, that’s fine, but they should be able to own their positions.

(6) NE - how would you ensure that “CO’s leading the way” is maintained consistently throughout NACURH so it applies to all regions?
   
   (a) I want to focus on the projects that they want to do this year and see how these can relate a common experience, help COs have an end goal for what they want their catalyst to be focusing on, each one would have a thing that they could do to help with NACURH level.

(7) NE - what do you hope to take away from the NAD position?
   
   (a) Development is a big concept, connects to not just NACURH Leadership but also NACURH, making sure that everyone is involved, not just the members who go to conferences, should help all people to say “NACURH gave me this.”

(8) SA - could you talk about your experience working with RHA Presidents and your vision for facilitating RHA President resources?
   
   (a) When I was RHA president last year, I worked a lot with President proxy post in the GroupMe, talked and built relationships with people, one of the most important things for me was visiting different universities, knowing that NACURH work doesn’t just stop at conferences ad virtual opportunities, can start by collaborating and visiting (maybe virtually), I prioritized president roundtables, think that there is so much opportunity there to exchange ideas, that’s the philosophy we want for RHA Presidents, as the NAD, I can ask the COs for RHA and CO-PRs what their RHA Presidents want
going into that year and have conversations about how they can create opportunities and resources that their Presidents actually want.

(9) Chair- can you talk about a piece of theory, research, framework, or practice that would inform your work as NAD?

(a) One of them could be transformational leadership - I think that leadership isn’t something that is attainable - leadership can be different every single year in a position, it can be a different thing every semester, and is an ongoing process.

(10) PA - during Semis, PACURH enjoyed working with a social justice consultant, when looking at goals and aspect of your role, you talked about marketing, have you thought of an external person to help with this process?

(a) Idea for a transition workshop that I did at Semis, would want to do that again next year but frame it differently, didn’t think about actually physically bringing someone, my professor recently has experience with corporations and leadership development, could possibly go to her for guidance next year to create a new workshop or educational experience.

(11) NCO - what tangible ways will you assist the NCO CO for Resource Development next year?

(a) Think that it is important to know that I shouldn’t act like I am doing work that they have ownership of, but I can be a resource and sounding board for ideas, tangible ways could include answering questions for resources around development and the LEAD program.

(12) GL - beyond training, how will you work to incorporate social justice and inclusion into your work?

(a) I haven’t had a lot of on these topics, but we have had workshops on my campus that I can continue to participate in, through that, I have increased my own education, want to bring that to the NACURH level.

(13) GL - in your bid you talked about the NACURH Leadership Cup; what do you think the intention of the NACURH Leadership Cup is and what would happen if you shifted who competed in it?

(a) This could be fun for the whole region, regional competitions where Leadership take things to their
representatives would be fun, maybe could also have a NACURH-wide cup that has to do with NACURH experiences, things that they can check off their list to complete and learn.

(14)Chair - could you talk about an experience you have had innovating through ambiguity?

(a) Something you have to do in this position is talk to and work with a variety of people, through the position, talking about different aspects about the position with the NACURH Execs and Leadership members will help me to best determine how I would like to implement this new position.

(15)CA - you have a pretty impressive list of NACURH experiences, what was the most valuable thing you learned during your time in NACURH?

(a) This year I spent a lot of time working with learning outcome things like through LEAD and NACURH U as well as on the regional level, this is what I have learned the most from because I brought these experiences back to my campus to create lesson plans, don’t know that I will go into student affairs, but NACURH has positively impacted my career as a business major.

(16)IA - you talked a little bit about your CO of the Month award, what will the selection process be and how would you prevent monopolization across one entity?

(a) Got the idea from a SWACURH OTM Representative initiative, the JotForm was sent to everyone in the region, would be cool to do this during NACURH chats to make sure it is done equally through all of the regions, if it is not done equally, that could turn into a conversation, but in general it would be an opportunity to increase recognition.

(17)IA - how would you engage COs during NACURH chats?

(a) Think that because they would be broken up, the first 30 minutes for business and updates and then 30 minutes for catalysts, COs would still be able to interact, also want to do engagement questions through the CO GroupMe, want to use both chats and GroupMe to showcase work people do.

(18)PA - what is your end goal for the regional and NACURH U program?
(a) I know that the strategic plan says to look through the regional U programs and standardize them, do not know if I believe in that, but it would be cool if regions get the skills and resources that NACURH uses to build them, would want to explore if regions want some type of support from NACURH here, if they don’t need anything would also respect that space.

(19) GL - yield to redundancy

(20) IA - how would you work to support a CO through midyear burnout?

(a) We can support them through reviewing bids and reminding them of their goals, checking in, asking COs their “why,” using that in chats, engaging COs and reminding them of why they are doing the work, would want to explore why the burnout is happening.

(21) MA - can you elaborate further on how you developed your catalyst groups?

(a) Used the four general catalysts that are in place right now, but some things I think would be important would be grounding in projects because that gives them a little more purpose, maybe not just projects that are task lists, but seeing what COs want and what they need to develop in those areas, provide development based on goals and positions.

c) Pro/Con

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Boardroom mock trials</td>
<td>● Lack of educational theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Relationship building</td>
<td>● Mention of NRHH collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Consistently working on transition</td>
<td>● Time commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Leadership theory</td>
<td>● Monday morning meetups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Taskforce involvement</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Leadership certification</td>
<td>● Social justice and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities</td>
<td>inclusion ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specific plans for each duty</td>
<td>• CO OTM selection process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New affiliate membership guide</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. IA - moves to end pro/con
   a) NE - seconds

5. Discussion
   a) CA - believe that a candidate bringing Leadership Development theory to the position should be considered as an added bonus, but should not have a negative impact if not included, theory can be researched once in the position, overall felt that Alisha seemed more task oriented than other two candidates.

   b) SA - moves to caucus for 10 minutes
      (1) NE - seconds

   c) NCO - appreciates all the time and effort put in by all candidates, we are students and don’t expect people to come into these roles knowing learning outcomes, believe that you can learn them, there was concern when candidates used the words “theory” and “learning outcomes” without knowing their meaning, struggled to back themselves up for this, NCO commends Alisha’s phenomenal presentation and for being the only candidate to reach out to the NCO in their planning.

   d) NE - think all three candidates are great, concerned about Alisha’s Monday morning meetup idea, Monday is generally a busy time for students, don’t see this as supporting on student well-being.

   e) GL - currently struggling between examining differences between two candidates, specifically Alisha’s and Gracie’s ideas and contributions, were some foundational pieces that we expected to hear more on from Megan that she did not touch on, with Gracie we saw passion, authenticity, and CO support structures, and with Alisha we saw a lot of new initiatives and ideas that have the potential to grow, are concerned slightly on where those ideas are founded, how will ideas grow without people interested in them, etc.

   f) MA - would like to recognize all three candidates, Megan has a lot of clear leadership experience, Alisha brought a lot of unique ideas, worried about the task-oriented approach Alisha took, but do think this shows opportunities for growth.
g) IA - appreciated Gracie and Alisha’s focus on CO support which is why we were originally excited to see this position created.

h) PA - appreciated Alisha’s focus on practice, don’t know that she showed as much thought into the why behind her ideas, would have liked to hear more about her research.

i) PA - believes that while all three candidates are equipped to serve in the NAD position, we appreciated that Gracie was honest about her areas of growth, think that Gracie set herself apart in that way, Megan showed a lot of attention to detail to improve what we have while Alisha showed ideas to start from scratch.

j) SW - while innovation is important, we believe that filling positional duties for this new position is currently the most important, currently Alisha is the only one in her bid and presentation who talked about all aspects of the position, full support of Alisha.

k) GL - would like to touch on the transition aspect of the NAD position, Alisha, while she has had experiences with the transition task force, came into her position as a co-conference chair where she already had a lot of background and context, Gracie highlighted that she did have a mid-year transition and had to snap to adapt practices, feel that Gracie will be able to apply this experience and support transition without context, create strong structure for transition and for transitioning the new NAD position.

l) GL - want to note that we would have liked to see each of the candidates more intentionally include social justice and inclusion with their goals, none of the candidates noted ideas for furthering these initiatives, felt this was an area of growth for all three candidates.

m) NE - were excited about Gracie’s overall presentation and goals that she shared, but were a little put off by her lack of NRHH goals and plans development, as well as a lack of plans for engaging NRHH in her bid.

n) PA - would like to note that within the NAD role that this person would be responsible for interacting with the NAN and NNB, Megan has experience with the NAN and NNB that could be helpful in this area, also were excited about Alisha’s past experience as RHA President and how that could translate to the NAD position.

o) SA - would like to echo the sentiments of the Great Lakes and believes that both Megan and Gracie have demonstrated the kind of collaborative growth mindset and the ability to acknowledge weaknesses while articulating a strong vision to be the best for the position, feel they are most qualified to serve in this capacity.
IA - would like to disagree with a point made by the Great Lakes about social justice and diversity, Gracie made note of her competencies within her presentation and talked about this multiple times throughout her bid, there would definitely need to be more of a focus in this area, but that was included.

SW - with respect to the comments about knowledge of student development, the Southwest understands the sentiment that research can be done prior to the position, both Megan and Alisha demonstrated that they put research into this ahead of time, where Gracie did not demonstrate this commitment.

NCO - appreciated Gracie’s willingness to do a SWOT analysis in her bid, liked her idea for CO buddies and how much she emphasized cultural competencies, for Alisha, we appreciated that she had a tangible theory and framework included in her bid, and that she also connected back to empower, motivate, and engage, Alisha also did a significant amount of research before her bid and presentation, talked to the NCO and other positions.

PA - there has been some disagreement or some concerns with various aspects of the NAD position in this conversation, would like to reinforce the idea that we continue connections with professional consultants, Alisha had connections to this and would also be able to bring additional ideas and resources.

NCO - wanted to touch back on Alisha being task-oriented, we appreciated that Alisha has specific tasks and ideas she plans to accomplish, but also appreciated Gracie’s vision.

IA - feel that this position was originally created to support the CO experience, only so much that can be done in the position, we would really like someone who focuses on COs, has the highest amount of trickle down, this is something that the Intermountain is really focused on, really want someone to focus on that as well, out of all three candidates we really feel like Gracie did this, a lot of the other expectations could be developed over time, excited about that development but also think there needs to be some sort of foundation, the way to do this is cultivate the CO experience.

SA - moves to narrow the field to two candidates

(1) MA - seconds

NCO - wanted to clarify something that has been discussed so far, do not think that someone needs to fully know student development theory to take on this position, it was in the expectations we set and people did talk about it in their bids/presentations, think a suggestion for future candidates would be to do this research beforehand, should be looking at professional opportunities and opportunities for development, if candidates say theories and learning outcomes they should be
able to explain and apply those things, also do not believe this position was created for just COs, is an important part but there are other important parts of the position as well, including leadership and development initiatives, the NCO is looking for a candidate who is ready to apply all of this to the actual position.

x) GL - are in full support of Gracie for this position, appreciated her presentation and bid, we believe the mention of intercultural development inventories will be helpful, also appreciated Gracie’s breakdown of supports, believe that she touched on her plans for all aspects of the position and will do well in the role.

y) CA - moves to caucus for two minutes
   (1) NE - seconds

z) NE - see Gracie as a good candidate but are also worried about her being so focused on COs, this will leave the precedent that the focus is on only that and not the other important development aspects of the position and strategic plan.

aa) NE - have been talking about a lot of different aspects of the position, next year the issue will be navigating uncertainty, are looking for a candidate who can offer good problem solving skills and background.

bb) SA - this position is new but the things this role is doing were once a part of the NAA position or Executive committee, feel that it would be narrow minded only looking at the presentations today, have to bring in past perspectives and information and look at comprehensive performance of positions as well as information presented in bids.

cc) NCO - wanted to commend Gracie, looking at bid and presentation, like that Gracie talked about affiliation and president goals, had concerns with Megan overall and her goals for the Leadership Cup.

dd) GL - remaining in support of Gracie, but wanted to recognize she did not talk about the NRHH aspects of the position or other areas and would like to see growth here.

ee) Chair - we are noticing a lot of contradictions in this discussion that don’t align with expectations or the conversations we had regarding similar topics in earlier discussions today.

ff) NE - moves to caucus
   (1) CA - seconds

gg) CA - moves to reconsider all three candidates
   (1) GL - seconds

hh) IA - yield
ii) PA - believes that taking into account all the resources we have that is available to us as well as considerations from last night we still believe Gracie is the best candidate for the role.

jj) PA - taking into account all of the resources we have available to us as well as considerations from the discussion on expectations last night, we believe that Gracie is the best candidate for this position.

kk) MA - yield

ll) SW - wanted to talk about Gracie’s CO competencies, these are things that she said were important, not confident in her ability to support this without having regular one on ones.

mm) NCO - would suggest coming up with three questions to ask each candidate in a second period of Q&A.

nn) NE - in support of that idea, believes we should be sure to pick questions connected to expectations and not questions that are tailored to certain people.

oo) IA - really wants to second the sentiments earlier from the Great Lakes, while we do want to be sensitive we want to talk about the larger issues not being addressed in the room.

pp) CA - would like everyone to consider the balance we are trying to find between being vision oriented and task oriented, within each election there has been a shift in discussion around these approaches.

qq) NCO - feel like we are dancing around important things that need to be addressed, bias is impacting discussion, not sure if it is based in popularity or identity, how can we move back with all three candidates in way that considers them all fully?

rr) PA - point of information, could we see all of the expectations for this position as well as hear the pro/con list for each candidate?

(1) Information provided

ss) SA - we experienced an election process in our region this year where there was a discussion based on identities of the candidate as opposed to qualifications and goals, believe maybe we should consider recessing for the evening to reflect on what we have discussed.

tt) NE - respects that but also recognize it has already been awhile since presentations, worried if we wait we may be further away from the information we received today and need to make the best decision.

uu) IA - appreciates the thoughts from the South Atlantic and believes that the room will have more clarity with reflection, but for the candidates’ sake we should continue to have discussion around what has happened, would like to reiterate support for
Gracie and Alisha, feel like both candidates reflect the values the Intermountain has and had clear vision/goals for the position.

vv) NE - moves to caucus for ten minutes
   (1) SA - seconds

ww) CA - after reading the minutes, the Central Atlantic still would like more information from each of the candidates, i.e., information on goals/plans for POY support, NRHH support, etc.; don’t feel like we can fairly compare candidates without hearing about these components of the role.

xx) NCO - respect that but also think there is value in considering the information that each candidate took time to address in their original bid, presentation, and Q&A, on the candidate to have goals for the whole position.

yy) PA - after discussing, the Pacific is worried there may be some bias in the room due to the fact that we spent additional time discussing two of the three candidates, have all of the information we need to make a decision and feel like further discussion is delaying the inevitable.

zz) IA - would like to remind everyone that what each candidate brought to the table is the most important; not previous relationships, bow that all candidates are back on for consideration we should treat them equally, see Gracie in this role, but would like to hear further discussion and perspectives on all three candidates.

aaa) GL - think we should build on our goals when creating this position, as well as the values and mission of our organization, this is a big decision so we must be open with our thoughts.

bbb) Chair - encourage you all to consider the ways you are using language to discuss specific characteristics that conflict with discussions this group had earlier today.

ccc) NAA - also encourage you all to consider the ways that identity may be impacting your decision making here, heard clear favorable discussion for two of the three candidates, then one candidate was eliminated from discussion, feel like there is a lot of coded language being used in this discussion.

ddd) SW - reading through the minutes, I took note of each discussion point that was made prior to narrowing the field earlier, recognize that SW was in support of Alisha and Megan prior, each candidate had the following number of points made about them:
   (1) Gracie - ten supportive, two critical
   (2) Megan - four supportive, two critical
   (3) Alisha - nine supportive, two critical
eee) GL - would like to acknowledge the amount of positive comments made about Alisha in our original discussion, if you are feeling uncomfortable, you should sit in that and work to examine why, want to acknowledge what has happened while still coming back together to make the best decision for NACURH.

fff) CA - would like to know what information each entity needs to help a decision be made, think that we need to fully consider all three candidates.

ggg) GL - feel like we have all of the information we need at this time, have had all of our questions answered, also have all of the information included in bids to consider, want to keep moving forward with discussion/decision making.

hhh) PA - believe that each candidate had twenty minutes to answer questions already and that future questions may be influenced by bias toward specific candidates, have all of the information we need and feel like we can move forward with a decision.

iii) IA - feel like both Alisha and Gracie had great points in their bids and presentation, ultimately in support of Gracie, concerned somewhat with Alisha’s initiatives like the CO of the Month award, Gracie did well talking about COs and also talked a lot about working with RHA presidents, LEAD, and other virtual opportunities.

jjj) MA - agree that each candidate brings different strengths and ideas to the position.

kkk) SA - we we caucussed we discussed that this was a high quality election with three great candidates, when we looked to narrow the field it was hard to do so, worried that we are stressed with the duration of boardroom as well as topics discussed, want to be cognizant of our own mentality, think further discussion should be about the candidates and their qualifications.

lll) SW - would like to respond to some thoughts that have been shared, it seemed like there were candidates who were missing certain points of the position, Alisha was the only candidate who laid out her plan for each aspect of the position, and also touched on her experiences that will help her succeed in all parts of the role, would like the room to further consider what parts of the position were missing from other candidates goals/presentations.

mmm) GL - at this time are in full support of Alisha, on page 8 of her bid she outlined a timeline for supporting COs, throughout her bid she talked about all of the different ideas she has for leadership development initiatives, has also served on many NACURH task forces and regional task forces that specifically relate to the areas of the position and feel like this context will be helpful.
nnn) PA - would like to reiterate that all candidates are capable of completing the duties of the position, are in support of Gracie, were most excited about her bid as well prior to any presentation or discussion.

ooo) SA - wanted to reiterate the merits and qualifications of Megan, feel like she has been forgotten in this discussion, is the only candidate who actually served as a CO, has demonstrated an ability to work through transition and uncertainty, beautifully articulated her vision and goals for the position.

ppp) PA - calls to question

    (1) SA - dissents; would like to hear further discussion

qqq) CA - moves to caucus for three minutes

    (1) SW - seconds

rrr) PA - yield

sss) IA - moves to end discussion

    (1) PA - seconds

    (2) SA - dissent; would like to hear further discussion

        (a) PA - does not withdraw second

        (i) Vote

            (a) 4-4-0, re-enter discussion

ttt) SA - at this point we are considering abstaining from this vote, feel like we don’t think there is a clear consensus in the room, before caucusing there was no explicit conversation about what has happened in this discussion.

uuu) MA - acknowledges the concerns of SAACURH but also do not feel like we need any more information to make our decision, are in support of Gracie for this position.

vvv) PA - also do not need any additional information and discussion at this time, wanted to share that with the room.

www) SW - would like everyone to consider the position that we established three months ago, all voted to approve the position with the duties listed, we are considering election someone who doesn’t have a plan to do many of the things in the position description, therefore giving them a lot of control over the position outcome, not all of the candidates brought these things up for discussion today but we already discussed and decided what we wanted this position to look like and the expectations we had.

xxx) NCO - believe that all three candidates are qualified for the NAD position, felt that Gracie had great goals for supporting COs, Megan has a strong background of educational theory that she applied to the position, however after everything we have
seen/heard/discussed we feel like Alisha is the best candidate for this position.

yyy) PA - moves to end discussion
    (1) NE - seconds
    (2) Vote is inconclusive

zzz) SA - wanted to note that we have been the only one to talk about Megan, which we feel like is confusing considering earlier the field was narrowed to Megan and Gracie.

aaaa) CA - in the earlier discussion, the room advocated for someone who was vision oriented in their goals over task oriented, feel like that is not aligning with the conversation happening now, putting our support behind Alisha, feel like Megan and Gracie have a good vision for some areas of the position, but are excited that Alisha has strong plans for all aspects of the position, think Gracie’s care would be valuable but ultimately feel like the person we select will set a precedent for the success of this position.

bbbb) Annual Conference - enjoyed all of the presentations and points brought up by each candidate, liked that Alisha focused on the Annual Conference staff along with the COs, want to make sure the Annual Conference staff is not being left out.

cccc) IA - don’t believe that the first person in this new position will totally determine what this position looks like for the future, when considering the expectations and position responsibilities we are still in support of Gracie, don’t want to treat this election like the person elected will determine the longevity of this position.

dddd) NE - while we agree with IACURH about the longevity of the position, do want to recognize that being the first person in a position will be stressful, don’t want to put undue stress on the position but do think that the first person in a position with only a two-year trial period will have an impact and set precedents.

eeee) GL - moves to end discussion
    (1) PA - seconds
    (2) Vote inconclusive, move into discussion on Alisha and Gracie as the top two candidates

ffff) MA - moves to caucus for two minutes
    (1) NE - seconds

gggg) SA - calls the question
    (1) IA - dissent, would like to hear further discussion

hhhh) CA - think that both candidates are qualified for this position, wanted to clarify that whatever the NAD is not able to accomplish in the first year will be can be accomplished by future people in
this position, think this election is about who the NAD position supports and who will be impacted by the NAD position, think Alisha showed the ability to work well with others and innovate in the role, Gracie showed the ability to connect over her passion and build relationships, both candidates have experiences as Conference Chairs and Regional Directors.

iii) NE - believe that Gracie is the best candidate at this time, set goals grounded in theory.

jjjj) NCO - interesting that you said Gracie had goals grounded in leadership theory, Alisha was the only candidate to actually name real theories in her bid and presentation, do not need to worry about the following years for this position at this point but do feel like Alisha will focus on leadership development that NACURH needs, also felt that Alisha was most clear in naming her plans for supporting COs and developing other members.

kkkk) IA - would like to acknowledge that both candidates have great ideas for the position, feel like the purpose of this role is to develop COs and feel that Gracie will do this if chosen for this position.

llll) GL - wanted to call attention to Alisha’s use of the five exemplary practices of leadership, think this is something that could be implemented throughout the year and aligns with current work happening in NACURH, don’t know that this is a theory but is a clear framework that could be implemented, also loved Alisha’s ideas for CO bar pins and increasing recognition for COs in NACURH Leadership.

mmmm) SA - agrees with IACURH that both of these candidates showed great involvement with supporting transition, Gracie has had a deep involvement in the strategic planning committee, also focused on marketing, excited about her goals for RHA Presidents and creating intentional RHA spaces.

nnnn) MA - wanted to express our continued support for Gracie.

oooo) SW - feel like Alisha will fulfill each positional duty, has at least one page on every responsibility and the goals she wants to accomplish, appreciate the comments that Gracie has adapted in unplanned situations, feel like it is being overlooked that Alisha also stepped up and volunteered to serve on the strategic planning committee this year to ensure the Southwest was being represented.

pppp) IA - moves to end discussion

   (1) SA - seconds

6. Outcome

   a) Gracie Smith is elected as the 2018-2019 NACURH Associate for Development
III.  NBD MM18-69 | Regional Support for the Annual Conference

A.  NCO - moves to bring MM18-69 to the floor
   1.  SA - seconds

B.  Proponent Speech
   1.  In the past month there was need for more clarity around support practices regarding conferences and regional support, we ask annual conference to have regional support typically, this is usually voted on and decided by the regions, we are okay with Boards supporting multiple institutions bidding for the Annual Conference considering that ultimately the NCCs don’t vote on the Annual Conference the Boards do, don’t want to discourage schools from bidding by having the NCCs of a region choose to support one institution over another, want to clear up questions Directors may have, additionally, this will be helpful to institutions to have this practice in policy, also clarifies the specific ways that Regional Boards can support institutions bidding for the Annual Conference.

C.  Q&A
   1.  SA - yields question to the Great Lakes, was this an issue for your Indiana schools and does that come into effect when we’re voting later this week?
      a)  Both institutions from the Great Lakes have regional support, it should not affect discussion or voting.
   2.  IA - regarding the part of this piece that talks about content for letters of support, why was this added to this piece, was it to give examples or avoid showing favor?
      a)  Ultimately feel like there is a fine line between Regional Director support and doing too much to give certain institutions an advantage, the CRC is responsible for working with schools to ensure they are prepared to bid, the RBD shouldn’t include content in letters of support that is outside of what has been shared in a pre-bid or presentation for support, thought these clarifications in policy would help with that.
   3.  IA - does this limit a Director, or whomever is writing the letter of support, from saying something about the institution’s involvement in the region?
      a)  No, would be able to speak generally about the institution and their regional involvement.
   4.  GL - moves to end Q&A
      a)  CA - seconds

D.  Discussion
1. CA - appreciate piece of legislation and think that this will prevent regions showing favor to specific institutions interested in bidding.

2. IA - also in support of this piece, in our region NCCs were at times under the impression that they should be selecting the conference when it actually is the NBD, helpful to have this written down in policy, like that this defines what regional support looks like and provides guidance in situations where two schools from the same region are interested in bidding for the Annual Conference.

3. MA - in support of this piece, clarifying the understanding that NCCs don’t vote on the Annual Conference may make more sense historically to have NCCs provide regional support.

4. SA - calls the question

E. Vote

1. 8-0-0, motion carries

WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 2018

I. Call to order at 8:14 AM PST

II. Award Bid Selections

A. School of the Year Award

1. Nominations

   a) MA - moves to nominate Truman State University
      (1) IA - seconds

   b) GL - moves to nominate University of British Columbia
      (1) PA - seconds

   c) IA - moves to nominate East Tennessee State University
      (1) SW - seconds

   d) SA - moves to nominate Drake
      (1) IA - seconds

   e) MA - moves to nominate University of Oregon
      (1) NE - seconds

   f) IA - moves to nominate Stony Brook University
      (1) NE - seconds

   g) SW - moves to nominate Northern Arizona University
      (1) PA - seconds

2. Truman State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Extensive regional and</td>
<td>● Description of results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NACURH involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integration of theme</th>
<th>Difficult to read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong budget breakdown</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTMs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### University of British Columbia

**PRO**

- Advocacy initiatives
- NRHH information
- Advocacy
- Traditional and new programs

**CON**

- Elaboration on improvement
- Difficult to read budget
- X
- X

#### East Tennessee State University

**PRO**

- Philanthropy
- Strategic plan
- X
- Clear layout
- X

**CON**

- Advocacy
- OTMs
- X
- Explanation of accomplishments
- International Tea Party

#### Remarks

- GL - moves to end pro/con
  
  (1) CA - seconds

- IA - moves to end pro/con
  
  (1) NE - seconds
5. Drake University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Bid theme</td>
<td>• Lack of measurable results for goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wellness programming</td>
<td>• Depth of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Budget</td>
<td>• Explanation of committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plastic for Puerto Rico program</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) GL - moves to end pro/con  
(1) CA - seconds

6. University of Oregon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership training and development efforts</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on advocacy</td>
<td>• Discussion of evaluation tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conference hosting</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrated use of NACURH services</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Stony Brook University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Institutional pride</td>
<td>• Program evaluation tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easy to follow content</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Growth in programming</td>
<td>• Depth of NRHH collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) GL - moves to end pro/con  
(1) SA - seconds
8. Northern Arizona University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Organization of goals</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Goals in progress chart</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Strategic plan</td>
<td>● Layout overwhelming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Shadow and sidekick</td>
<td>● Lack of recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure</td>
<td>methods and achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● NRHH involvement</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) IA - moves to end pro/con
   (1) NE - seconds

9. Discussion

a) SW - appreciated that Northern Arizona University demonstrated the ways that each of their Executives Boards are involved on campus and the positive impacts of their involvement.

b) CA - would like to note that Drake University’s bid overall is lacking content and lacking clarity in some of the later initiatives.

c) MA - would like to recognize Drake University’s fun bid theme but would have liked to see further information included on why they should be selected as school of the year.

d) SA - were very impressed by University of Oregon’s bid for their identity as an advocacy group and the ways they have brought that to their region and NACURH.

e) SW - would have liked to see further elaboration on East Tennessee University’s goals included in their bid/

f) GL - appreciate the bid from the University of British Columbia, especially including their advocacy initiatives and efforts to include indigenous populations, believe Truman State University’s regional involvement is commendable.

g) MA - appreciate Truman State University for being consistent in content throughout their bid.

h) IA - appreciate Stony Brook University’s regional member involvement, however thought there was lack of explanation in their overall involvements, left something to be desired.
i) PA - would like to recognize Northern Arizona University and their efforts to overcome challenges, as well as their potential to develop new student leadership on their campus.

j) MA - appreciate Northern Arizona University for their organization of goals and completion, as well as their developmental approach.

k) PA - would also like to recognize the University of Oregon for their regional and NACURH involvements as well as their student advocacy efforts.

l) MA - would like to highlight University of British Columbia, the organization of bid highlighted their impact on campus.

m) IA - moves to narrow the field to three candidates
   (1) CA - seconds

n) Field narrowed to three
   (1) Northern Arizona University
   (2) Truman State University
   (3) University of Oregon

o) SW - believes that the University of Oregon did a great service to NACURH this year, hosting a conference is not an easy task, they are deserving of school of the year for transforming their campus with advocacy initiatives and how they have impacted their community via sustainability in addition to their NACURH and PACURH involvements.

p) MA - would like to highlight Truman State University and NAU’s bids, feel they more closely adhered to the requirements in policy and demonstrated significant contributions on their campus.

q) SA - would like to commend the University of Oregon for their regional and NACURH involvement and their ability to give back to their students.

r) IA - appreciates NAU’s holistic discussion of their university including focus on housing, added regional and NACURH involvement, and appreciate their contributions to STARS College.

s) MA - feels that Truman State University’s bid is well rounded and includes all of the necessary elements, also involves NRHH and their significant growth including OTMs and student involvement.

t) SW - agrees that Truman State University has shown how they have grown their campus, RHA, and NRHH, feel they have contributed immensely on the regional and NACURH level and appreciated the way they discussed members of their campus becoming more involved in NACURH.
u) GL - appreciates the University of Oregon’s bid specifically for student advocacy and social justice, also how they acknowledged their challenges with students using inclusive language and their overcoming that, and for acknowledging the shift from professional staff advisors to student staff advisors.

v) SA - in support of University of Oregon, hosted a conference this past year, hosting an RBD member, bid for a number of awards, and discussed in their bid the importance of advocacy and inclusion initiatives on their campus.

w) CA - wanted to highlight the thoroughness of University of Oregon’s involvement throughout the year at the NACURH level, however we don’t necessarily feel hosting a conference or a Board member should be held against others because of institutional circumstances, but want to acknowledge that the University of Oregon’s NACURH involvement outline was strongest of all three bids.

x) IA - would like to remind everybody of the selection criteria, both Truman State University and Northern Arizona University have exemplified all of these.

y) MA - would like to reiterate the comments made by the Intermountain, also were impressed to see student representative involvement from Truman State University on the NACURH involvement in NACURH level task forces and initiatives, also wanted to remind the room that Truman State University hosted a regional conference this year as well.

z) PA - moves to caucus for three minutes

   (1) NE - seconds

   aa) MA - would like to highlight Truman State University again for highlighting student growth and involvement on campus, Truman’s bid shows that they are the ideal definition of NACURH involvement for their OTM submissions, OCM involvement, NACURH Advocacy grant participation, MACURH advocacy grant participation, and others, and through this involvement they are deserving of the School of the Year.

   bb) SA - would also like the recognize Truman State University, felt they were able to demonstrate campus level involvement and connect that back to regional and NACURH resources, strong involvement and initiatives at the campus level.

   cc) SW - adding onto the campus level contributions, the Southwest believes that the University of Oregon has showcased a lot of initiatives such as sustainability and advocacy, they also emphasized self-care, inclusive language, they have shown regional and NACURH level involvement through the NACURH
Connection and their RHA President wanting to propose a new bid category.

dd) GL - feel that University of Oregon could have provided more information about the impact of their programs but appreciate the number of programs they implemented, appreciate their connection to advocacy and feel they exemplify NACURH’s values in their involvements.

ee) IA - appreciate NAU’s state involvement, they are largely involved in their state organization and professional association, also have a strategic plan that is modeled off of the IACURH and NACURH strategic plan, have demonstrated a dedication to NRHH, host a regional representative, and have shown a continued dedication to their hall councils.

f) SA - would like to reiterate that the regional and NACURH level involvements do comprise 60% of the bid criteria, not specifically in support of any particular institution but want to ensure that involvement is recognized.

gg) GL - calls the question

   (1) MA - feels that with a bid category of this caliber there needs to be more discussion and the room has not reached a clear consensus

hh) SA - moves to narrow the field to two candidates

   (1) NE - seconds

ii) Field narrowed to two

   (1) Truman State University
   (2) University of Oregon

jj) SA - currently torn between these two institutions, feel that they demonstrated similar involvements on the campus, regional, and NACURH levels, would love to hear more conversation to support decision making.

kk) MA - would like to highlight Truman State University for this year, not including the Annual Conference, three students from Truman State received a MACURH Service Award, several received Golden Cowbells, one of their Moo Crew members received a Silver Pin, every delegate for RLC submitted a program, one of their programs was recognized as a Top 10 Program and highlighted implicit bias, we really appreciated their involvement with OCM and it showed that they did campus-level outreach and worked with Angela directly, all aforementioned comments lead us to believe that Truman State University is deserving of School of the Year award.

ll) GL - would like to reiterate support for University of Oregon’s bid, do commend Truman State University’s bid and regional and
NACURH involvement, but are in favor of University of Oregon’s campus level programming and involvement, also acknowledge University of Oregon has had a lot of involvement in their region and NACURH.

mm) IA - would like to show support for Truman State University for their focus on RHA development, feel that the regional and NACURH level work is comparable between both bids however Truman highlights impressive individual resident work on their campus.

nn) PA - would like to highlight OU’s alignment with PACURH’s values, specifically their focus on sustainability, focus on the experience of residents throughout their bid, appreciate their advocacy efforts, have been a driving force within their region, value individuals’ time and innovation in conference hosting, also had institutional recognition in award bids throughout the year.

oo) MA - wants to highlight Truman State University’s addition of NRHH focus and their involvement within RHA and NRHH strategic planning, their campus members were the founders of the RHA strategic planning committee, and that was a wonderful addition to the Midwest for resources, their use of the NACURH Advocacy Grant was used to highlight mental health awareness.

pp) GL - feel that the same voices are being heard in the room and that the conversation is going in circles at this point.

qq) IA - echo the sentiments of the Great Lakes, this is one of the largest ways NACURH recognizes institutions each year and believe this deserves considerable time and attention, would like to hear additional voices and perspectives in discussion.

rr) CA - honestly believes that both are deserving of the award, we would have liked to see more explanation of impact with the University of Oregon but we feel that there is rather comparable regional level involvement, for us, the main differentiating factor is the impact on campus level, and seeing the wider scope of initiatives on the campus level, we would like to hear additional discussion, but based on the breadth of campus reach, we are supporting the University of Oregon.

ss) PA - moves to caucus for two minutes
   (1) IA - seconds

 tt) CA - moves to extend caucus for one minute, withdrawn
   (1) NE - seconds, withdrawn
   (2) IA - dissent, people need to say what they’re thinking and we feel that words are better than silence

uu) MA - wants to recognize that both bids are exceptional and demonstrate the recognition and achievement of a NACURH School of the Year award recipient, if you do examine the criteria
of the bid we feel that Truman State University meets more of the criteria and demonstrates achievements well, feel their involvement on the campus, regional, and NACURH levels have been exceptional.

vv) NE - believes that both schools are more than qualified, however, we feel that in terms of on-campus involvement, Truman State University has done more.

ww) SA - would like to echo that both are exemplary, but we do believe that in ways for NACURH to continue its values, we are supporting the University of Oregon.

xx) SW - believe that the University of Oregon provided unique perspectives, appreciate their unique contributions and initiatives.

yy) SA - calls the question

10. Vote

B. RHA Building Block of the Year Award

1. Nominations
   a) NCO - moves to nominate Baylor University
      (1) GL - seconds
   b) CA - moves to nominate Florida Gulf Coast University
      (1) IA - seconds
   c) SA - moves to nominate the University of Evansville
      (1) GL - seconds
   d) MA - moves to nominate Washington State University
      (1) PA - seconds
   e) GL - moves to nominate the College of New Jersey
      (1) CA - seconds
   f) IA - moves to nominate the University of Colorado Boulder
      (1) SA - seconds
   g) SW - moves to nominate the University of Nebraska at Omaha
      (1) NE - seconds
   h) GL - moves to nominate the University of Indianapolis
      (1) MA - seconds
   i) CA - moves to nominate the University of Hawaii at Manoa
      (1) IA - seconds
   j) IA - moves to nominate the University of Georgia
      (1) SW - seconds
2. Baylor University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Addition of another committee</td>
<td>● Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Quotes and pictures add personality</td>
<td>● Specificity of bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Ability to identify challenges</td>
<td>● NACURH involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Four focus areas</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) GL - moves to end pro/con
   (1) SA - seconds

3. Florida Gulf Coast University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Plan for marketing and recruitment</td>
<td>● Empty space in bid format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● RHA organizational chart</td>
<td>● NACURH involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Response to national crisis</td>
<td>● Font choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Constitutional revamp</td>
<td>● Lack of details in conflict areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Goals</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) SW - moves to end pro/con
   (1) MA - seconds

4. University of Evansville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Programming included other parts of campus</td>
<td>● Lack of direct relation to building block award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Highlight of hall committee structure</td>
<td>● Lack of specificity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional involvement</td>
<td>Lack of strong communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration of clear growth through comparisons</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong comparison and formatting to demonstrate old structure versus new structure</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) SA - moves to end pro/con  
(1) IA - seconds

5. Washington State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quotes from community</td>
<td>Does not address challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of philanthropy</td>
<td>Lacks content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of roles</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showcase of impact</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) NE - moves to end pro/con  
(1) SW - seconds

6. College of New Jersey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of past to present</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of strategic plan</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New focus on safety and security for students</td>
<td>NACURH involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration of growth</td>
<td>Outside timeline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Colorado University - Boulder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Embrace of departmental traditions and culture</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● High number of impactful legislation</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Explored goals with action items</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Program evaluations</td>
<td>● Building Block focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Strong analysis of budget improvements</td>
<td>● Color and fonts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Thoughtfulness of included legislation</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. University of Nebraska at Omaha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Elements of comparison</td>
<td>● Colors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Sustainability award</td>
<td>● Lack of programming elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Focus on sustainability</td>
<td>● Little discussion on specific initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● NRHH cooperation</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Demonstrated member impact</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) MA - moves to end pro/con
   (1) CA - seconds

9. University of Indianapolis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Collaboration</td>
<td>● Lack of content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus on self-care

Weekend programming

Wording

Lack of relevance to criteria

a) SA - moves to end pro/con
   (1) IA - seconds

10. University of Hawaii at Manoa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Past/present comparison</td>
<td>• Explanation of goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Showcase of contributions as advancements</td>
<td>• Elaboration of Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RHA values</td>
<td>• NACURH Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student staff training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) NE - moves to end pro/con
   (1) NCO - seconds

11. University of Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Vulnerability</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Thorough goals and challenges</td>
<td>• Focus on NRHH Chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foundation of past context</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional involvement</td>
<td>• NACURH involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Addition of four new committees</td>
<td>• X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Discussion
   a) IA - appreciate the work that Florida Gulf Coast University did to respond to the national crisis with the hurricane their institution experienced.
b) CA - would like to commend the vulnerability of the University of Georgia.

c) SA - wanted to commend the University of Hawaii at Manoa for their incorporation and theme and its demonstration to showing building blocks.

d) SW - although the Southwest appreciates the University of Indianapolis’s assessment, we would have liked to see more challenges discussed as well as how the organization has grown in the past year.

e) GL - appreciated the University of Georgia’s bid overall, however it was a little difficult to gather the details and there was a large focus on NRHH for an RHA bid.

f) MA - appreciate the College of New Jersey for comparing the past and present to showcase innovation and growth that had occurred over the past year.

g) GL - appreciates the University of Evansville’s bid for the structure section and how that has shifted.

h) CA - appreciates the number of areas in which Baylor University worked to present this year and would have like to see more content and elaboration in areas.

i) IA - appreciated that Washington State University did a lot of work to recognize their campus and programming impact however we would have liked to see them use the space in their bid most effective to showcase other impacts.

j) SW - believe that CU Boulder did a great job transforming their campus through legislation and innovation of their Executive Board goals, but would have liked to see more thoroughness in their bid.

k) CA - appreciates the University of Indianapolis for bidding but feels that the quality and content of their bid in contrast to the others does not compare.

l) MA - appreciate UNO’s bid and elements of comparison but wished they would have showcased how their RHA has developed and grown more.

m) GL - feels that the College of New Jersey had an aesthetically pleasing bid and it was easy to break out the details, however, we do feel that it was lacking details that were specified in the bid criteria.

n) IA - moves to narrow the field to three candidates

(1) SA - seconds

o) Failed narrowed to three

(1) The College of New Jersey
University of Colorado Boulder

University of Hawaii at Manoa

p) GL - appreciates the University of Hawaii at Manoa for the way they demonstrated growth, specifically on page 7 of their bid and the old vs new structure table, also appreciate how they showed and broke out their values early in the bid so they could highlight that throughout the bid.

q) MA - appreciate the College of New Jersey and their focus on student safety and security and advocating for the student body, feel that the advocacy presented truly represents their on-campus student voice.

r) IA - would have liked to see more explanation on the University of Hawaii at Manoa’s budget, while the pictures are helpful there was not a lot of content in this area.

s) CA - feels that CU Boulder has thorough information in their but does not demonstrate the year to year growth that is expected of an RHA Building Block award recipient.

t) SA - echo the sentiment from the Central Atlantic, would have liked to see more growth from CU Boulder.

u) NE - appreciates the work CU Boulder highlighted in their bid but do not feel like they are the best candidate for this award recognition.

v) MA - feels the College of New Jersey had a great bid that incorporated detail on almost all elements and called for little areas of elaboration.

w) IA - felt that the College of New Jersey could have included more information to show the ways they have built on past experiences.

x) PA - wanted to recognize CU Boulder for their admirable initiatives surrounding conferences and NRHM, however felt that they could have provided additional details on programming and resident involvement.

y) IA - appreciates CU Boulder and that they took the time to show growth in each area of their bid, feel that just because they focused on accomplishments does not mean they have been grown or meet the expectations for a building block organization.

z) GL - moves to caucus for three minutes

   (1) CA - seconds

   aa) IA - feel that there are a couple of areas in the College of New Jersey’s bid that are concerning including their explanation of goals and extremely limited NACURH involvement.

   bb) GL - feels that the College of New Jersey did not articulate goals as much as the other bids, and that CU Boulder did not
demonstrate the growth that the University of Hawaii at Manoa did, are in full support of Hawaii at Manoa.

cc) NCO - echo the sentiments of the Great Lakes and Intermountain.

dd) SA - agree with previous statements and are in support of CU Boulder and Hawaii at Manoa.

ee) SA - calls the question
   
   (1) IA - dissent, would like to hear more thoughts before voting

ff) SW - although the University of Hawaii at Manoa only had three goals/objectives in their bid, they greatly demonstrated how they used those three areas to build their chapter.

gg) CA - would like to echo the sentiments of the Intermountain, NCO, and South Atlantic, etc., feel that the College of New Jersey was a strong candidate for the regional level recognition by fulfilling award requirements for regional level involvement, the lack of NACURH involvement limits its consideration, are in full support of the University of Hawaii at Manoa.

hh) IA - appreciate the University of Hawaii at Manoa for showing their development throughout their year but there is a lack of content in terms of specific goals and development of goals, would encourage them to bid in the future after further development.

ii) MA - appreciates the University of Hawaii at Manoa by comparing year by year and appreciates intention to impact that has been made on the campus level.

jj) SA - calls the question

13. Vote

III. Recess

IV. Call to order at 8:14 AM PST

V. NBD MM18-68 | Educational Sessions

   A. NE - moves to bring MM18-68 to the floor
      1. NCO - seconds

   B. Proponent Speech
      1. This piece is about changing the name of programming sessions at conferences to educational sessions, with the passing of the strategic plan we are working to move away from the idea of “programming” and toward a more intentional focus on educational opportunities for members, feel like “educational sessions” better aligns with the actual experiences presented at conferences, is more broad and while encompass all different types of education, not debating the legitimacy of the word “program,” just feel this doesn’t align with the current
conference sessions, other professional organization use the “educational session” terminology at their conferences, feel like this will elevate the services and opportunities NACURH provides from an outside perspective.

C. Q&A

1. NCO - this piece is changing the name without actually changing the components or requirements of the sessions, does just changing the name do enough to make these educational?
   a) Creating learning outcomes is a part of the strategic plan and is a hope for the future, NACURH is not ready for that to be fully implemented yet, some people currently include learning outcomes in their proposals, more about the reality that programming sessions are not actually programs, feel like this language aligns with what NACURH currently does as well as supports opportunities for growth in the future.

2. SA - would we maintain the Program of the Year award and program OTM categories? Would we change Top 10 Programs and Top 40 Programs?
   a) Program of the Year award and OTM categories would stay the same, those are both actually about campus programs, would update Top 10 and Top 40 at conferences.

3. IA - have you thought about this potential to minimize the amount of sessions proposed for conferences?
   a) It could be something we have to confront, but the reality is right now we are calling these sessions something they are not, calling these educational sessions could help advisors to better support their students in creating proposals, could create more clear educational connections, and could expand our current understanding of “program” sessions.

4. MA - do you think that this would shift the culture of what we’re offering at conferences and how will it affect delegate experiences?
   a) Yes it will change the culture at conferences, hopefully for the better, if we are doing what we say we do, equip members with skills and resources for success, many campuses are moving away from thinking about RHA only for programming initiatives.

5. NCO - at conferences we traditionally have Programming Chairs, would this change to Educational Chairs instead?
   a) Yes, would likely need to discuss further, but think the name would need to be changed.

6. IA - has this been considered as the difference between a student organization and a professional association?
   a) Yes, NACA and NODA, two student-driven organizations who host student conferences, have educational sessions as well.
7. SA - yield
8. MA - would we have to reevaluate what OTM categories look like?
   a) No, this is just the sessions at conferences, OTM program categories are actually about campus level programs.
9. IA - is the session that talks about the regional implementation of this impacting just conference programming or regional U programming as well?
   a) No, this proposed change is just talking about the sessions facilitated by institutions at conferences, PEAK Programming and NACURH U ARE educational sessions though.
10. NE - would this also affect passive programming?
    a) No, passive programming is a regionally specific initiative, would need to make that decision respectively.
11. NCO - would Top 10 Programs now be called educational sessions?
12. NCO - would top 10 programs be called educational sessions?
    a) Yes, they could also be Top 10 sessions.
13. NBD Liaison - yield
14. PA - moves to end Q&A
    a) SA - seconds

D. Discussion
1. GL - are in support of this shift in language, slightly confused on the resistance in the room apart from the traditional aspects about what NACURH has referred to as a program in the past, but language is important as it can lend to a culture shift, we believe we have been working to make our programming sessions more intentional and that this name change will further those efforts.
2. Annual Conference - feel that this may allow programming at conferences to be taken more seriously and would present great professional development opportunities.
3. SW - echoes the sentiments of the room and feel that changing programming sessions to educational sessions would allow students to feel attached to NACURH educating, empowering, and engaging students, the educational sessions at NACA for example make the students feel engaged.
4. MA - are also in support of this piece, feel that this will help ensure program sessions are intentional and impactful for delegates.
5. PA - appreciates the standardization of NACURH's professional development, especially preparing us for other developmental experiences.
6. NCO - appreciate that this will align our current practices with the language we use.
7. SA - hopes that this will also legitimize and standardize our corporation to better sell the corporation to those who don’t understand us.

8. CA - yield to redundancy

9. IA - does not support this piece, are concerned about the implementation for our region, have PEAK Programming that was established before NACURH U, feel like this would have financial implications on our region as well.
   a) Chair - PEAK Programming would not be impacted, this piece only pertains to the conference facilitated sessions.

10. SA - calls the question

E. Vote
   1. Consensus, motion carries

VI. OCM Presentation

VII. NBD MM18-63 | NACURH Leadership and Conference Hosting

A. NCO - moves to bring MM18-63 to the floor
   1. NE - seconds

B. Proponent Speech
   1. This piece is working to clarify precedent and NACURH practice, in practice there has been consistent expectations about who can and cannot participate in Annual Conference selections, two things being added to policy here, first clarifying that NACURH Leadership members cannot serve on Annual Conference bid teams, also adds the clarification around the role of Regional Directors in supporting Annual Conference bid teams, currently Regional Directors are notified when an institution in their region submits and intent, makes it clear what the role of the Regional Director is in this situation compared to the support the CRC provides.

C. Q&A
   1. NCO - moves to end Q&A
      a) NE - seconds

D. Discussion
   1. CA - are in full support, like the ethical foundation this piece adds to ensure NACURH Leadership members are only provided the expected support to bidding schools.
   2. SA - point of clarification, what is the global accountability enforcement if it is found that a member of NACURH Leadership is found helping with a bid?
      a) Chair - they would be told not to, further accountability steps could be implemented if needed
3. SA - are in full support of this piece, feel that it allows us to maintain objective and unbiased practices in our support of institutions bidding to host the Annual Conference.

4. NE - call the question

E. Vote

1. 8-0-0, motion carries

VIII. NBD MM18-85 | NAA Position Updates

A. MA - moves to bring MM18-85 to the floor

1. CA - seconds

B. Proponent Speech

1. This piece is working to clarify a few things in terms of what we changed earlier this year with the NAA position in consideration of the addition of the NAD position, we want to be critical about what the NAA will do and how the NAA can still support members of NACURH Leadership, spent a lot of time talking about how the NAA could better support the ADAFs in the administration portion of their position, also don’t want to add more work and meetings to the ADAFs’ plates just because of the dual nature of their positions, want to ensure that the NAA still has a presence and can provide support in “administration,” suggesting that we formally add to policy that the NAA attend at least two meetings per semester with the ADAFs for this support, would see this as being already existing meetings, also formally adding that the NAA coordinates marketing and outreach on behalf of the corporation, lastly adding that the Chair is the Chair of the NRHM task force, in the past the Chair and NAA have worked collaboratively, but we want this to be a holistic experience for NACURH and think a consistent leader will be helpful, the NAA now has more time to devote to NRHM.

C. Q&A

1. SW - there have been a few conversations with having the marketing catalyst work with NRHM, has that ever been considered for policy?
   a) Think that would be left up to the NAA and NAD, don’t think that needs to be clarified here, left NRHM intentionally with the NAA as the marketing person, could be a collaboration between the NAA and NAD with COs but don’t feel like that is ready to be added to policy at this time.

2. IA - what was the thought on focusing the NRHM piece, knowing that traditionally, NRHM is governed by NRHH.
   a) That is actually a common misconception and something we have worked to move away from, NRHM is a NACURH-wide initiative, not an NRHH specific initiative, think some of this perception may have come from the fact that an ADNRHH has chaired the NRHM task force for the past two years, by adding this to the NAA position formally we hope that NRHM becomes something that
all of NACURH Leadership buy into and collaborate on, would like to see both NRHH and NACURH involvement.

b) IA - is it possible that there could be future considerations for the NAD to do this instead considering NRHM is rooted in NRHH values?

(1) Anything is possible but again think NRHM is more than just an NRHH initiative, this is something the NAA will have time for and something the NAA has worked with for at least the past three years, the NAD position will be a huge undertaking for the first year, further consideration will likely need to be given to the balance between the two positions but wouldn’t have to be NRHM.

3. CA - yield

4. SA - when you were talking about moving NRHM in the fall, how do you see NRHM playing into the winter if that piece is not passed?

   a) Either way this would work, there is time in the NAA position with the removal of COs, if NRHM remains in February then it would still need to be planned early, i.e. in the fall semester.

5. NCO - have you thought about the potential for an NAA who wouldn’t be receptive of supporting the NCO and NACURH Store via social media and how that would work?

   a) Did not specifically consider this no, the piece doesn’t say they would specifically support the Store or Office, more related to NACURH-specific marketing and communication.

6. SA - moves to end Q&A

   a) NE - seconds

D. Discussion

1. SA - are in support of this piece, believe this will help alleviate some concerns about the NAA’s interactions with and ability to support members of NACURH Leadership, also excited about the addition and reprioritization of NRHM within NACURH.

2. CA - also in support, excited to formalize a relationships between the NAA and ADAF that will benefit the ADAFs in their administration work.

3. NCO - have concerns passing this piece as is because of the current operating structure and its operational marketing, specifically as it relates to the Office and the Store.

4. MA - yield

5. MA - calls the question

   a) NCO - would like to caucus

6. NCO - moves to caucus for two minutes

   a) IA - seconds
7. NCO - how would you interpret policy regarding the marketing wording, does oversee mean approval? Does that mean the NAA would approve all thing before they are shared?
   a) NAA - would interpret “oversee” to mean that there are other people involved, on the Exec and NCO side, in practice would expect this to be a continued conversation and area for collaboration as it relates to both the Exec committee and NCO.

8. NCO - would like to table the piece to the author to be edited and re-presented.

9. SA - hears and respects the concerns from the NCO, could possibly consider adding a branding guide for the NCO to have some delineation and separation of Office autonomy.

10. IA - would this trickle down to the regional levels?
    a) Chair - no, specifically relates to NACURH social media and communication, regions are still expected to adhere to the branding guide.

11. NCO - if we created a branding guide and conformed to NACURH’s standards, would we have free reign to post on the social media?
    a) NAF - from experience working with NCO, would expect this to be a conversation between the NCO and Exec Committee anyway, don’t know that a separate branding guide makes sense since the NCO is included in the NACURH branding guide and held to the same expectations as the rest of the corporation, maybe could consider more informal things like a social media plan.

    b) NAA - like what the NAF said, think we could have a different conversation about the NCO marketing at a different time but feel like this specifically applies to NACURH marketing and recognize their are two separate needs here, could work to clarify where the Office sits within NACURH marketing, think collaboration has been important to me but also recognize that with me leaving the position this wouldn’t necessarily continue, would be happy to hear what suggestions you have.

12. SA - hearing concerns agree that there could be further conversation around this piece if tabled.

13. NCO - moves to table this piece to the author until Thursday
    a) NE - seconds

IX. NACURH Case Study
   A. Q&A

1. NCO - you shifted from recovery to resilience, can you explain this?
   a) When we are talking about recovery, this describes instances where a region asks how to respond to a situation after the
situation has occurred, resilience is having a plan in place to take action.

2. NCO - the plan is being able to have a committee to act on this?
   a) The suggestion is that this committee will look at these situations, there is currently no system in place, want to have something in place to have a more clear plan for action, would like to have a way for people to submit ideas and engage in conversations.

3. NCO - is the plan to have this committee meet on an ongoing basis or are you planning to have them only meet when they need to respond?
   a) Would have the committee meet and then system for planning responses.

4. IA - how would this committee and this plan respond to immediate issues of crisis?
   a) Talked a lot about this, feel like the idea of regional vs. NACURH voice helps here, regions could make statements immediately, compassion can happen autonomously, but stances being taken have to come from NACURH with those checks and balances and would have slightly more time.

5. IA - how would this work with situations where there is a crisis that is also connected to a political issue such as gun violence?
   a) Thinking about situations like Charlottesville, SAACURH issued a statement of compassion, we connected with regional representations and condemned acts of violence, did not take a stance on gun laws and the NRA, just wanted to make sure that people felt safe and had a region who supports them.

6. NE - as a non-profit corporation, political stances are somewhat of a grey area since they can put that status in jeopardy; how would you go about navigating the legal aspects of this plan?
   a) What we are going for is the chance for dialogue and conversations to happen in NACURH, have no official plan in place which means less conversations are happening, could incorporate this into future training and advising, if representatives felt passionate about something NACURH could evaluate taking a stance on that, trying to solve the issue of when we want things to happen but don’t have a plan in place for action, just structure to those conversations, other organizations have restrictions around endorsing political candidates, don’t think that would be something NACURH would do or need to worry about.
   b) Chair - we are not at the level of jeopardizing these things.

7. IA - have you all thought about what it means to be civically engaged, how NACURH knows that, and how does that look?
a) We looked at requiring submissions, thought the committee could provide actionable steps for campuses, NACURH focuses a lot on programming, have programming and advocacy based RHAs, a part of that is being civically engaged in NACURH, representatives would have the opportunity to be more engaged in dialogue in NACURH.

8. IA - how would this committee help students actually mobilize civic engagement?
   a) Looking at regional voice vs. NACURH voice, when connecting all of these levels, NACURH would be releasing stances, the regional level would be talking about that stance and how to engage with it, this is part of what NACURH could do overall, would help to facilitate intentional conversation.

9. CA - for the statements of compassion, how do you perceive the process for forming those and how do you envision the vetting process?
   a) Think we talked about timeline and time constraints, when looking at the regional process there are some grey areas, at the discretion of the Board to best serve their members, this would be between the regions and the Chairperson, had quick communication when issues occurred in SAACURH, determining a regional process was not in our scope.

10. NAA - what plans do you have to prevent implicit biases from the people on the committee?
   a) Did not talk about removing biases from the committee, feel like overall NACURH is moving in that direction, the main goal of the committee is to have more and more conversations around this issues, don’t have a perfect plan, would look for training and discussion around this, would try to provide concrete strategies for examining bias, this provides one more opportunity to discuss these issues in a structured setting, difficult to avoid bias, would need to provide development.

11. NCO - have you thought about how you would respond to negative feedback to the stance(s) and/or statement(s)?
   a) For the committee, if anyone disagrees then that person would be able to have a conversation with the committee Chairperson, also gives power to voting representatives to be active in the corporation, in the same way that we sit in the room and have discussions/disagreements to come to a decision the committee would ultimately have to come to a best answer for NACURH as a whole, the type of disagreement matters, for example if only one person disagrees we move forward often in this room as NBD.

12. NCO - is it in this policy for regions to talk to the Chair before they post something on social media?
a) Don’t have this outlined, would need to have conversations with the incoming Execs, this year we had conversations with the Chairperson, believe a conversation should happen and would rather have the new Executive team create a plan for this.

13. NAA - what plan do you have for delineating what requires a statement of passion or a statement of stance?

a) If I was a Director I would say I think this is an issue I will be making a compassion statement on and have that conversation with the Chairperson, then expect that the NACURH statement is coming, providing a system for that discussion, believe there is a place to meet in the middle, we have seen some action items this year with compassion, i.e. regions making a statement and then saying “here are ways you can engage.”

b) NAA - how do you envision Regional Boards making statements of compassion?

(1) Talked about keeping this tied to our mission and vision and tying it to scope, see Regional Board members as regional content experts, as well as content experts for regional policies, mission, and vision, would want these statements to connect back to values.

c) NAA - how do you think a statement of compassion would be received from an institution in a situation? How do avoid the “thoughts and prayers” pitfall?

(1) Think that the goal of compassion statements is that they are rare, not everyday, would need a minute to find our stance but immediately could ready out to members to say we are here for them and that we support them, could be more quick responses before NACURH as a whole takes the time to take a stance, not the main piece, the larger NACURH statement would be what is important, Boards represent their entity and are elected to make responsible decisions, don’t think we imagined a specific plan for the statements of compassion, they could also be suggested items (Hurricane relief efforts, etc.).

14. CA - have you thought about the process by which members of this committee are selected?

a) Don’t think personally this could ever be perfect without being able to know intentions, in the current structure if a statement needs to be made you have to talk to the Chair to figure it out, the hope is that all regions would be represented, having multiple people would be key, having that summary given to the Chair would be important for the Chair to use in their decision making.

b) CA - do you plan to have a mix of positions represented on this committee?
(1) Would want every position to be represented, imagined structuring similar to the strategic planning committee.

15. NAF - what did you envision the size of this committee being?
   a) Around eight people, looking for the representation of the strategic planning committee as well as regional representation.
   b) NAF - what accountability would be in place for members of the committee?
      (1) There is always the chance that people could fall out of the committee but this would come down to whether or not you want your region to have a voice in NACURH in this way, region would need people to step up and have representation, we also want to continue to prompt leaders to be able to make statements and take stances but with this comes accountability to action.

16. SA - regarding the form, how would you handle institutions using the form to report other institutions or situations they don’t align with based on institutional philosophy in NACURH?
   a) The plan itself expresses that submission guidelines for the form should be to only submit issues that could be taken a stance on, would not create opportunities for back and forth, would probably consider a combination of our unification and equity statement, similar to what we do on campus when people feel like their rights aren’t being upheld vs. campus needs.
   b) SA - how would you handle an institution who submitted a request but did not receive a response because of some conflict with what NACURH values?
      (1) The goal would be for the committee or Chair to respond to every form submission, even if that conversation is a follow up on the equity or unification statement, would provide details on the decision made either way.

17. NCO - did you think about looking into professional opinions when responding to situations?
   a) Are definitely in support of professional consultation, recognize we are not content experts, would reach out to the Chairperson too, the committee creates space for dialogue, would present the highlights, action items, and summary of discussion to the Chair who would then make a final decision on a response.

18. IA - moves to exhaust the speaker’s list with additions
   a) NE - seconds

19. CA - what do you foresee as the responsibility for any backlash from a statement (considering the Chair is the face of the organization but the NAA is the head of the committee that makes the statement)?
a) Think that that would align with the general culture of the organization.

20. NAA - in regard to the timeline, do you see this committee and this process lengthening the time for responses to crises/situations? Currently these statements have always been made based on conversations between the Executive Committee which can happen quickly, what happens if the Chair wakes up and sees a crisis on the news, etc.? Will this expand response times?
   
a) If there were to be things that required immediate response from the Executive Committee, they would have the power to do so, wanted to committee to have a lengthier process to talk about ongoing issues (i.e. if there are proposed changes in Title IX), going back to the participation of the committee, the committee would have the expectation that they would be able to meet within 24 to 48 hours of a notification or coordinate a proxy if they are unavailable.
   
b) NAA - so to clarify, would the committee meet on an ongoing basis or only to coordinate responses to form submissions/crises?
      
      (1) There would be continued training and dialogue with scheduled meetings as well as meetings on an as-needed basis.

21. GL - are there any sort of guidelines or guiding values that you would foresee the committee having?
   
a) Didn’t talk about this or find things similar, feel like the idea of adding corporate priorities would really help in this process.

22. IA - if, in a situation where a region disagrees with NACURH’s thoughts/perspectives, how would you see the committee advising the region to proceed?
   
a) Needs to be one consistent corporate message, regions need to buy into this, we are working to standardize a process while also maintaining regional identity, if a region disagrees with NACURH they could provide those perspectives to the committee for group consideration, on the regional level we would be looking to support all identities and issues.
   
b) IA - with regional social media, would civic engagement include retweeting items encouraging interaction?
      
      (1) Don’t think we talked about it but I would leave this to be decided as a part of the committee guidelines, would need to have a larger stance decided that could then be supported by smaller actions.

23. NAF - what if only two people show up to a committee meeting? Then would the Chair be acting on the recommendation of two people?
a) The committee is simply making a recommendation to the Chairperson who would then provide a final decision.

b) NAF - would really encourage further investigation of what happens when there is a disagreement between so few committee members on such a short timeline.

24. CA - how can the committee be proactive and could you work with the policies and practices committee to gain additional insight into corporate practices?

a) Think conversations so far have been around statements and the ways we can create space to have those discussions, could definitely consider that as an option.

25. NAA - this past year the Exec Committee advertised and facilitated campus climate dialogues that had very low participation and attendance, do you think students will engage with this and what do you perceive the involvement to be?

a) Don’t imagine that the moment this form goes live that everyone on campus will submit topics for consideration, thinking about the NACURH focused climate dialogues, would need to begin with NACURH Leadership, NACURH would make a statement and then regions will engage to start that trend, when NACURH Leadership gets engaged representatives are more likely to engage, think we have low engagement in other virtual opportunities but if regions don’t buy in and engage then we can’t expect members to either.

26. NCO - where would we make these statements?

a) Connects back to the idea of recommendations for action for the Chairperson, the committee would suggest how the message should come across (doesn’t always have to be social media posts), and then could also have a place on the website or in emails, would ultimately be on the Chair.

b) NCO - do you have any ideas about what the statements should look like?

(1) Would likely be NACURH branded or on NACURH letterhead, with specific methods determined by the Chairperson.

27. SA - have you done any research on what could happen to our corporate sponsorships if we did begin taking stances on things?

a) Good point, not something we discussed, have a limited number of corporate partners and sponsors, would expect the Chair to take these things into consideration, as long as we have a process for considering the values of our corporate sponsors this should be less of a concern.
28. IA - how would people within NACURH Leadership making social comments on issues influence NACURH making stances on issues?

a) Media members vs. the institutions they serve, could consider having NACURH Leadership members add bio like “all opinions expressed here are my own, etc.” and guidelines around what you can and cannot do, the Execs will need to discuss with the next NBD, feel like that is a part of a larger conversation that needs to be had.

B. Discussion

1. NCO - appreciates the ideas you all brought forth, looking at the requirements outlined the NCO feels that we will need to consider adding guidelines for communication for the committee.

2. CA - echo the sentiments of the NCO, love the clarity and idea for the committee, want to know more about the committee timeline and the accountability for committee members, feel like this is a step in the right direction with some work still needed.

3. NAF - thanks again, things that we feel like still need to be discussed most specifically are the accountability for committee members and opportunities for regional buy-in, what we have seen this year is that there is low participation and buy-in for committee for members of NACURH Leadership, the value of having regions represented wasn’t enough but feel like you can’t not do your part and then be upset about the outcome, also feel like we will need to be clear about the process and the work that this would require taking on, in addition need to investigate the timeline for responses as well as the piece the Intermountain brought up about what it means for NACURH Leadership to post and be followed by representatives on their social medias (think there would need to be clear separation or heightened NACURH expectations to follow in line with NACURH perspectives and statements).

4. IA - feel like we are missing the civic engagement component, specifically would like members to know what it means to be civically engaged and for their to be a clear NACURH understanding of civic engagement, would like to know what NACURH can do to be more civically engaged and promote civic engagement for members, this year we wrote a letter of compassion as a region, think it would have been hard to wait to share that with the region so there needs to be a separate timeline for regions writing these statements, need to clearly separate what an area of compassion is and what an area of political perspective is, need to know where regions have autonomy.

5. SW - one of the things in Megan’s bid was the idea of focusing with Directors on how to respond to crises, feel like it will be important to incorporate these topics into training and professional development, would maybe also need resources available to help regions and NACURH Leadership write statements for personal and region-wide
communication, think regions will still need to make immediate statements but need proper training and transition.

6. NCO - agree with the Southwest, feel like this will be interesting but one thing I am very grateful for is that I am not a Director for a region and would not be in a position to have to make a statement like this, agree that there will need to be training and also professionals, wondering about the committee and them giving suggestions, feel like this will put a lot of pressure on the Chairperson, wonder how much information and direction the committee would provide.

7. SA - would caution against creating set guidelines for what is and what isn’t compassion/politics, tried to do that as a regional entity and make a clear plan for how we respond to things, didn’t want it to be so rigid that we would prevent ourselves from responding this situations as they happened.

8. GL - think that Megan’s idea for corporate priorities would assist with this, would be helpful to manage situational bias by having clear values, statements shouldn’t be based on personal opinion but how the situation interacts with our mission and vision, feel like we will need to investigate compassion statements and really think about when and how we are making those statements, would want to make sure NACURH is acting as well as making statements.

X. NBD MM18-65 | Mileage Reimbursement

A. NE - moves to bring MM18-65 to the floor
   1. PA - seconds

B. Proponent Speech
   1. Currently NACURH and regions are not following the same policy or rate for mileage reimbursement, are proposing changing all mileage reimbursement in NACURH to the charitable donation rate outlined by the IRS, not because NACURH is a charitable organization but because this gets us much closer to the actual price for gas, most often when people drive on behalf of NACURH it happens once or twice per year, no need to reimburse people for things beyond gas, policy would also say that NACURH can reimburse for the exact amount with receipts provided, want to ensure that all members of NACURH Leadership are being reimbursed equitably and also think that people should not be making money off of NACURH travel.

C. Q&A
   1. NCO - have we heard this piece of legislation before?
      a) This was a part of a piece heard at Semis, for that piece the question was divided but then tabled without a vote on any component, from that conversation seemed like people were in favor but it was hard to separate the funding of this piece with the travel liability components from the other piece.
2. GL - this would mandate that all regions or entities plus NACURH would pay the $0.14 per mile rate?
   a) Gives regions the option to either pay that rate or pay for exact reimbursements based on receipts provided, also would update as the IRS updates that standardized amount.

3. CA - moves to end Q&A
   a) NE - seconds

D. Discussion
   1. GL - in support of this piece, appreciate this being separated from the previous legislation on liability.
   2. CA - also in support, appreciate streamlining and clarifying reimbursement expectations as much as possible.
   3. CA - calls the question

E. Vote
   1. 7-1-0, motion carries

XI. NBD MM18-66 | Conference Registration Information
   A. SA - moves to bring MM18-66 to the floor
      1. IA - seconds
   B. Proponent Speech
      1. A part of risk management, working to specify in policy that whomever collects personal information for conferences or in-person meetings for NACURH must properly destroy the collected information at the completion of the conference wrap-up process, also clarifies that all personal information should only be shared on a need-to-know basis, only relates to in-person meetings at this time.
   C. Q&A
      1. NCO - when hosting a conference a lot of times teams will share documents, forms, Google files, etc. where personal information is collected, have you thought about what this would look like?
         a) Yes, by adding in that personal information shall be shared on a need-to-know basis the expectation would be that information is protected as best as possible.
      2. PA - for things outside of the law, would this limit the ability of students to participate in activities that they don’t consent to?
         a) No, would be on a case by case basis based on who is facilitating, wouldn't change practice for member participation.
      3. NCO - have you thought about having conference staff members sign a confidentiality agreement if they are working with this kind of information?
a) Great idea, hadn’t thought specifically about that but could see that being implemented.

4. CA - would this only be for the conference waiver or would this be for any waiver that people sign on behalf of NACURH?
   a) This is not about waivers this is about any personal information that is collected like as a part of the registration process, information like this is already included in waivers, want to make sure our policies are specifically clear and that people know what is happening with their information, would apply to corporate partners and sponsor agreements as well.

5. SA - would this change the security of platforms that conference teams use for registration?
   a) Can’t imagine that it would, the current idea is that we prefer not to tell conference teams which platforms they can and can’t use, feel like regardless of the platform information collected should not be shared with entire conference teams or beyond just because, and that that information should be properly destroyed of when no longer needed.

6. CA - moves to end Q&A
   a) MA - seconds

7. Discussion
   a) MA - in favor of this piece because it is logical and appreciate the need-to-know stipulation.
   b) NCO - calls the question

D. Vote
   1. 8-0-0, motion carries

XII. NBD MM18-78 | Full Time Student Status
A. NCO - moves to bring MM18-78 to the floor
   1. NE - seconds

B. Proponent Speech
   1. Working to clarify what we perceive to be current NACURH practice, this does currently exist in seven out of eight regions, requires that all members of NACURH Leadership be full time students, adds the expectations that this could be discussed and waived by the Chairperson in coordination with the Executive Committee.

C. Q&A
   1. IA - why were incoming members of NACURH Leadership included in this?
      a) This is currently the way this is reflected in NACURH policy, want to ensure that people meet this expectation while elected.
2. IA - were there other considerations for when an incoming NACURH Leadership member wasn’t an full-time student when bidding and they have to extend that status?
   a) Could be something for consideration for discussion, have similar live-on requirements, not looking to prevent anyone from applying for positions, that was the language that already existed.

3. MA - yield

4. CA - moves to end Q&A
   a) GL - seconds

D. Discussion

1. IA - good with this piece overall apart from the incoming member portion because we don’t have it in our policy book currently and we don’t want to limit anybody from bidding for NACURH Leadership, we are concerned because they are not yet members of NACURH Leadership because it could be overly constricting.

2. SW - point of information; would this apply to candidates before their term based on the wording?
   a) NAA - it currently reads “between their election and installation of office…” so at this point yes.

3. SA - think that there would need to be some consideration for the people who are entering their positions part-way through the academic year.

4. IA - feel like the expectation and situation would be different for someone who starts their position in September or by an appointment than from someone who is elected in March and begins their term in May.

5. GL - moves to amend
   a) Strike;

   b) CA - seconds

   (1) Proponent Speech
   (a) Feel like this change aligns with the conversation of the room while still meeting expectations, understand that as written this piece could create a barrier to NACURH Leadership and would like to avoid that.

   (2) Q&A
   (a) SA - point of information; what does it mean specifically by installation of office?
(i) NAA - would read as when the individual begins their position, when sworn in at the Annual Conference, etc.

(b) SA - how does this change when filling a vacant position?
   (i) Installation of office would be whenever the person officially begins their position, like getting access to email, etc.

(c) CA - yield

(d) IA - what is the difference between incoming members and the line in question?
   (i) The point of contention was the specificity of “between election and installation of office,” that sentence seemed to be more restrictive than the first component.

(e) CA - moves to end Q&A
   (i) Seconded by SA

(3) Discussion
   (a) SA - support this amendment, feel like this aligns with the original intention and removes barriers.
   (b) IA - moves to end discussion
      (i) NA - seconds

(4) Vote
   (a) 7-0-1, amendment carries

6. CA - calls the question

E. Vote
   1. 7-0-1, motion carries

XIII. NBD MM18-82 | Contingency Limits in Conference Budgets

A. NCO - moves to bring MM18-82 to the floor
   1. MA - seconds

B. Proponent Speech
   1. This piece specifically applies to conference budgets and adding contingencies to conference budgets, schools generally practice adding contingency amounts to budgets when preparing to host a conference, want to respect host schools and acknowledge that some contingency is helpful but are looking to minimize the amounts included to ensure large excesses are not continuously generated, felt it was important that contingency is only included in a dedicated line item and that there is a cap on the contingency allowed, do not see this practice motivating the
need to add contingency funds when conferences are budgeted for productively and conservatively.

C. Q&A

1. PA - knowing that some line items are a “worst case scenario” expense, would this still allow people to plan for the worst case for best-case/worst-case expenses?
   a) Yes, in a budget you always need a hard number to be included, conference staffs should be doing their best to budget conservatively and plan for maximum costs where needed, this is more specifically related to general padding of conference budgets or rounding up total conference per delegate costs.

2. NCO - have there been a lot of line items that have been set as contingencies in the past?
   a) There is an interesting disparity between regions and conferences, technically there are no line items required in policy for conference budgets, not a lot of consistent data.
   b) NCO - what is an Annual Conference total budget?
      (1) Around $100,000.00 in expenses, the NAF and CRC closely review the Annual Conference budget but wanted to provide more guidance for regional conference oversight.

3. NCO - moves to end Q&A
   a) CA - seconds

D. Discussion

1. NCO - a perfect conference would budget perfectly, recognize that’s not the reality, worried now that institutions would have the opportunity to budget for a 1% contingency which would lend itself to higher conference excesses.

2. MA - point of information, do regional budgets have to include a contingency?
   a) NAF - not all regions currently include a contingency line, this policy also does not require regions to add contingency line items just clarifies the process if contingency is being added.

3. NE - in favor of this because it is similar to our budget and should help to ensure lower conference costs.

4. NACURH Advisor - the error of students is higher than professional staff members and we feel that a 1% contingency would be enough to help mitigate that risk.

5. NCO - are the regional ADAFs the only people overseeing a regional conference budget?
a) CRC - it should be the ADAF and Regional Advisors, Regional Advisors participate in conference training each year at the Annual Conference.

6. MA - moves to end discussion, withdrawn
   a) IA - seconds, withdrawn
      (1) NCO - dissent

7. NCO - one thing we would like to consider further is that if a conference makes a mistake this is not going to resolve that.

8. MA - calls the question

E. Vote
   1. 8-0-0, motion carries

XIV. NBD MM18-79 | NACURH Graduate Student Advisor of the Year Award

A. NE - moves to bring MM18-79 to the floor
   1. CA - seconds

B. Proponent Speech
   1. This came to the table from my region and thought it would be good to differentiate from professional advisors who have longer terms and more opportunities to grow and develop and graduate advisors who do not have the same opportunities, we wanted to extend recognition opportunities to those graduate students who are also advisors, this would have the same timeline and requirements as the current NACURH Advisor of the Year award but as a separate category and complement to Advisor of the Year award.

C. Q&A
   1. IA - how does this award differentiate from the current Advisor of the year award?
      a) The only difference is that only graduate students would be eligible for this recognition and not be compared against full time professionals.
         (1) IA - why do you feel that full-time advisors have an increased chance of selection if the criteria is based on performance and not student status?
            (a) Feel that there are other situational comparisons that are made based on years of professional experience.

   2. PA - moves to end QA
      a) NE - seconds

D. Discussion
   1. SW - in support, do think the resolution statements will allow regions to tailor this to meet their needs and also agree that student status is the only thing that could be difficult in comparing between the two, bid also
talks about campus involvement which professional staff members don’t always have the opportunity to be involved on campus.

2. CA - also in favor of this piece, our region is also largely made up of graduate student feel like this will allow for increased recognition for those individuals.

3. IA - are hesitant with this piece because there is no current policy that states that graduate students cannot win the Advisor of the Year award and the selection criteria goes from academic year to academic year so there is no real reason why a graduate student could not be compared in their position as an advisor against a professional staff member, if a graduate student went above and beyond in their position, that is great and can be recognized, but we don’t feel that it is necessary to create an entirely new award for one piece of selection criteria.

4. PA - do think there may be some unintentional bias when evaluating bids knowing that one candidate has more experience than another and feel like this will increase recognition for graduate students.

5. NCO - would like to hear discussion on how we may be doing a disservice to graduate students by creating this separate award and therefore saying that graduate and professional advisors are on different levels.

6. SA - appreciate this award because it would allow more recognition from different institutions.

7. MA - unsure why this should be a NACURH-level award as compared to a region-specific award and would love to explore that further.

8. GL - find this piece interesting, this is not something we had really considered before as a graduate student advisors are not heavily involved in our region, do not know how many graduate student advisors we have in our region and think they may sometimes go unnoticed, wondering if students don’t know that graduate students can be nominated to the Advisor of the Year award.

9. NCO - wonder if students don’t see the difference between a graduate advisor and a professional advisor and if this award could create confusions, also wondering about general award bid submissions, is there room for this award when there are larger awards such as School of the Year also selected at Pre-Conference.

10. IA - would like to echo sentiments from the NCO, are scared this would create a dichotomy in advising, implying that a 6-year advisor would always win against a graduate student, creates distinction between advising styles where it is not accurate or needed, maybe instead we need to increase our conversations around graduate student recognition in NACURH generally, other opportunities in NACURH beyond award bid categories.

11. NCO - wonders about the interesting culture of students, graduate students, and then advisors, interesting that when someone is bidding
for an award as an advisor and also as a student, also curious about
creating another award bid to recognize advisors when we could be
doing more to recognize our students.

12. CA - wants to acknowledge the proposed sentiments by the NCO in
terms of recognizing students over advisors, instead of creating a
dichotomy, we might be acknowledging one that already exists,
however, neither of the individuals currently representing the CA have
professional or paraprofessional experiences.

13. IA - in regard to the question posed by the Central Atlantic, interesting
grey area for graduate students that is also unique to each institution,
balance both roles on campus and at institutions, don’t think an award
bid solves the issue of a graduate student identity.

14. SA - in the conversations that we have had, it’s an odd identity and it can
be hard to be comparable in other awards or even candidates for the
same award, we do see a need to step in this direction to recognize
those individuals.

15. GL - feels that the qualifications for the award now do not necessarily
recognize or address the conversations happening in the room, feel like a
Graduate Student of the Year award could be important but would need
different requirements and qualifications.

16. MA - feel that recognizing graduate student advisors is important but are
unsure that this should be an award on the NACURH level at this time.

17. SA - would agree with the Great Lakes about where this award could go
and would like to hear further discussion on solutions.

18. PA - appreciates the recognition aspect but are also unsure about the
progression of this as an award and feel that there is potential for this to
be tabled and have additional discussion at a different time.

19. IA - yield

20. NCO - point of parliamentary inquiry, what are the options for voting?
   a) Table to the end of pre-conference, table indefinitely, vote
      between for, against, and abstain, tabled pieces that are not
      brought back by the end of Pre-Conference die.

21. CA - feel like this award could be a viable option in the future but we
      need to have bigger picture discussions not in this space, we
      recommend that this be tabled so we have the option to discuss this
      again by the end of pre-conference.

22. IA - calls the question
   a) SA - dissent; would like to table the piece

23. PA - do not believe tabling the piece would be effective, the sentiment
      of the room is that this is not a viable option for NACURH at this time.

24. NE - moves to table the piece back to the author until the end of
      preconference
a) SW - seconds  
b) IA - dissent, tabling is not effective  
c) Vote  

(1) 5-4-0, the piece has been tabled with a vote by the Chair

XV. NBD MM18-67  | Conference Chairs & NACURH Award Bids

A. NCO - moves to bring MM18-67 to the floor  
   1. IA - seconds

B. Proponent Speech  
   1. This piece relates to conference chairs and their involvement with NACURH level award bids, added conference chairs to NACURH Leadership last year, feel that all members should be limited from participating with NACURH award bids at the same level, would essentially clean up the wording to just clearly state “NACURH Leadership” in this section, hoping to prevent undue bias in bidding processes.

C. Q&A  
   1. SW - if we have a policy that states that conference chairs can win award bids at the regional level, how would this policy affect that?  
      a) This is just for NACURH-level awards at this time.
   2. IA - our conference chairs are ex-officio members of our board but NACURH has recognized conference chairs as NACURH Leadership, where does that leave us?  
      a) If I were interpreting they would not be allowed because of the way NACURH recognizes conference chairs as members of NACURH Leadership.
   3. SA - are conference chairs allowed to be nominated for and nominate people for OTMs?  
      a) NACURH policy currently doesn’t say anything on that, at this point yes.
   4. PA - yield
   5. NCO - yield
   6. CA - moves to end Q&A  
      a) NE - seconds

D. Discussion  
   1. CA - are in favor of this piece, while this piece adds restrictions we feel like this aligns with our updated understanding of NACURH Leadership.
   2. PA - conference chairs often come from our most active schools, are worried that our quantity and quality of OTM submissions may go down.  
      a) NAA - point of clarification, this piece is only pertaining to award bids.
3. SA - feel that it has been the wish of our regional conference chairs to be more included and we’ve had conversations about inclusion of NACURH Leadership members, this will further incorporate them into these expectations.

4. IA - feel conflicted on this piece because of our current regional practice and the way conference chairs are recognized as ex-officio members of our board, unsure and would like to hear from other regions.

5. MA - coming from a region where conference chairs are established as full members of regional boards it makes sense to us that they would not be eligible to participate in those activities.

6. NAA - point of clarification, in the NRHH policy book, NACURH Leadership may not be nominated for any regional or NACURH recognized OTM categories.

7. MA - yield

8. IA - are hesitant now because of this new information, worried this removes any opportunity for conference chairs to be recognized outside of their conference.

9. MA - an additional point to consider, if there are awards that Board members and conference chairs are eligible for on the regional level, if that person wins an award bid and that person becomes a conference chair at RBC, that award would no longer be able to be submitted to the NACURH level which would limit bids.

10. SA - yield

11. SA - would prefer to have seen more definitive exploration on conference chairs as NACURH Leadership members before having some of the finer details addressed but do overall support this piece.

12. IA - moves to caucus for two minutes
   a) NE - seconds

13. Chair - The Executive Committee is a little conflicted and want to reiterate that it is your decision, however, there was a push last year from the Boards to include conference chairs in NACURH Leadership, and we need to be fair and equitable, this seems to be a larger conversation around conference chairs as NACURH Leadership, but it doesn’t make sense to have it both ways, if conference chairs are recognized as members of NACURH Leadership than they should be treated fully like members of NACURH Leadership, no other member of NACURH Leadership can have awards or even OTMs written about them.

14. IA - with reflection we are not in support of this piece because of our regional stance and do not consider conference chairs to be in NACURH Leadership, need more conversation about including conference chairs in NACURH Leadership.
15. PA - one of the PACURH values is recognition and we are concerned with limiting the ability of conference chairs to be recognized because we feel it could discourage potential conference host sites.

16. SA - in support of this piece as it currently stands, conference chairs are currently members of NACURH Leadership and should be fully treated as such, conference chairs should be included.

17. CA - agrees fully with the SAACURH, the push to include conference chairs in NACURH Leadership has got us here, and this could be an unfortunate but necessary consequence

18. GL - yield

19. SW - would also like to point out that conference chairs being included as members of NACURH Leadership brings conference chairs a variety of other opportunities like task forces, attending other regional conferences, etc., and therefore could provide a leg-up in award bid consideration processes.

20. MA - believes that when these conference chairs are in office it would make sense but if the bid was submitted on their behalf before they became a conference chair, the bid should be considered.

21. CA - agrees with the sentiments just presented by MACURH, wanted to draw attention to point e, which would allow some flexibility, but we acknowledge that there isn’t a process in place to determine what has been infringed upon.

22. GL - feels that if there are no new sentiments we would rather move to a vote.

23. MA - would like clarification on CAACURH’s most recent comment because of the way that contradicts with the legislation.

24. SA - calls the question

E. Vote

1. 5-3-0, motion carries

XVI. NBD MM18-75 | Moving Documents to the NACURH Connection

A. NE - moves to bring MM18-75 to the floor

1. IA - seconds

B. Proponent Speech

1. We, NACURH, pay a considerable amount of money for Flight which hosts the NACURH Connection, and feel that it should be used, when people ask why to affiliate, my answer always comes back to the NACURH Connection, and another reason is to be able to access all of the regional and NACURH resources, the NACURH Connection needs some keywords to make it work well, but if we start those habits now, we can mold it into an amazing resource. The old RFI database was exclusive to RFIs and we received a consistent amount of feedback to bring back the RFI database back and people still talk about it because they don’t
realize that the NACURH Connection is the RFI, the NACURH Connection is also a better way to utilize our space and we pay a lot of money to use this but not a lot of members use it, we can’t justify paying more and making it more secure if nobody is using it, the Connection needs buy-in from regions, want regions to be required to move databases and resources to the Connection.

C. Q&A

1. IA - how many years back would regions have to submit bids to the NACURH Connection and are there specific resources to go to the Connection or just everything?
   a) I would interpret as anything you put in a vault or if there is a resource link on your website, things currently on Google Drive, not everything of from all time but current resources. This year our CO-RD worked with the NAA to upload a large section of resources and CO picked the most important/relevant resources to maintain, things from 1990s are more history than resources, as much as possible is best as NACURH really values NACURH history right now.

2. GL - is this also saying that regions would have to take resources off of their website to solely having things on the NACURH Connection?
   a) I do not think it is saying that but would implore the room to think about WHY would we put it in both places and why would we pay so much to not use the NACURH Connection, but the priority now is to just get things on there.

3. IA - specifically, for bidding, would this include all bids submitted at each conference, or just the bids that have won?
   a) I believe it should be all, in the NACURH Connection you can click a button and transfer an entire Google folder over in to it if the folder is on the Drive.

4. CA - would that also include governing documents, conference minutes, etc.?
   a) It should, would be a great way for more interaction across regions, should have everything on the Connection.

5. GL - moves to end Q&A, withdrawn
   a) NE - seconds, withdrawn
   b) MA - dissent, has a question

6. MA - are wondering if the regional websites could have a link to the Connection on there in place of these resources?
   a) It’s complicated because if you link something that is claimed to be NACURH’s largest resource but link the open-access link on your website, you lose the entire value of affiliating, this could work further down the road if we had a more secure connection
that requires a specific login, could link the general login page for the NACURH Connection but not internal resources.

b) MA - so then would we remove the documents from our drives?

   (1) This piece does not say that BUT please consider the value of affiliating and of the NACURH Connection if we make all of our resources available to any person without affiliating, should promote the Connection as the place to find resources.

7. GL - moves to end Q&A
   a) CA - seconds

D. Discussion

1. CA - fully supports this piece as this is a necessary step to make the NACURH Connection everything the corporation wants it to be, we also hope to see in making this move that regions would remove resources from their websites to make it more exclusive and only accessible to affiliated institutions.

2. MA - appreciates this piece as all of the training at Semis on how to upload our bids to the Connection.

3. IA - appreciates further clarifications and we are excited because 20.7 GB/30 GB on my Drive is currently full and a lot of that is past bids, we are excited to see further establishment of the NACURH Connection because currently opening it right now, it’s sad to only see the POY bids, it’ll also help connect people to NACURH bids overall.

4. GL - in support of this piece but wants further exploration around what should be on regional websites, we can search on our site and in the Connection, in the Connection you can’t see it, don’t know why people would be inclined to go look at it.

5. SW - echo the sentiments of the Great Lakes, feel like we have already moved a few resources to the Connection and that that should be a priority, but also would like clarification of what can stay on regional sites and what should be moved to the Connection.

6. PA - agrees with the SWACURH and GLACURH but wants to recognize the effort and hard work going into this piece and this database in this inbetween, ultimately the goal of moving to the Connection is incentive to affiliate, agree with keeping some of those pieces out for members to gain insight into NACURH before choosing to affiliate.

7. IA - enjoys that a lot of resources are on the Drive and the website, we enjoy having a streamlined process to provide a home for all of our resources, and we enjoy how easy it is to transfer from the Drive to the Connection.

8. GL - feels that if regions were to move them to the Connection it would create the regional buy in by using the service, also would promote cross regional collaboration being able to find them all in one location.
9. NE - calls the question

E. Vote

1. 8-0-0, motion carries

XVII. NBD MM18-77 | Unification Statement

A. CA - moves to bring MM18-77 to the floor

1. NE - seconds

B. Proponent Speech

1. At Semis we did a workshop on the Unification statement, took the feedback to work and update the unification statement, feedback we received from you all was that the statement was not actionable, received the idea of better explaining who NACURH is, the original unification statement had pieces that were more actionable and those were then removed, wanted to incorporate the One NACURH elements, this concept was originally intended as a marketing effort but feel that could be made more intentional, tried to incorporate the unification of both our entities and our individual members, aligns with Who Is NACURH NACURH U sessions the task force will be doing this weekend.

C. Q&A

1. GL - with this piece and the One NACURH language do you hope this becomes more than just a marketing thing?
   a) Had discussion within our group about the difference between “One NACURH” and just “NACURH,” trying to incorporate this concept somewhere in the policy book.

2. SA - can you talk to me about the phrasing of the portion of One NACURH repetition part?
   a) Wrote that section, personally like repetition in writing, see this as repeating the idea and restating it in the ways they will connect, wanted to be sure to intentionally include educate, empower, engage.

3. IA - would you mind reading this aloud to help some people with the language?
   a) Read by the GLACURH ADAF

4. GL - moves to end Q&A
   a) NE - seconds
   b) NCO - dissent, had a question

5. NCO - you used “One NACURH” a lot, was there a reason to emphasize this so much?
   a) I like repetition, if you want to change it fine, we wanted to ground the statement in the concept of One NACURH, repetition makes people remember, you can clearly identify with this new statement because it covers so much.
6. CA - moves to end Q&A
   a) PA - seconds

D. Discussion
1. IA - moves to caucus for three minutes
   a) NE - seconds
2. SW - the piece is well written and it does address a lot of who NACURH unites and goes onto say further identities, this could address the experience and environment we attempt to provide and would be curious to explore adding these components.
3. GL - are in full support of this piece, feel that this truly unifies NACURH under the One NACURH statement and lets it be more than just a marketing concept.
4. IA - moves to amend
   b) NE - seconds
   c) Proponent Speech
      (1) When looking at this, the idea of One NACURH was brought up a lot, we feel that NACURH should be the focus here rather than the concept of One NACURH, also would like this to be one sentence rather than several smaller sentences.
   d) Q&A
      (1) NCO - can you read this new version aloud?
         (a) IACURH Director reads updated statement
      (2) SA - did you consider removing the first comma and the first ‘which’?
         (a) In this it is saying NACURH has these things, might be more important in that situation, are unsure about the ‘which.’
      (3) GL - can you add another comma after ‘and’?
         (a) Yes.
      (4) NCO - are wondering if we should table this piece to talk about the grammar, syntax, and structure of the statement.
      (5) CA - what of this could be updated by the NAA based on syntax and what actually needs to be voted on?
         (a) NAA - so far this discussion has centered around more than just syntax, wording and structure seem to have a deeper meaning, it may be better to have this conversation in a different format.
(6) SA - moves to end Q&A  
   (a) NE - seconds  

e) Discussion  
   (1) SA - are in full support of this amendment, like the clarification provided.  
   (2) NE - are in favor of this amendment, feel like removing ‘one’ gives the statement more clarity.  
   (3) PA - calls the question  

f) Vote  
   (1) 8-0-0, amendment carries

5. PA - we would like to hear more discussion around the middle part of this statement, starting with “NACURH which embraces…” those last lines seem very repetitive of the mission statement, would like to hear more about the ways NACURH actually does the things outlined here.  

6. NCO - echo the statement from PACURH, think maybe it would be better to have this larger conversation in a different format.  

7. MA - we are currently wondering about discrimination statements, would like to hear further discussion on the different components of the changes presented here and how this revised statement would meet NACURH’s needs.  

8. SA - in reflection of the past week after the strategic plan and elections, especially since conversations had at Semis, feel that maybe the unification statement we currently have is better than we thought and does apply to NACURH as it is today.  

9. NAA - yield question to the authors, I am wondering what you all believe a unification statement is and how these updates make this more of a unification statement than what we already have?  

   a) GL - we ran into problems when trying to find other organization unification statements, got the feedback at Semis that maybe this could connect to One NACURH, the corporation, and all of the different parts of the corporation, wanted to ensure all of those things were included and the statement was less “fluffy,” this new statement is grounded in action and now says and does new things.  

   b) CA - additional feedback we received said that the statement should be a call to action, should actually unify people for a purpose, the last statement just made a statement and was not calling for action.  

   c) GL - the original statement was formed around celebrating diversity, feel like this is more representative of what we do, more focused on educational pieces and other language that was circulating, adding ALL of the ideas.
10. SA - moves to table this piece back to the authors for reconsideration before the end of Pre-Conference.
   a) Chair - have not heard a lot of suggestions for the authors to make improvements on.
11. SA - feel like the end portion really encompasses the unification statement, thinks NACURH’s statements of purpose should be complementary of one another rather than repetitive.
12. MA - yield
13. PA - would like to bring back information from the strategic planning committee regarding NACURH lack of cultural competence education, we are confused about the statement regarding education, have stated in the past that we should not have statements that we are not prepared to act on.
14. SA - yield
15. NAA - thank you for taking time to explore this statement as we can see it is complicated in implementation, from my perspective, I have always seen the unification as our diversity statement, reflecting on the conversation we had at Semis we do want to be a diverse and socially just organization and are trying to improve all of these areas (diversity, inclusivity, and social justice) so there might be value in having a diversity statement still, when this piece was proposed at Semis I was worried about the prospect of removing our diversity statement altogether and what that would say about our organization, I would like this to focus on individuals and how we can connect and unify our members of diverse identities to NACURH and its values/services, would maybe suggest adding the list of specific identities to the statement we have currently but keeping everything else the same, also found that unification statements are not really a concept for other organizations, would encourage updating to “inclusivity statement“ or something similar, adding specific identities may also help the statement to feel less fluffy, would encourage focusing here on what NACURH is and the values we espouse, separate from vision statement, also do not really believe statements can really be “actionable“ and would challenge that idea, think we need this statement but that the current unification statement is better than what is being proposed and would recommend working with what we have rather than starting new.
16. MA - feels that if this were to stay in the format it is currently in we would like to propose an amendment, don’t think the goal of the unification statement is completely accurate.
17. PA - we are mainly uncomfortable with the “NACURH embraces education“ component, we currently struggle to face inequities, this proposed statement might be more applicable in three years after the strategic plan has been implemented but does not match where NACURH is currently at.
18. MA - moves to amend

b) IA - seconds

c) Proponent Speech

(1) We are not experts but did do some research on other non-discrimination statements and wanted to reflect additional identities here, feel like we want to encompass more if specific identities were to be listed in this final statement.

d) Q&A

(1) SA - moves to end Q&A

(a) NE - seconds

e) Discussion

(1) SA - think that this change clears up confusion about listing out only certain identities, we worry that we would accidentally leave out an identity so this allows us to ensure we are being intentional about the wording used.

(2) GL - moves to caucus for three minutes

(a) CA - seconds

(3) NE - understand the sentiment of this amendment but feel that it is still exclusive, think that it should be less specific instead of limiting the statement to any specific list of identities.

(4) SA - agree with the Northeast, also do not like the phrasing of “under the law,” feel like this specifically would impact our region in consideration of the fact that some laws in our region actually discriminate against or exclude people of certain identities.

(5) MA - wanted to recognize that this amendment is only updating the list but the conversation seems to be on whether the statement as a whole should be more vague or more specific.

(6) CA - appreciate the sentiments but think that this is a little extensive.

(7) IA - would like to comment that there has been a lot of discussion about what is and is not recognized, which is difficult, would like to generally have more conversations about the unification statement and its merits.

(8) SA - calls the question

(9) Vote

(a) 0-7-1, amendment fails
19. SA - we feel as though when making a statement, we are looking for something concise that members are able to understand and connect to, agree with the NAA that we should consider editing the current statement as opposed to starting from scratch.

20. CA - moves to table the piece back to the authors in consideration of our conversations today to be heard by the end of Pre-Conference

   a) SA - seconds

   (1) MA - dissent, if we table this we should have critical discussion about what we want the statement to look like

   b) Vote

   (1) 3-5-0, motion fails

21. GL - would like to implore everyone to consider the fact that we did a workshop at Semis and that this piece was created in reflection of that feedback, we have already had time and thought put in before hearing this piece.

22. MA - do want to thank the authors for putting this together as a result of a compilation of ideas from the room, the purpose of tabling would be to make edits to present back to the room, believe that we need to give more feedback about what we actually want to see.

23. NCO - do hear that this was composed based on the feedback from Semis but also feel that we have progressed in our ideas and understanding of this statement since conversations at Semis, also feel like this proposed statement is complex and hard to understand in an effort to compile all feedback shared, do not think this meets NACURH’s needs at this time.

24. SW - agree with MACURH, think this would be more helpful if we all provided a few points of feedback, for example it seems the be the consensus of the room to not list a lot of specific social identities, other places don’t list this much, something we could talk about is the general structure of the statement, talking about identities and then the who, what, when, where, why, how of doing these things.

25. NE - thankful for the authors for taking the time to write this, however agree that this statement feels like a compilation of the NACURH vision and mission statement, feel like maybe a unification statement is intended to be different than what we had thought.

26. NE - yield

27. IA - heard feedback that we think may helpful for authors, hear dissonance between wanting the statement to be vague and wanting the statement to include identities, think the idea of educating individuals on these issues is an important piece of this statement but don’t know that this is, in reality, what NACURH is currently doing.

28. SA - feel that at the moment we should table this piece, think we should consult with individuals that have more experience with statements like
this, want professional opinion to help here since this is an important statement for a corporation.

29. NCO - would like to hear more about whether the unification statement should be about where we are or where we want to be, was in the Semis workshop and the thing I remember from that session was that there was no common understanding of the unification statement and a lot of confusion, think we need to define what the statement should be and then go from there.

30. GL - yields question to the NACURH Advisor, what is the historical background for the unification statement?
   a) Advisor - the unification statement did exist before my time in NACURH, have personally wondered why this was not an “equity” or “inclusion” statement, feel like that is what is practiced by other organizations, this was created in response to the perceived climate of NACURH a few years ago.

31. PA - still not hearing a lot of conversation on the bulk of the action for this piece, we believe this is a critical piece for our organization, hope whatever result comes from this is something we are able to workshop further.

32. MA - yield

33. SA - statements like this are a challenge for international corporations to form, do not feel totally confident in NACURH’s students’ ability to form a productive inclusivity statement, would like the author to further consider exploring outside resources and shift this statement toward an equity/inclusion statement instead of “unification.”

34. NE - yield

35. CA - yields a question to the author, is the unification statement supposed to be what we hope NACURH is now or what we hope NACURH to be in the future?
   a) That’s a conversation we’ve been having but nobody seems to be one hundred percent certain or happy with anything that is produced, think the wording of unification is weird, the conversation at Semis was also interesting in terms of who we are unifying, if we are doing social justice work I think it should be more inspirational.

36. GL - yield

37. CA - yield

38. IA - would like to remind the room that the way to move the corporation forward is to have statements written down to hold ourselves accountable to.

39. PA - moves to amend
   a) NE - seconds
b) Proponent Speech
   
   (1) Believe that the mentions of so many action verbs are unnecessary and essentially describe a NACURH we desire to be rather than a NACURH we are today, would like to remove the specific identities listed and make the statement more succinct and understandable in general.

c) Q&A
   
   (1) SA - are OCM and other corporate partners included in the unification statement for NACURH?
      
      (a) That was in the original piece.
   
   (2) IA - moves to end Q&A
      
      (a) NE - seconds

d) Discussion
   
   (1) IA - are not in support of this amendment as it does not align with the authors original sentiment, would rather take a different approach.

   (2) SA - feels like this action is more representative of where we currently are as a corporation, are interested in moving toward this amendment.

   (3) CA - regarding the point of this amendment and this piece as a whole, do not personally feel like we have gauged whether a unification statement is supposed to reflect NACURH in the present or what NACURH aspires to be, don’t think we can move forward until we are on the same page.

   (4) MA - appreciate this amendment, think everything in this statement is true but think we should go back into discussion on the piece as a whole.

   (5) SA - calls the question
      
      (a) GL - dissent

   (6) SA - moves to end discussion
      
      (a) No second, motion dies

   (7) NE - moves to table piece until after dinner, withdrawn

   (8) MA - yield

   (9) SA - do not feel that we are at the point where we can use this for the unification statement.

   (10) IA - calls the question

e) Vote
   
   (1) 0-7-1, amendment fails
40. NE - believes that we began this conversation months ago, not everyone in the room seems to have a shared understanding of why these changes are being made, not sure what can be done at this point to reach more of a consensus.

41. CA - want the room on an idea, wonder if it is possible to have the first half of a unification statement talk about where NACURH is at and the second half talk about the future aspirations for NACURH?

42. MA - feel that the unification statement is an official statement and should be grounded in the practices of NACURH in the present, think we should do a straw poll to see where other regions are at before doing any more amendments.

43. SW - agree with CAACURH, think unification is a process, might be somewhere in between, also agree with MACURH that this statement shouldn’t be focused solely on the future.

44. NCO - believes this looks like a vision or equity statement, if we want this to be a unification statement we need to define what a unification statement is.

45. NE - encourage taking the thoughts about NACURH’s future and adding that to our vision statement, instead see this statement as an inclusion statement which should be closely to what NACURH actually is today.

46. SA - feel like we are not in a position at this time to make a productive decision, do not think this piece should pass as is.

47. SA - moves to end discussion
   a) No second, motion dies

48. IA - moves to table this piece to the authors before the end of Pre-Conference
   a) NE - seconds

XVIII. Annual Conference Bid Presentation Discussion

XIX. NBD MM18-61 | Conference Displays
   A. NE - moves to bring MM18-61 to the floor
      1. GL - seconds
   B. Proponent Speech
      1. Displays are currently a part of NACURH culture and practice, only really in policy in NACURH in the conference awards section, personally have been to four NACURH Annual Conferences and a lot of regional conferences and have never seen displays incorporated in the conference in a meaningful way, many other conference spirit items have been moved to electronic formats, even when displays are made from recycled materials they take time, materials, and energy that could be allocated toward other conference preparation items.
   C. Q&A
1. NE - moves to end Q&A
   a) SA - seconds

D. Discussion
1. GL - in support of this piece, most institutions fly to the Annual Conference and cannot feasibly travel with a display so we have noticed a lack of participation and meaning.
2. PA - PACURH really values this piece, values sustainability and think this will ensure schools do not waste time, money, or resources on displays with little meaning.
3. NCO - when the University of Delaware hosted NACURH in 2016 the conference staff had to throw out so many displays, it was sad to see materials go to waste, in full support of this piece.
4. IA - in support of this piece, implemented this in IACURH, had an alternative option where people used supplies at the conference to build displays which could be explored.
5. CA - yield to redundancy
6. SW - yield to redundancy
7. PA - calls the question

E. Vote
1. 8-0-0, motion carries

XX. NBD MM18-86 | NACURH Residence Hall Month

A. NCO - moves to bring MM18-66 to the floor
1. GL - seconds

B. Proponent Speech
1. Have gotten a lot of feedback from members this year about NRHM happening in February which is Black History Month and the implications of that, not sure there is a perfect month for NRHM or that we will be able to avoid an affinity month, but that feedback did prompt further conversations about February and its benefits for NRHM as a program, do like the idea of NRHM happening during a conference season but want NRHM to happen earlier in the year, think moving NRHM to November will be productive, could help cultivate interest from members earlier in the year, NRHM is typically overlooked, but has a lot of history and value for NACURH, has been around since the 1970s, connected to NACURH’s establishment as a corporation, the Executive Committee believes this is an important experience for NACURH and is something that the NAA or a member of the Executive Committee should oversee, there are a few suggestions listed here, could see those being there or being removed, think overall that these changes will help further the development and implementation of NRHM in NACURH, specifically as a more NACURH-centered experience.

C. Q&A
1. NCO - did you think about how Thanksgiving breaks, which usually take an entire week, would affect NRHM?
   a) We did, the reality is no month is a great month, picked the option we saw with the most potential success, with consideration of NRHM being a more NACURH facilitated experience than a campus facilitated experience there would be opportunities for participation during breaks, hard to account for every school in NACURH with fall breaks being at different points in the year, thought Thanksgiving would be an okay thing to work through with NRHM.

2. PA - is there a particular reason why NRHM is being tasked to the NAA?
   a) The NAA has worked with the NRHM task force for the past two years in coordination with the Chairperson and task force chair, there is a misconception that NRHM is an NRHH-centered initiative, NRHM is something all of NACURH should buy into, with the changes to the NAA position we felt that the NAA would have appropriate time for this responsibility, helps that the NAA works with marketing and social media.

3. IA - have there been considerations for changes to the weeks (the themes) for NRHM?
   a) Yes, the Execs talked about the meaning of each week and its utility for NRHM, don’t know that we’re ready to change the themes now but would like to look through existing NACURH assessments to determine common areas of focus in NACURH and update themes accordingly, for example, think that programming week could be updated, would be able to work on this with these updates in mind.

4. GL - could you talk about your end goal(s) for NRHM?
   a) When we talked about moving this up in the calendar year, we talked about how NRHM is a great initiative and opportunity for members to live out the mission and vision of NACURH, NACURH has had little Leadership-wide buyin for NRHM in the past few years but hope that these changes will improve participation and make NRHM a more NACURH-centered initiative.

5. SA - have you done research on the residence hall month that made it to the floor of Congress?
   a) Yes, that is why NRHM was originally established, NRHM was previously in April and was moved to February in 2015 truthfully think there could have been further conversations at that point around the implications of moving NRHM to Black History month but that April also proved to be an ineffective month for this initiative.

6. GL - have you thought about how November is Native American Heritage month?
a) Yes, did do that Google search when writing this piece, that is why I mentioned earlier this piece came up because of member feedback on Black History month but is being presented based on a number of other benefits we see in moving NRHM to earlier in the academic year, do not think there will be a perfect month for this initiative but hope that this change will improve member experience.

7. SA - do you have any data that would support the ability to do this in November?
   a) Don’t have specific data on why it would be best at this point, beyond that we are wanting to demonstrate that campuses should not be the only people participating with NRHM, would love to see this become more of a NACURH service than campus facilitated experience.

8. SA - who said that we should be engaging more with Black History month?
   a) The feedback/suggestion of moving NRHM away from Black History month came up at multiple points from members including in the NSPA, RLC strategic planning assessment, and demographic survey.

9. MA - do you think that this will be manageable given that the Executive Committee travels a lot during November?
   a) Yes and no, but in reality the Executive Committee travels just as much in November as they do in February, as an Exec you don’t get to focus on a conference specifically during conference season, have to focus on NACURH initiatives all year, also recognize that a lot of pre-planning should go into NRHM before the month of November.

10. CA - moves to end Q&A
   a) NE - seconds

D. Discussion

1. NE - are in support of this piece, we know that it is difficult to choose a month because each month is dedicated to something, acknowledge that November could be exciting with fall conferences, having NRHM earlier in the year could also lead to more active contributions from members.

2. PA - appreciates that we are moving it early, but late enough to allow quarter schools opportunities to participate.

3. CA - also saw evidence to this regarding NRHM in the last year and that it overlapped with Black History Month which seemed tone-deaf of the corporation to ignore that intersectionality, we do not want to ignore barriers to access for groups with whom we are trying to interact.
4. GL - believes November could be a better month than February, but still struggle with RBDs being able to participate since this is a very busy time of year for RBDs, are concerned that we may not be able to have the time to deal with this, also still concerned about it falling on Native American Heritage month.

5. IA - IACURH is very involved in NRHM and it is very important to the region overall, we promote it heavily on social media, and our institutions also value it but they have expressed that February is an unorthodox time for it, so we appreciate that NRHM is gaining the focus to promote it further in NACURH, however we also recognize the sentiments of GLACURH because we have a lot of tribal colleges in our region.

6. NCO - echoes the sentiments from IACURH about making NRHM more valued in NACURH, wonder if October would be a better month and see this as a way to engage with the initiative, October would allow Leadership to use the summer months to hype people up.

7. SW - support this piece, feel that the move from February to November could be beneficial, especially in terms of preparing hype for conferences, and it has the ability to increase collaboration with COs, also presents the ability for a NACURH Exec Buddy to incorporate that into an Executive presentation.

8. GL - would like to focus on the second half of this piece, are in full support of having the NAA chair the NRHM task force, also in full support of writing what NRHM is in policy as well as suggestions for implementation.

9. MA - generally supports changing the month from February, we are concerned in general of the concept of valuing one identity / heritage month over the other and we find that logic problematic, we think one of the most important things is, rather than the one month calling for involvement but the actual programs themselves calling for involvement, could be explored to still be successful in April and we could support October but we do not support the argument of not wanting to infringe upon one social identity.

   a) NAA - October is dedicated to Filipino Americans and LGBTQ+ community as well, there is an affinity connected to most every month, not about prioritizing specific identities over others, we need to focus on which month makes sense for NACURH and also we need to think about how we could potentially tie the week or the initiatives of NRHM to celebrating an affinity.

10. CA - would like to echo the sentiments of the NCO, think October is a great month because schools will get excited but it is also late enough to still plan for the initiative at the campus and NACURH levels.

11. NE - would also like to go off of what the Great Lakes said earlier about focusing on the second half of the piece which we are in support of, no guarantee that November will not work and would like to consider at as a viable option.
12. NAN - we did talk about September and October as options but I advocated against them because I attend a quarter school and September is almost impossible for quarter schools to manage, for quarter schools the fall semester does not start until late September which would leave schools with very little time to prepare.

13. SW - moves to split the piece between the proposed month and making the NAA the chair of the NRHM task force
   a) CA - seconds

E. Making NAA task force chair
   1. SW - supports this component because we believe practice should go into policy and the NAA has been chairing this initiative in recent years, also like having some suggestions in policy for the next NAA to consider.
   2. NCO - calls the question on the second part of the piece
      a) Vote
         (1) 8-0-0, motion carries

F. Changing the month from February to November
   1. NCO - appreciates MACURH pointing out that we should not choose one affinity month over another, think that November would be too difficult to get people engaged, anytime around a conference seems difficult, October and November are when a lot of the work in NACURH is happening, would also like to recognize quarter schools who may not be able to participate in earlier months.
   2. SA - do appreciate recognition week aligning with the holidays off but would caution that the week might have negative implications when aligned with Thanksgiving.
   3. NE - recognizes that all schools have different structures around breaks, want to ensure NRHM has the most support from schools and regions, think November is a viable option.
   4. GL - coming from the ADNRHH perspective, we, along with most of NACURH, are focused on affiliation in the fall, just another reason why November might not be the best, would also like to ask why are we doing a month when a month does not cleanly fit anywhere, and would like to explore a week.
   5. CA - would like to propose that we think about focusing on weeks rather than an entire calendar month.
   6. NCO - recognize CAACURH’s sentiments but do not believe that that is a solution because it could create difficulties, also want to point out that we have a lot of “NRHM” pins and moving away from “month” would have further implications.
   7. SA - our concern is that week four is programming week, if people are not present on campus during the fourth week then that could be challenging to accomplish in November.
8. IA - would like to remind people in the room that NRHM is primarily connected to NRHH and the mobilization of NRHM within a campus, we should prioritize how this impacts a campus rather than how this affects us as NACURH Leadership
   a) NAA - point of clarification, NRHM is a NACURH-centered initiative not an NRHH-specific initiative.

9. CA - yield

10. SW - would recommend considering starting NRHM on November 4 so that the weeks would shift in a way that avoids the programming week being on Thanksgiving week.

11. CA - yield

12. NE - calls the question
   a) SA - dissent, had a discussion point

13. GL - sees the potential benefits of doing this in November for member school engagement because it might be when they are most focused on their regions and NACURH, feel that no month is perfect but a November trial would be beneficial.

14. NCO - yield

15. SA - echoing IACURH, would like to poll the representatives at the Annual Conference regarding what would work best on their campuses and have some hard data that could better support this decision, could also help to avoid choosing a month based on a specific set of identities.

16. GL - calls the question
   a) MA - dissent, would like to make a discussion point

17. MA - can see November working but we want to avoid having recognition week during Thanksgiving because we don’t want to imply that we are supporting Thanksgiving as a corporation.

18. NE - would be nervous to tailor a specific week to a specific holiday but do think recognition week could be something that happens better virtually than programming week, could generally move the weeks around.

19. SA - calls the question

G. Vote
   1. 7-1-0, motion carries

XXI. NBD MM18-15 | Conference Guests
   A. SA - moves to bring MM18-72 to the floor
      1. NE - seconds
   B. Proponent Speech
      1. Heard this piece at Semis, did not come to a clear conclusion of a viable option to replace conference guests but the sentiment was to move away from using the “special guest” language, we have also considered
“NACURH guests” if that is what the room prefers, could have multiple names for multiple different people but not sure that is the best solution, would also be willing to call everyone something within one grouping, think that the conference teams are the people who provide a special service to the regions and NACURH, want the language to reflect the roles of individuals.

C. Q&A

1. GL - did you all envision how changing this piece of policy, or if we changed it to, for example, “NACURH guests,” would apply to other potions of policy, i.e. swaps?
   a) The way we see this is that this would be an overarching term for any guests at conferences, would not impact the Swap title or concept at this time.
   b) GL - is it, then, that you want this to be a term to refer to all guests, so doing one term, instead of two?
      (1) Yes this would refer to all guests, want a term that encompasses everyone.

2. SA - moves to end Q&A
   a) NE - seconds

D. Discussion

1. SW - is in favor of saying “conference guest” rather than “NACURH guest” because we want to give respect to professional associations.

2. IA - in favor, believe this will offer a great benefit to conference experience create a more professional experience for guests at conferences.

3. SA - calls the question

E. Vote

1. 7-1-0, motion carries

XXII. NBD MM18-64 | Conference Hosting NACURH U

A. SA - moves to bring MM18-64 to the floor

1. NCO - seconds

B. Proponent Speech

1. This piece pertains to NACURH U categories, specifically the conference hosting track, have experience in the past few years regarding who is responsible for this presentation, the past few years there has been one presentation facilitated by the CRC and other members of NACURH Leadership, half NACURH U and half not, feel like this track does not currently align with the other eight tracks, want the How to Bid and How to Host presentations to be implemented by the CRC, this change reflects practice, this is also already in one part of the CRC position
description, updates policy to make the CRC policy consistent throughout the policy book.

C. Q&A

1. SW - why did you choose the language of “workshop” over “presentation?”
   a) That wording is the same wording that is already in policy in the CRC position description in a separate section, copy and pasted into both sections with the CRC position description.

2. NCO - moves to end Q&A
   a) NE - seconds

D. Discussion

1. SW - point of information, do you think changing the word workshop would be in the spirit of the piece?
   a) NAA - no, this piece is regarding the NACURH U session/track.

2. MA - appreciate this piece since the CRC has the most experience with conferences and is most equipped to handle this educational experience, will help guarantee a successful conference session.

3. IA - see great benefits from this addition, think this will provide better support to institutions looking to bid and/or host a conference.

4. NCO - point of information, with NACURH U, there’s usually an overarching topic and then three sessions underneath it, how would that work?
   a) Currently for this track there is only two presentations, would not foresee any changes being made to the sessions that have been implemented.

5. IA - calls the question

E. Vote

1. 8-0-0, motion carries

XXIII. NBD MM18-62 | OTM Database Administrator

A. NE - moves to bring MM18-62 to the floor

1. IA - seconds

B. Proponent Speech

1. Had a conversation about this piece with the NNB earlier today and have also had a conversation with the incoming NAN, the current person who created and has been maintaining the OTM database is Andrew Bell and has been doing this without any sort of financial compensation since 2002, when talking with Andrew about a contract we went in with the expectation that this could be done by December of 2018, he did not feel like that would be possible, this essentially states that NACURH will begin the search for a new OTM Database Developer and will take steps to transfer ownership of the database to NACURH.
C. Q&A

1. IA - with switching to a new database, would we still have access to the OTMs that have been submitted?
   a) The ideal situation would be that we are able to archive our currently existed OTMs, whether through this new database or the Connection.

2. CA - do you have any idea how much you are willing to pay this database manager?
   a) We originally set a cap of $2,000 a year, maximum, and give $8,000 retroactively but Andrew wanted $30,000 USD and we could not reasonably give him that.

3. NCO - can you clarify, he asked for $30,000 for retroactive payment?
   a) No, he wanted $30,000 because he would have to take time off of work to update the database.

4. MA - until we have a new database, who would continue to maintain the current database?
   a) As of now there is a mutual understanding that Andrew will continue to maintain the current database.

5. NCO - is there money that we can use to purchase the rights to the OTM database?
   a) We have not negotiated that but yes, we do have money that could be allocated toward that if needed.

6. SA - moves to end Q&A
   a) SW - seconds

D. Discussion

1. SA - appreciate the hardwork and dedication that Andrew has put forth thus far and it is one of the key programs that we use, but as an ADNRHH also recognize we need a new system for OTMs.

2. MA - echo the sentiments of SAACURH, are excited to begin the recruitment process of a new OTM Database Developer.

3. IA - believe that this is a great step and as we continue growing, this is the best way to help continue the growth of NRHH and the OTM program.

4. SW - in favor of this piece, NRHH representatives would be appreciative of this update as well.

5. NE - would like to thank Andrew Bell for their time and dedication to the database and to NACURH and would like to agree that we can appreciate the time required to update and maintain this database.

6. NCO - yield question to the author, can you explain what this legislation is actually doing? Could changes happen without this piece? Will this piece approve any financial decisions?
a) This is enacting a search process for a new OTM Database Administrator.

7. GL - calls the question

E. Vote

1. 8-0-0, motion carries

XXIV. NBD MM18-74 | Compensated Registration at the NACURH Annual Conference

A. MA - moves to bring MM18-74 to the floor

1. NE - seconds

B. Proponent Speech

1. COs and Conference Chairs are now included as members of NACURH Leadership in policy, COs come to Pre-Conference early (Thursday night) to help NACURH and the conference team, could be helpful for regions to have their registration covered within the annual conference budget, propose that regions would save money on COs but not conference chairs and advisors, since NACURH would be absorbing that cost I felt that it would be the responsibility of the regions to contribute some of that money back to NACURH member schools as well, money that would have been used on registration would be put toward the Annual Conference scholarship fund.

C. Q&A

1. SW - can you explain the last resolution statement about this going into effect for NACURH 2019 and the 2020 fiscal year?
   
   a) Yes, CO funds would need to be planned for for the 2019 Annual Conference budget but the contributions from regions to the NACURH Annual Conference scholarship and changes in regional budgets would impact the 2020 fiscal year budgets, new fiscal year begins in April.

2. NE - why did you choose to not pay for Advisors?
   
   a) COs were easiest to quantify with differences in Regional and NRHH Advisors across regions, COs are easy to see per region.

3. IA - do you have a projected amount of the impact this would have on an annual conference budget based on past conferences?
   
   a) Yes, looked at Annual Conference budgets for Purdue and Tempe, conference teams also typically lower their conference registration cost between Semis and the actual conference.

4. Chairperson - what is the root concern that this piece is working to address?
   
   a) Not totally sure, wanting to reevaluate what the regions pay for and what NACURH pays for.

5. IA - yield question to the NAF, what would the financial implication on NACURH be?
a) For the actual operating budget there would not be an impact, this comes out of the annual conference budget, costs for regions and member institutions would need to be higher, it would lower net cost of what regions are paying for the Annual Conference, the CO cost would be the same as a delegate cost ($200 - $250 per person), in total for NACURH COs that would be similar to the amount for line items like all of the socials, all of the t-shirts, hospitality rooms, etc., would likely raise the per delegate cost by $10 to $15 per person.

6. CA - want to ensure we are understanding this correctly, when we see this this incorporates all of the annual conference CO registration, roughly 40 people?
   a) For this conference it would have raised the cost by $9 to $10 per person.

7. Chairperson - can you elaborate on the Annual Conference scholarship connection and why that is important?
   a) The increase in number of scholarships was to recognize that this would increase the cost of the Annual Conference registration for member institutions and could potentially alleviate the financial barriers to schools who could not afford this increase.
   b) Chair - follow up, how do you negotiate increasing scholarship for five institutions at the cost of approximately 200 additional institutions attending the Annual Conference?
      (1) Do not know.

8. CA - may have already been answered but how did you decide how many scholarships you would add?
   a) Going off of historical Annual Conference costs, since the scholarship is given in increments of $1,000 this number helps to get to the $5,000 mark, was an easy way to round up.

9. Chairperson - how do you see this working with varying CO positions and numbers of COs across regions?
   a) Did not give thought to that or the difference between regions, was just looking at overall costs.

10. NCO - why would you not have the regions just pay for their COs?
    a) Was looking for COs to be paid for because of the work they do for NACURH, Advisors do not necessarily have the same relationship with or responsibilities at the Annual Conference.

11. MA - have you considered doing additional scholarships from the CO add-ons?
    a) Had not considered that.

12. CA - this does not include conference chairs, right?
    a) No, does not include conference chairs.
13. SA - moves to end Q&A
   a) IA - seconds

D. Discussion

1. IA - overall have struggled paying for COs to attend conferences, only the Directorship and Advisors have been fully paid for, it would be helpful for COs to be included but are concerned about the financial implications on NACURH, appreciate the inclusion of Cos within NACURH, think it is a good thought but do not know how this would look in practice.

2. NE - move to caucus for two minutes
   a) CA - seconds

3. SW - yield

4. NCO - yield

5. GL - feels conflict with this piece, feel that the aspect of COs being expected to be at the Annual Conference but having regions front cost and the way that impacts services, but also see that raising the delegate cost is not the best way to make this more equitable, could maybe discuss going half-and-half in the future, but are currently trying to balance NACURH Leadership impact and member impact.

6. Chair - the Executive Committee is admittedly not in support of this piece, the Annual Conference host institution is asked to do a lot and we are guests, though the budget is big, there is a lot to do included, in a way NACURH is already doing half-and-half by paying for NACURH Board members and having regions pay for COs, advisors, conference chairs, if the true goal is equitability could also move toward the regions paying for all Board members but don’t think that is necessarily the answer either, cannot support this when COs are not consistent across regions meaning the compensated costs would vary per region, would also mean that any addition or removal of a CO position would need NACURH Board approval, currently the only work that COs do specifically for NACURH during Pre-Conference is award bid selections but that could be done virtually if needed, NACURH does pay for the early registration associated with CO attendance, not in support of this and concerned about the impact this would have for NACURH as a whole.

7. NCO - recognize that we have the most COs and that we do not utilize all of our money, have enough money to pay for our COs to attend the Annual Conference and do not want to put pressure on the conference staff, think asking regions to contribute money to the conference scholarship could be challenging, also have seen low participation in NACURH scholarships and do not that increasing scholarships helps to make this any more accessible for institutions who need financial support.
8. SW - want to see this piece tabled to ensure the Annual Conference team is represented in the room.

9. CA - while CAACURH does see the intentions here and think maybe this could be done in the future, we do not think this is feasible for NACURH at this time, echo the sentiments of the NCO and the Chairperson, by implementing this this would leave regions with extra money that needs to be utilized, not sure that we see the effectiveness of making a change to a system that is meeting the needs of NACURH and the needs of the regions currently.

10. CA - calls the question

E. Vote

1. 0-8-0, motion fails

XXV. NBD MM18-70 | Assessment Plan Timeline

A. SA - moves to bring MM18-70 to the floor

1. IA - seconds

B. Proponent Speech

1. Have worked to create an assessment and evaluation guide similar to the NACURH branding guide, this timeline encompasses everything we do currently, only change is that this would move the NSPA to the spring semester, this would allow us to assess students when they know more about NACURH, also aligns with when we can capture member opinions about NACURH when they are most educated about the corporation, the other proposed difference is that a regional assessment would happen in the fall, see this as an opportunity to collect more intentional regional feedback, would be interesting to assess regions in a standardized way and create opportunities for sharing of best practices as well as comparisons between varying services and processes, there would be a common core regional assessment provided by NACURH with the opportunity for regions to add additional content as needed, calling these “regional service and performance assessments” or RSPAs.

C. Q&A

1. IA - do you have ideas about what those common cores questions could be?

   a) The initial idea would be to take the questions in the current NSPA on regions and move them to the RSPA, which would then create opportunities to ask more questions about NRHH and NACURH services, from there tailor to regional specific initiatives and needs.

2. NCO - the RSPA and NSPA would be the only places we are assessing learning?

   a) Could potentially increase evaluations of learning, have been calling our corporate assessment the NSPA (NACURH services and performance assessment), right now it is really a satisfaction
survey and not an evaluation of learning, only real evaluation of learning currently are the entrance and exit surveys done at NACURH.

b) NCO - this is an assessment of learning?
   
   (1) No

3. CA - would the RSPA replace the NACURH 360 evaluations in turn for NACURH Leadership?
   
   a) It could, it might be a good option to merge those two things, could see mixed results if you went that route.

4. NCO - you’re moving the data from the NSPA to the RPSA?
   
   a) That could be the starting point but the NACURH Board of Directors could develop that together as a project next year.

5. NCO - moves to end Q&A
   
   a) NE - seconds

D. Discussion

1. GL - thinks this is an important step for standardizing assessment and evaluation, we feel that trying to move forward with the regional assessment surveys that are too bulky to administer bi-annually, we also would like to see where best practices work in NACURH and explore those outside of chats, and also hope that we could be of service.

2. CA - have seen a lot of inconsistencies in assessments for regions in the past, don’t currently have an assessment mindset as a region, feel like this is a good step to allow for the exploration of best practices and ensure annual assessment practices, will be good to evaluate things year to year with strategic plan platforms.

3. IA - moves to caucus for three minutes
   
   a) NE - seconds

4. SW - feel that the Executive Committee made a great choice in moving the NSPA to the spring so regional assessment won’t be competing with NACURH assessment, and it could be a good segway to NACURH’s assessment efforts.

5. MA - are in full support of this and recognize the hard work that was put into this guide, have been talking within our region about assessments and enjoy the upcoming support and collaboration.

6. IA - believe that this is a great way to create a baseline for assessment that our region hasn’t had in the past, however we are concerned that each region would be sharing all practices in order to make sure that regions are doing everything the same or similarly.

7. MA - sees the goals of this plan and this piece as having specific aspects being evaluated across regions to allow for collaborations where wanted, but also appreciate the opportunity to add region-specific questions.
8. CA - would like to note that it is important to have a baseline set of data and context for underlying initiatives, hope that this could be shared with regions so regions can create a framework that will work for them.

9. GL - calls the question

E. Vote

1. 7-1-0, motion carries

XXVI. NBD MM18-71 | Assessment & Evaluation Guide

A. Proponent Speech

1. This is proposing an assessment and evaluation guide that is modeled off of the NACURH branding guide, acknowledge that assessment and evaluation is trendy right now, people in NACURH want to talk about assessment and learning outcomes, do not know that this should be primarily a student responsibility but also feel that NACURH needs to focus on data to ensure that we can demonstrate our corporate worth to stakeholders, this guide attempts to outline some philosophical foundations, as well as an assessment cycle that is a simplified version reflective of our needs and our student-ran status, one section outlines Bloom’s Taxonomy and the development of student learning that is centered on learning outcomes for reference, assessment gauges learning which is not how NACURH generally refers to assessment or evaluation, timeline that outlines the different formal evaluations that happen throughout the year, discusses some strategies for surveys as well as when surveys could be most effective, end with the expectation of reporting out.

B. Q&A

1. GL - do you hope that this guide and further implementation will help increase participation for NACURH assessment and evaluations?
   a) Yes, also hope for a more critical focus on evaluation and assessment in NACURH, for example the NSPA has low participation, could be because it isn’t done at the right time in the year, also think we need to communicate more information about assessment outcomes and back to our stakeholders and prioritize closing the assessment “loop,” overall hope this increase interest and intentional implementation of assessment in NACURH.

2. GL - in the timeline on page eight you included NACURH affiliation reports, what assessment do you foresee for that?
   a) Assessment doesn’t have to be a form, affiliation reports have key words and that can be coded for data, you can search for something via metadata, and that is an assessment opportunity to see what is being submitted and how it’s being submitted in NACURH each year.
3. IA - can you elaborate on what the NACURH 360 evaluation analysis process would look like?
   a) Right now I would say the analysis piece is the report and reflection as well as implementation of changes, last year this was a JotForm or 1:1 with a NACURH Executive, this year we had a document with more guided discussion, haven’t found the right thing yet so this could go in a few different directions, am sure whatever is done would offer an opportunity for NACURH Leadership to reflect and also provide feedback on the process overall.

4. SA - moves to end Q&A
   a) NE - seconds

C. Discussion

1. IA - as far as assessment goes we believe this provides great input and ideas for improving processes, we as a region have not been the best at evaluation or assessment and believe this will give us areas to work on beyond surveys which we really appreciate.

2. NCO - appreciate the thought and effort put into this surrounding affiliation report assessments, this will be a guide for the future, also appreciate grounding the guide in research which will help explain why NACURH assesses.

3. SW - appreciate the way this guide could increase opportunities for the NAA to support ADAFs on regional assessments.

4. GL - appreciate the variety of suggestions that are present in the guide, especially for our region, one of our top five goals is improving assessment and wanting to become more effective, figuring out where people are at rather than making assumptions.

5. IA - also wanted to point out that schools could possibly use this guide to make improvements to assessment, will give schools a guide and foundation.

6. NCO - calls the question

D. Vote

1. 8-0-0, motion carries

XXVII. NBD MM18-87 | Mission Statement Updates

A. IA - moves to bring MM18-87 to the floor
   1. SW - seconds

B. Proponent Speech

1. When we started the strategic plan, we went in with the mindset that we did not want to change the mission statement and still feel like our current mission statement is effective, throughout the year as direction form, especially with the difficulties securing a NACURH Annual Conference host site, and centering regional conferences, we thought
that this could be a way that we could refocus and recenter what NACURH actually does for our members, feel like we are not content experts on all of these topics despite wanting to be, to us this focuses a little bit on what NACURH can do and acknowledges limitations as we see them and see in ways where we can reach out, for LeaderShape, we are creating an environment to learn but we’re not disseminating that education directly, NACURH pays for the NACURH Connection but students are still writing and submitting affiliation reports, there are a lot of things that we can do when we’re creating environments, NACURH’s responsibility is to create the space for these educational experiences to happen and are not always the ones to actually disseminate the information, if the piece passed, the end mission statements would be updated in the regional policy books as well.

C. Q&A
1. SA - move to end Q&A
   a) NE - seconds

D. Discussion
1. SW - appreciates the additional words added to the mission statement as they do show what this whole room has felt this year and do think that this can align with different services we provide, additionally think it would be cool if, in the email signatures, that we would use the last line of the statement.
2. CA - agrees with SWACURH, also feel that in explaining the work we do professionally and personally that we talk about the spaces we create and the opportunities for collaboration we foster for members.
3. SA - calls the question

E. Vote
1. 8-0-0, motion carries

XXVIII. NBD MM18-82 | Risk Management & Safety
A. PA - moves to bring MM18-82 to the floor
1. NE - seconds

B. Proponent Speech
1. With risk management policies, the focus is on protecting the corporation and avoiding liability for NACURH, this piece would not actually change practice, talking about the safety of members during in person meetings/events, only so much this piece can do, outlines that anyone serving on behalf of NACURH at a conference must report any concerning behavior to the appropriate parties on campus, the CRC and Chair would work with conferences to form that plan of action, would also add expectation for regional conferences that Regional Advisors and Directors would also work to create clear plans on the regional level, hope that other policies and practices would be put in place but think
further consideration will need to be given to the virtual environments that NACURH creates.

C.  Q&A

1. MA - can you expand upon plans to work with Regional Directors to support the knowledge base to address these situations, not just how to report, but also how to handle the conversation when somebody approaches you?
   a) Yes, think Regional Advisors go through a conference training session, also think what you’re describing would need to be for all NACURH Leadership not only Directors, anyone could receive information at any time and need to respond, would like to see ongoing training and conversations.

2. NCO - is this mandated reporting?
   a) No

3. NCO - is it NACURH-mandated reporting?
   a) We would not call this mandated reporting, there are separate trainings and certifications for that classification.

4. NCO - if I heard there was a threat of self-harm, would I have to report it to someone?
   a) It is an expectation that they would report that to campus/conference staff, putting that expectation in policy, mandatory reporting requires training and this is not that.

5. NCO - would this extend to the COs and the NCO?
   a) Yes, any member of NACURH Leadership would be expected to follow this and share information with appropriate parties.

6. NCO - do you believe everyone in NACURH Leadership would have the ability to recognize that they are expected to report and have you thought about training you would provide to NACURH Leadership to help them meet this expectation?
   a) Think that gets at what I was just saying, this would require ongoing training for all of NACURH Leadership, also would always rather have someone report something than say nothing.

7. IA - yield

8. SA - could this lead into further conversations about Title IX training?
   a) I will yield to Chairperson but I think we want to create a system that is balanced, we recognize that this is not about NACURH’s policies it’s about the campuses policies, the appropriate people need to create a plan that aligns with the institutions expectations, this would be doing NACURH’s part of meeting the requirements of the campus.
   b) SA - would there be resources for people to call including something on Guidebook maybe?
(1) That would be something the Director and the Advisor would collaborate to plan with other relevant parties.

9. SA - Move to end
   a) NE Seconds

D. Discussion

1. NCO - moves to caucus for six minutes
   a) SW - seconds

2. IA - upon reflecting on our regional practices, when I was training to be Director, we were trained on how to report situations, however, when situations happen at my conference, I also set that expectation with my conference chairs that NACURH has policies on reporting, and NACURH needs to know about incidents, all of my situational reporting knowledge comes from my student affairs training, not my NACURH training, for this, it is important to have, but it needs to be thought about how we’re going to educate on how to do navigate these situations, and need to focus on specific trainings for this.

3. SW - in complete support of this piece, like the expectation of reporting, on a personal note just went through child protection training, feel like whoever is in charge would need to be made aware of situations of concern, enjoyed this year the sheet of crisis management that was provided to Directors and feel like that was helpful in crisis situations.

4. PA - would like to clarify that this is a start for future discussions and that this is in no way required for NACURH Leadership to handle or insert themselves into the situation, only that we could be required to report if we receive information.

5. NE - in complete support, as a region had sickness/health related emergency, this would have helped alleviate some of the anxiety around how to deal with that situation.

6. PA - calls the question
   a) IA - dissent, would like to hear further discussion

7. NCO - have concerns around requiring Leadership to recognize and then report situations, worried about the lack of outline and definitions, wondering who this is talking about as operating on behalf of NACURH, feel like policies and practices should be established, there should be communication around how we are talking to conference hosts about these policies and systems.

8. NE - would like to highlight that this is not making NACURH Leadership mandated reporters, it is moving toward having better bystanders, if there are concerns for a person’s health and wellbeing there is a responsibility for NACURH Leadership to follow up on that, we believe we need to put expectations into policy in this area.

9. SA - moves to end discussion
a) NE - seconds
b) NCO - dissent, believe there has not been enough discussion around our concerns

10. NCO - appreciate sentiments from NEACURH about empowering Leadership to respond but are concerned about then not giving the training to do that, are concerned about the ability of my COs to meet this expectation.

11. MA - yield question to the authors, have you thought about virtual instances?
   a) Yes and that is why that is not included in here, there needs to be more explanation of that in depth, admittedly in a conference setting this is easier to enforce because we are able to connect situations to campus policies and expectations, a virtual environment is an environment that NACURH creates and is therefore more responsible for, consideration demands more time and research.

12. NE - yield

13. CA - yield question to the NCO, are you looking for something in this piece that says “NACURH Leadership are training in ___” or are you looking for specific criteria that you want people to meet in training?
   a) NCO - looking for both, would like a few things to be more defined in this piece.

14. NCO - yield

15. PA - in an effort to continue on the NCO’s point of requiring time to explore these details, would like to table this piece

16. PA - moves to table to be heard by the end of Pre-Conference
   a) NCO - seconds
      (1) SA - dissent, would like a decision to be made
   b) NCO - does not withdraw second
      (1) Vote
         (a) 3-5-0, move back into discussion

17. IA - would like to reiterate that we agree that the training on this is critical and understand the hesitation, are also hesitant to not pass this piece because we do not want to find ourselves in a situation where someone receives information and chooses not to report that to the appropriate individuals, want to protect our students and our conference attendees, would like to see this piece passed because it does not say that there will not be any training and feel confident that that will be implemented down the line.

18. SW - also notes that this piece would not go into effect until the end of the 2018 Annual Conference, this piece failing is a viable option if it needs more time and consideration.
19. NE - yield question to the room, would it be possible for training to happen before the regional conferences?
   a) Chair - believes NAA said yes.

20. SA - would like to reiterate that there are campus procedures in place for these situations and would like to restate that we need to keep our students safe and that this piece needs to pass as a foundation for future conferences.

21. NE - experienced situation at our Spring Leadership Conference and had concerns about that situation not being reported, think this piece would have helped.

22. IA - moves to end discussion
   a) GL - seconds
      (1) NCO - dissent, are concerned that people are viewing this in different ways and not concurring on what this piece is saying, the NCO is worried about the liability and ramifications this would have on NACURH Leadership.
   b) GL - withdraws second
   c) IA - withdraws motion

23. NCO - is not disagreeing that we should be active bystanders and we recognize that this is regarding conferences and institutional policies and practices and this piece by our understanding is saying that, on behalf of NACURH, Inc., and those who are representing, and would have to recognize these and report them, our COs do not have the ability to do that, and some of us do not have that ability, we appreciate those who do, but we are extremely concerned.

24. SW - if a person operating behalf of NACURH, Inc. and has a concern they should report it, if a person has a shadow of a doubt regarding self-harm or harming others, they are expected to follow some sort of reporting procedures before even getting involved in those situations, it is workable, and at this time, we think that we should start this conversation early, the piece encourages bystander intervention rather than being a bystander and ensures that our students are being taken care of, or have some intention of getting aid to them, think education can come soon and that is important, but as the piece is, it is something to get the ball rolling on those things.

25. MA - believes that this piece should happen, believes that NACURH Leadership should be expected to report these sorts of things, but echoes the sentiments of the NCO that there needs to be continual thought and development of training on these issues, there are people who view this as something that is easy to do who may have previous experiences that enable them but not everybody does and we can potentially cause more harm because we don’t know how to respond to them but only that we are to report.
26. GL - this feels like a standard piece of policy you would see for a corporation, puts the liability on the individual in the situation or the host institution rather than NACURH as a corporation, understand the training components but also understand the importance of a policy like this for our corporation.

27. NE - would like to highlight that the piece says that Leadership would have to report to the appropriate party and it is just that.

28. NCO - bystander is a word used in training, liability can fall on a person with this piece of legislation passing, someone could talk to you if they have concern, but there is nothing in policy saying to go to you or what you could do to that, I am concerned about the assumptions that are being made, and would encourage this to be failed or tabled to further consider this.

29. SA - we hear the concerns of the NCO but we also hear the sentiments of the room and we feel assured that we will receive training within the next year and would strongly encourage a vote.

30. CA - moves to end discussion
   a) PA - seconds, withdrawn
      (1) SW - dissent, would like to propose an amendment
   b) SA - seconds
   c) Vote 4-4-0, Chair does not cast a vote, motion dies

31. SW - moves to amend
   a) NE - seconds
   b) Proponent speech
      (1) Feel like there is a general sentiment of favor in this room but also feel that a plan for action expectation could strengthen the piece as a whole.
   c) Q&A
      (1) IA - have you thought about the training level of the NACURH Executives and training on bystander intervention?
         (a) Would not expect that the students would be providing the education but that they would be making a plan to present that education responsibly.
      (2) PA - question yielded to authors, if this were to pass, would you have time to do this immediately?
         (a) We are prepared to do this regardless
      (3) GL - moves to end Q&A
         (a) SA - seconds
   d) Discussion
(1) CA - while the Central Atlantic believes this amendment tackles the sentiment of the room, do not believe this addresses our primary concerns with this piece, do not see this amendment as necessary.

(2) IA - moves to end discussion

e) Vote

(1) 3-4-1, amendment fails

32. NE - calls the question

a) MA - dissent, feels that we have something important to share

33. GL - yield

34. MA - in favor of this piece, believe that the Executives will make a commitment to ensuring this training will happened but are concerned with the general minimizations of concerns for this piece, believe that there are larger items of concern to be considered.

35. IA - agree with MACURH, but also agree that this is a way past people seeing something and saying nothing, are not in total agreement but want to assure the room that this is not simple and would create a foundation for something that is not the easiest to consider without other perspectives.

36. PA - based on the conversations in the room PACURH feels like we would like to table this piece to be heard finally tomorrow.

37. NCO - believe there is also an aspect for consideration missing regarding institutional policies being required to be provided, believe in the current Executives but also think this could continue to be a focus without this piece passing.

38. CA - feel like we have been talking in circles for half an hour and would like to see a motion to table or vote.

39. PA - moves to table

a) NE - seconds

THURSDAY, MAY 24, 2018

I. Call to order at 8:08 AM PST

II. NBD MM18-80 | NACURH Swaps

A. NE - moves to bring MM18-80 to the floor

1. PA - seconds

B. Proponent Speech

1. Following up from a piece tabled at Semis, think the Swap experience is valuable in NACURH, found that there are no clear outcomes in policy for this experience when people swap, want intentionality instead of people just going to conferences for friends/the experience without contributing, want benchmarks for the swap experience, proposing adding a wrap-up
report for the Regional Directors involved, hope that if the wrap-up report is insufficient that steps could be taken to make sure that the next person is held more accountable, holding people accountable to bringing something back to their regions, hoping that this will make swaps about more than personal learning and development and be a cross-regional learning opportunity, have done a lot of reflection in the 360 Evaluation process, want a similar process for reflection and implementation, writing down ideas helps to hold people accountable, will encourage sharing best practices across regions, Chair shared an old swap guide with us so we took ideas from that and added on, the biggest thing we are hoping to eliminate is variability in the experiences for people swapping.

C. Q&A

1. SA - do you all see a template being created for this wrap-up report? Is it up to the person writing it or could there be a standardized form?
   a) Think it could be realistic to have a JotForm or something for this, would not want the report to be long or extensive, just thoughts, ideas, and reflections compiled.

2. IA - what is the accountability process for someone who doesn’t submit this form?
   a) Would be up for discussion, intentionally left that vague, don’t want to assume the appropriate level of repercussion, could see it being that the person is not allowed to swap again without further reflection, think there should be some accountability.
   b) IA - follow up, with this, in addition to the accountability piece, could the Regional Director of the region to where a person has swapped hold the person who swapped accountable if the Regional Director didn’t find the report sufficient?
      (1) Didn’t think about it from that perspective, were thinking about how this could be developed further in the new Exec structure, purpose for sending the report to the second Director would be for them to see what a person learned from attending a conference with their region, not judging as much as gaining additional information.

3. CA - would this apply to Execs and NCO members attending conferences?
   a) No, not attending conferences as swaps.

4. NCO - why are the Annual Conference Chair and NBD Liaison being removed from the list of people eligible to participate in swaps?
   a) Those two are currently written twice in policy, just updating syntax.
   b) NAA - is likely a formatting error and can just be removed.
5. SA - since our regional entities do not fund the swap experience and some institutions will sponsor this, have you considered how campus-level requirements for a person would align with this new process?
   a) Think if its only at the institutional level, that would not guarantee the cross-regional learning and collaboration, if needed people could still submit a summary to their institution, see a chance that if host institutions are funding these experiences they may be more willing with these additional requirements.

6. MA - did you take into other learning styles when writing this? Why did you choose three weeks for creating this report?
   a) I think an extension could be appropriate if someone needed one, these reports would be happening at hectic times, it is reasonable that a person may need additional time.
   b) MA - follow up, should they have to be able to ask for an extension? Like is time of the essence or is this focused more on learning outcomes?
      (1) Definitely more about the learning outcomes but at least before the next conference people should be expected to submit these, or the next retreat, etc., we are open to more time but wanted to make sure the experience is fresh and people are actually reflecting on learning as soon as possible.

7. PA - since this is an additional experience, and if students were funding this out of their own pocket, where does NACURH lay in saying that “you funded this experience yourself but we are requiring you to complete this additional work?”
   a) Think that is fair but looking at the requirements it’s just five things, you might already be doing this reflection, I have done this already in my swap experience, could literally be two sentences, doesn’t need to be that extensive, you could do this at the conference, the registration is also covered by the region so NACURH is not completely separated funding-wise, the intention is focused on learning and education.

8. NCO - did you consider potentially doing a video report or some other medium instead of a formal, traditional, written report?
   a) We are open to that, talked about other mediums as well, easily could remove the written part to allow that to be open for interpretation.

9. CA - did you envision anything being done with these reports, potentially like uploading them to the NACURH Connection?
   a) Hoping Directors would provide a space to share learning, if you really want people to bring learning back to the region you all should be working in tandem, want to bring that knowledge back,
could upload these to the NACURH Connection, not just the Connection but maybe this report could be sent out to, or other sharing for example I wrote an article for our regional newsletter.

10. IA - why did you choose three for the positional and two for the regional takeaways?
   a) Decided on more for the position because if the region had the same amount that is fine but usually people are thinking more from the perspective of their own positions, think that the swap application usually talks more about positional goals and learning than goals for the region.

11. MA - was there discussion about a word count for these reports or is more about what people want to write?
   a) Wanted to leave that open, getting at different styles, some people like to write a lot while others like to leave things short, especially because it could also spark conversations rather than seeing reports as a complete and total summary.

12. IA - moves to end Q&A
   a) GL - seconds

D. Discussion

a) SA - really appreciates this piece and the thought put into it, are concerned about the requirements being added for people how are most often paying their own money for these experiences, this conversation has come up a few times though so we are happy to see some action.

b) IA - moves to caucus for three minutes
   (1) NE - seconds

c) IA - supports this piece because we think it will be interesting to have a benchmark process for swaps and this can help demystify things about swaps, specifically saying we’re going to expect things from you as a swap because of pre-existing relationships, but we are still a little concerned about the accountability measures and those mentioned by other members, we also agree with the PACURH regarding paying out of pocket and adding additional responsibilities, we see no hesitation about this but are also mindful of proposed concerns.

d) GL - feel that the swap experience is impactful for members, this could help share regional practices, provides a good structure to share experiences, uploading these documents to the NACURH Connection could be exciting, like that this sets a structural foundation for swapping.

e) MA - yield question to NAA, does each region cover registration for their swaps but not travel?
(1) Yes, every region pays for registration as a part of the conference budget, per policy NACURH/regions do not fund swap travel.

f) NE - calls the question

(1) GL - dissent, there has been limited discussion for such a large piece.

g) NCO - after going to many different conferences we have seen a variety of swaps, would you be open to amending this to have a report overall instead of a specific written report?

h) SA - does not feel like we need to change the structure, “written” includes a lot of different mediums.

i) IA - moves to amend

(1) GL - seconds

(2) Proponent Speech

(a) After hearing the sentiments of the Office agree that there are different ways to share and reflect on learning, allows people to have some creativity and avoids limiting reports to written mediums.

(3) Q&A

(a) GL - for syntax, can we also change point c to “share?”

(i) Yes

(b) SA - So if someone’s learning style is to discuss it, where is the proof of reflection taking place?

(i) As previously mentioned, we could have these uploaded to the NACURH Connection, since the Connection supports it, but at the end of the day, it is going to the Director who hosted a swap, at the end of the day, there still will be sharing, but the medium is not of the most important.

(c) SA - moves to end Q&A

(i) PA - seconds

(4) Discussion

(a) MA - are in favor of this amendment and keeping learning styles and processing in mind, like that it does not specify what is best for processing.

(b) SW - also in favor because this incorporates learning styles and makes this reflection more accessible to all members of NACURH Leadership.

(c) NCO - calls the question
(5) Vote
   (a) 7-1-0, amendment passes
j) SW - a friendly amendment should be made to point b, changing region to entity.
   (1) NAA - would be updated, syntax
k) IA - after amending, we are in full support and are excited because this is a portion of NACURH that has required further consideration for some time.
l) IA - calls the question
2. Vote
   a) 8-0-0, motion carries

III. **NBD MM18-84 | Policies & Practices Task Force**
   A. NE - moves to bring MM18-84 to the floor
      1. PA - seconds
   B. Proponent Speech
      1. This is proposing a slight shift in one of our current annual task forces in NACURH, would add a policies and practices committee that is more formal and outlined in policy, thought originally this would be a cool way for ADAFs to connect with the NAA by being required to sit on this committee, that said recognize that not all ADAFs may be passionate about policy and legislative practices as much as finances so instead changed it to at least one person per entity, excited about opening this experience up to other interested members of NACURH Leadership like COs looking to further policy experience, think it may be helpful to have someone responsible for reviewing the equity and inclusivity of policies and practices within NACURH on an ongoing basis, this committee would be made up of only NACURH Leadership members and be filled along with the other fall task forces in NACURH, removes policies and practices from the annual list of NACURH task forces.
   C. Q&A
      1. GL - do you think people would participate in this committee? How could people be held accountable? What would the committee look like if participation did drop off?
         a) I agree that that is something worth considering, generally we see with committees and task forces that people quit or drop off midway through the way, think that we will need to investigate the larger problem of accountability for task forces, this is intended to create spaces for dialogue with this committee, if the committee were to be successful that would be great, but if no one participated we would just continue to have the policies we already have now, considered but didn’t seem this as reason
enough not to move forward with what we see to be an otherwise exciting idea.

2. IA - do you have any specific goals that you want this committee to focus on when starting?
   a) Not necessarily when they are first starting, am generally not a proponent of increasing legislation in NACURH for legislation sake, when we started the year I did not want a policies and practices task force for that reason, if you go looking for things to change in the NACURH policy book you will be able to find them, don’t think that is the end all, be all of the work we do in NACURH, don’t want committee to overlegislate, think we may see some excess legislation in this first year of implementation, but the idea of having the committee give recommendations for the next year would be that there would be connection and continuation from year to year and in turn limit excess legislation.

3. CA - in what way do you foresee this committee affecting regional policy?
   a) Don’t see this as being an opportunity for the NACURH Executives to tell regions to change their policies without further discussion, would maybe instead have the committee discuss discrepancies between regions and NACURH and investigate opportunities for increasing equity.
   b) CA - follow up, do you see this replacing any regional policies and practices committee?
      (1) Did not really think about it like that, could go either way, in my region we had a legislation and development committee for members to participate with, think that that could be continued if that made the most sense for the region.

4. MA - moves to end Q&A
   a) NCO - seconds

D. Discussion

1. MA - acknowledge the root of the problem for this and that NACURH might have some inequitable policies and practices, also acknowledge that we as individuals might not have the ability to challenge those, but we are interested in seeing how, based on recommendations, people are reaching out for sage advice.

2. GL - are excited for this piece, believe this could provide an avenue for people who may not know how to interact with NACURH policy to learn more, also think this could allow more people to make intentional legislative changes, think this could also create meaningful connections between regions and legislation.

3. CA - wanted to highlight what MACURH was talking about with creating equitable policies and practices, also think that this could be great
training for individuals in their interests, could help individuals to learn strategies for investigating their own regional policies to be streamlined and accessible.

4. SW - current we have a Bylaws and Policy Book task force in SWACURH, each year that has been beneficial for our region and think that this could similarly help NACURH move our policies and practices forward.

5. IA - calls the question

E. Vote
   1. 8-0-0, motion carries

IV. NBD 18-85 | NAA Position Updates
   A. GL - moves to bring 18-85 back to the floor
      1. NE - seconds
   B. Proponent Speech
      1. Talked with the NCO about this piece and the marketing component, are bringing the piece back as is, feel that “oversee” implies oversight but not full control, will ensure that there is collaboration between the NAA and other Execs/the NCO, are excited about the other aspects of this piece which have been left the same as well.
   C. Q&A
      1. IA - moves to end Q&A
         a) NE - seconds
   D. Discussion
      1. IA - overall support this piece and appreciate the NAA getting some face time with members of NACURH Leadership, specifically the ADAFs.
      2. MA - in support, also like the connection to the ADAFs to provide better support.
      3. NE - calls the question
   E. Vote
      1. 8-0-0, motion carries

V. NBD 18-79 | NACURH Graduate Student Advisor of the Year Award
   A. IA - moves to bring 18-79 back to the floor
      1. GL - seconds
   B. Proponent Speech
      1. This piece has not changed since it was first heard, thought about the opportunities that the addition of this award could present for NACURH, feel like recognition is warranted in this area, are not trying to address a larger graduate student experience in NACURH and think this is instead more about recognition, would like this to be an award for the NACURH level.
C. Q&A

1. IA - is this currently in SAACURH’s regional policy?
   a) Not currently but it is being added/considered at this conference.

2. NCO - would you be willing to assess the need for this bid category?
   a) Sure.

3. SA - are there any financial issues or implications with adding this award that could impact NACURH?
   a) This award would be added to the Annual Conference budget for the award plaque.

4. NCO - moves to end Q&A
   a) NE - seconds

D. Discussion

1. IA - are still not in support of this piece, still maintain our prior concerns, are interested in seeing this on a regional level before the NACURH level, would like to see an evaluation of the need for this bid category, also feel that using one region’s perspectives to create an entirely new award category does not seem right.

2. PA - in a similar situation as the Intermountain, have a very small number of graduate student advisors in our region, feel like this would create another opportunity for PACURH to not be represented on the NACURH level.

3. SA - speaking on my own behalf, there are a lot of graduate students who serve under our organization, mold student leaders, and provide opportunities for growth, as someone who recently graduated, this would have been nice to have the recognition, sometimes you can get lost in the professional world among those who work 40+ hours per week.

4. SW - still in support of this piece, saw a need for this in our region and passed this at our business conference, could also be in support of this being added regionally before NACURH-wide.

5. CA - agrees with SWACURH, don’t currently have this in our region but see this as something that could fill a need or want in our region since we do have a large population of graduate student advisors, would be interested in implementing this, we would prefer to implement this at the regional level and then have it pushed to the NACURH level if fitting.

6. GL - not in support of this piece at this time, believe there should be further conversations about how this award could be different than the traditional NACURH Advisor of the Year award on the NACURH level.

7. SA - would like the room to consider how graduate students are currently recognized within NACURH’s awards.

8. IA - in our region, we have an extremely limited amount of Graduate Student advisors, based on institutional practices, graduate student
advisors in our region are eligible for our regional advisor of the year award generally, would like to further consider increasing graduate student advisor recognition for graduate student advisors, don’t think this should be an award for the NACURH level.

9. PA - while this might not be the best fit for PACURH, we do appreciate the additional recognition and hear the sentiments of the room, currently support this piece to provide additional support to others.

10. SA - yield question to the Great Lakes, would you be more in favor of this piece if it included academic components?
   a) From conversations yesterday, we talked about graduate students and the interesting line that they straddle in the organization, GLACURH feels that replicating the NACURH Advisor of the Year qualifications would help with some of the concerns presented, but don’t know if a GPA requirement would do that, would like to see further conversation had, not trying to downplay recognition but want to ensure that we are being intentional with NACURH award bids.

11. CA - yield question to SWACURH, as a region who has this already in policy, how does your criteria differentiate between the two advisor award types?
   a) The criteria is the same for the most part between the two awards.

12. MA - appreciates this being brought to the floor and feel that there needs to be further consideration for this on the regional level before implementing in NACURH.

13. NCO - calls the question
   a) GL - dissent, would like to caucus

14. GL - moves to caucus for three minutes
   a) NE - seconds

15. IA - after more deliberation, IACURH still does not support this piece, we would like to see more regional assessment if there is an overall regional need for this award including assessing regional success since it hasn’t started yet on the regional level, in addition, feel that this has greater financial and conference implication for just the NACURH level, feel that this could add an award just to add an award and would be open to recognizing graduate students overall instead of just graduate student advisors.

16. GL - also still not in support of this piece, do not believe at this time that moving forward with a graduate student advisor award is what makes the most sense for NACURH, would be more in favor of a graduate student of the year award generally, do not think this will be beneficial.

17. CA - echo sentiments of GLACURH and IACURH, also talked about a graduate student of the year award being added with advising as a
selection criterion, still think that regional implementation would be a better first step than bringing this to the NACURH level.

18. GL - calls the question
   a) SA - dissent, would like to make a discussion point

19. SA - in conversations with the CRC we asked about historical context, do support the consideration of regional implementation, also recognize that there are regional awards that do not go to the NACURH level and see students asking about the value of bidding for those awards when they are not supported or considered at the NACURH level.

20. GL - calls the question

E. Vote
   1. 3-5-0, motion fails

VI. NBD MM18-28 | NACURH Travel Policies
   A. NCO - moves to bring MM18-28 to the floor
      1. GL - seconds
   B. Proponent Speech
      1. This is another follow-up from a piece we heard at Semis, first and foremost we separated out the mileage reimbursement policy which we heard earlier this week because we wanted to make it clear that this piece is not about money but rather the safety of our student leaders, are proposing adding a few new things that have not happened in the past and recognize this will change the way NACURH Leadership travel to and from conferences, encourage you all to think about this from a NACURH perspective rather than from your own personal positions, at Semis there was some confusion shared over regional vs. NACURH oversight, have separated that out (highlighted in blue), travel to and from NACURH conferences would need to be discussed with the CRC and Chair and then travel to and from regional conferences would need to be discussed with the Director and entity Advisor, all other components were left the same from Semis.

C. Q&A
   1. CA - as NAA, how would you interpret “consecutively?”
      a) Consecutively seems very clear to me, could change the word if you would prefer something else, a stop or a break would break up the time limits, just working to prevent one person from driving more than six hours without a break, would expect a reasonable reprieve, not just a quick break like stopping for gas, etc.
   2. IA - what constitutes a break?
      a) Truthfully think that it would be difficult to put that into policy, “break” could look different for different people, ultimately what I have seen is that people are often put in positions by their Boards
where they HAVE to drive long distances they are not totally comfortable with, there are opportunities for this policy to be waived, when I was on an RBD we were a driving region and driving 7-8 hours at a time was maybe not always what was best but that was what happened and there was no place in policy to advocate otherwise, want to err on the side of protecting the safety of members of NACURH Leadership.

3. SA - have you considered consulting policies for truck drivers or other regulations in place for people who drive for a living?
   a) No, not how we approached this piece, we already had the 400 mile limit in practice and the precedent for a mileage limit in policy, not changing that component just making sure that it is clear that it applies to all travel on behalf of NACURH and regions, true changes and additions here are expecting people to follow policies at all times while driving, traveling, etc.

4. MA - was point 3c already in policy previously?
   a) Yes, text in plain black indicates an existing policy, just changing the formatting.

5. GL - moves to end Q&A
   a) NCO - seconds

D. Discussion

1. IA - when this piece was heard at Semis IA took into consideration the fact that we have a large landmass, it usually takes us at least six hours to travel to any conference/retreat, however after chatting and thinking about risk management as well as what a break could be, feel like even the distance from Reno, NV to Las Vegas, NV is approximately eight hours and would require a break, so, as a flying region, we are in support of this piece.

2. GL - also still in support of this piece, appreciate the further clarification, like the distinction between NACURH and regional travel.

3. CA - we really appreciate the NAA’s answer to IACURH’s question and hope this will lead to a shift in expectations for NACURH Leadership to promote travel practices that align with espoused self-care expectations.

4. SW - calls the question
   a) NE - dissent, wanted to make a discussion point

5. NE - are concerned about the math of 400 miles, if this is passed we would need to increase our budget for our upcoming RLC, 400 miles is just not a great number for us.

6. PA - are in support of this piece, feel it is already reflective of our regional practices and could benefit other regions.

7. SA - are still somewhat confused, are we still saying that travel can only happen from a person’s home or institution?
a) NAA - home, institution, or permanent place of residence, want to make sure that people are not flying to other locations at an increased cost on behalf of NACURH.

b) SA - and travel would only conclude when an individual returns to their home. Institution, or regular place of residence, what happens if they are traveling but no longer under NACURH’s jurisdiction?

   (1) NAA - if NACURH paid for the travel than the individual would be expected to follow NACURH policies, the flight back to your end destination is a part of NACURH travel, could be changed on a case-by-case basis but would need to be a conversation.

c) SA - does the fact that the exemption is in section 1 make it still apply to later sections?

   (1) NAA - yes

8. IA - the part about “all driving over 400 miles needs to be approved,” does that mean all driving in general, even with a break?
   a) NAA - I would hope someone driving any distance over 400 miles would be having a conversation about this, think the technical answer is no, but like that is a large trip and should warrant some additional consideration.

9. MA - yield question to the author, can you imagine/describe a scenario where a trip is 401 miles and the limit is 400, how would this be approved, can you describe a situation where travel would not be covered?

   a) Sure, when I was on a Regional Board I went to school in Iowa, the trip from Purdue University to my school was close to 400 miles, I remember texting the Chairperson at the time, checked in and said yes, approval was very easy, we are not trying to create symantec conversations around small differences in distance, for the second part of your question, if a waiver is not granted and a trip is over 400 miles, a waiver would need to be signed by the individual travel, no need to sign a waiver if an approval is granted, NACURH/regions would not pay for travel in a situation where an individual is not granted a waiver but chooses to drive anyway.

   b) NAF - not about the money necessarily, if NACURH is saying that it is not safe for an individual to drive than they should not take on the expense or liability related to that travel.

10. NE - yield

11. CA - calls the question

E. Vote

   1. 6-2-0, motion carries
VII. GL - moves to recess for 10 minutes
   A. IA - seconds

VIII. Who Is NACURH Task Force Presentation

IX. Ceremonies Overview

X. Corporate Overview

FRIDAY, MAY 25, 2018

I. Call to order at 8:50 AM PST

II. Annual Conference Selection

   A. Indiana University Bloomington
      1. Presentation
      2. Q&A

         a) NE - what do you want delegates to take away from this conference?
            (1) First is to recognize they don’t need to compartmentalize leadership experiences, you can draw on all leadership experiences, second would be recognizing and utilizing identity in leadership experiences.

         b) Annual Conference - see that your sponsorship goal is $90,000, can you please touch on your plans for reaching that goal?
            (1) IU is lucky, we have strong relationships with other student governments and student organizations, our Housing Department has also agreed to give a subsidy on housing as well, formed a partnership with Coca Cola who would compensate the dining cost, Student Life and Learning office will also give sponsorships, the Provost office, Administration office, and others are people we would hope to get additional funding from.

         c) NCO - the NCO usually hosts a store during the Annual conference weekend, what kind of space would you have available for a store during the conference weekend?
            (1) Would want to have the Store in conference headquarters which would be close to housing as well.

         d) GL - the Semi-Annual Business Meeting for the NACURH Boards usually happens in January, do you have any plans for this meeting?
            (1) We started looking at conference plans for Semis, would have housing in the same locations as the Annual Conference.

         e) NE - what unique aspect would your school bring to a conference weekend?
The history of our school as well as the community IU brings, will be all hands on deck, we will have cultural centers worked into the conference weekend, international student affairs in addition to residence life to provide a holistic experience.

f) IA - wondering if you could elaborate more on sustainability practices you have planned for the conference weekend?

(1) Sustainability is something IU has focused on heavily in the past three years, are in transition still, cannot give definitive answers about what this would look like in one year but we are working on more conference specific practices like composting.

g) NE - what are your plans for the social justice and inclusion track/social and what would that track entail?

(1) Would be for anyone who has an interest in learning more about social justice, everyone would be welcome, would want someone to ask questions and become informed on topics around identity.

h) GL - moves to extend Q&A by five minutes

(1) SA - seconds

i) IA - for your philanthropy, mentioned you would be collecting donations that would be connected to spirit points, how will you include institutions who cannot participate?

(1) Would collect in-kind donations prior to the conference that would be counted as well.

j) NAA - hosting a conference is a large undertaking that requires significant time and collaboration, can you touch on your plans for bringing an effective team?

(1) I would meet with individuals on campus who have the ability to video chat to start conference planning as soon as possible on things that would need to happen now, will also meet bi-weekly as a conference staff and begin recruiting additional staff members as soon as students are back on campus.

k) SA - at NACURH 2017, regional breakout was scheduled for over an hour as well as for this conference, see that you have planned less time, would you be open to extending time for regional breakout?

(1) Yes, the schedule proposed will be up for negotiation and changes based on feedback from NACURH, am hoping for a lot of feedback from people who have attended conferences.
l) CA - wondering for the people traveling from the airport to your campus, do you have any plans for supporting that transportation?
   
   (1) Do have a relationship with GO Express, when asking delegations about travel plans we would connect them to this resource, GO Express only runs at certain times so we would plan to get additional buses to compensate.

m) PA - in the budget we did not see too much mentioned about the Semi-Annual Business meeting, is this included in your budgeting plans?
   
   (1) A separate budget for Semis is still being finalized.

n) NCO - thank you for providing a map, were wondering if you could expand on the holistic travel/walking required and any plans you have for signage/directions?
   
   (1) Don’t have a firm answer for that at this time, that is something I could look up and send more details about if needed, for signage we have this accounted for in the budget.

o) Annual Conference - could you touch on your plans for technology for the programming spaces?
   
   (1) All classrooms will have projectors and screens for presentations, accessible to laptops, also have speakers if needed.

p) SW - during the corporate business meeting this year we are facilitating separate RHA President roundtable sessions, wondering if you all would have space to accommodate that?
   
   (1) Yes, the roundtables could either be held in the programming spaces or our memorial union depending on what space is needed for programming.

q) Annual Conference - moves to extend Q&A
   
   (1) MA - seconds

r) GL - what inspired your conference staff to bid for this conference?
   
   (1) Two main reasons, the first, IU has not been very active in NACURH in the past which has been frustrating, want to revitalize our university, RHA, and NRHH, want to let our university see the benefits of being involved, also a few on our campus have complained about conferences, see this as a way to humble members on campus.

s) SA - since 2011, there has not been an Annual Conference that has not been less than $200 per person, was wondering if you could expand on your cost and other things that may not yet be reflected here yet?
A lot of the costs we have factored in have been negotiated already, cost is low due to sponsorships for housing and dining.

t) SW - for registration, we were wondering if you could create or consider a system for accepting alternate delegates?

   (1) Alternate delegates will be welcome, are very aware of emergencies.

u) PA - do you have any plans for adjusting meal times to account for delegates traveling from different time zones?

   (1) Yes, we are planning to stagger meal times to represent time changes.

v) GL - how do you envision working with your staff to overcome the time you have lost in the conference bidding and planning process?

   (1) First, we are very dedicated, an indicator of this is what we have been able to put together in the time allotted, we will meet more frequently than what probably would have been expected, we will have more volunteers and more professional staff in an effort to have all hands on deck.

w) CA - looking at your budget, we were wondering about the planned amount for your add on fee?

   (1) NAF - the add on fee for NACURH 2018 is $17, which is what they currently have budgeted.

x) IA - wondering if you could expand on your spirit plans/items for throughout the conference?

   (1) For Sunday during the time between travel/activities we are planning a spirit swap which is picking another institution to wear their spirit items.

y) NAA - at the Annual Conference there is typically an advisor social that is sponsored by OCM, do you have plans to accommodate this social or could you elaborate on your plans for socials?

   (1) The advisor social could take place in the memorial union, the layouts are smaller but are a good size for socials.

z) MA - moves to exhaust the speakers list

   (1) IA - seconds

aa) MA - what are you most excited about for this conference?

   (1) All of it, am excited to see everyone’s expression when they arrive on campus, also excited to see how everyone displays their institution through spirit, displays, and programs, feel like that would look different from the hosting perspective.
bb) SW - wondering what you foresee as one of the biggest challenges in hosting a conference and how you plan to overcome that challenge?

(1) IU is a large campus with many small buildings, the hardest part will be making sure that we get reservations in for all of the spaces we need, while we have the spaces, there are not a lot of backup spaces available on campus.

c) NCO - in your bid I saw from your timeline that you plan to have your conference website go live in January, could this happen sooner?

(1) Yes, we are flexible and open to anything.

d) IA - in your bid the only plan you list for marketing is a Snapchat geofilter, what other plans do you have for marketing and outreach?

(1) This is something that not many people on the bid team are experienced with, am hoping to connect with other schools and connect with Regional Directors for outreach ideas, for the financial piece, I am not sure what this would look like yet.

e) IA - wondering if you could expand on your plans for the conference banners collected?

(1) It wouldn’t be sewing, it would just be you making a 3x3 quilt for individual schools to work on like a piece of a quilt.

f) PA - wanted to know if you could elaborate more on your plans for accessibility and ADA accommodations?

(1) In terms of ramps and doors, everything is accessible, the only thing we don’t have is hearing impaired doorbells for housing spaces, everything else is already in place at our university, if there is an accommodation that is needed that can be planned for.

3. Pro/Con

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Institutional spirit</td>
<td>• Sustainability practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dining options</td>
<td>• Short regional breakout time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spirit plans</td>
<td>• Programing plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staggered meal times</td>
<td>• Unknown distances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Acknowledges challenges</td>
<td>• Unsure about reservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social justice and inclusion initiatives</td>
<td>Unfamiliar with ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit innovation</td>
<td>Unclear social justice goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introspective bid theme</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) IA - moves to end pro/con
   (1) NE - seconds

B. Indiana State University
   1. Presentation
   2. Q&A
      a) GL - what inspired your team to bid to host the NACURH Annual conference?
         (1) Mustafa Mustafa, a student at our school, is a ball of energy and inspired us.
      b) PA - what is your plan to organize the dog toy philanthropy?
         (1) Using Goodwill donation bins and other donation collection practices throughout the year to have extra t-shirts and ensure enough supplies.
      c) SA - what do you feel may be the biggest challenge you will need to overcome in planning this conference?
         (1) Our biggest challenge so far has been securing the mass gathering site, unsure of construction plans but do have a backup plan in place.
      d) SW - yield to redundancy
      e) GL - how do you foresee making up for lost time when planning this conference?
         (1) Feel like we have put together a successful bid and think that from here we are prepared to begin the traditional planning process, also have a lot of support from our department and central staff.
      f) Annual Conference - can you elaborate on ADA accommodations and housing spaces?
         (1) Currently ISU is already accommodating to all of needs, will use processes in place for supporting any delegate needs for housing, dining, ceremonies, etc.
      g) NE - what unique aspects will your school bring to the NACURH Annual Conference?
         (1) Something unique that ISU plans to bring is that our campus is centrally located, short walking distances
between conference spaces, plan to focus on the delegate experience throughout the conference, housing spaces will have social spaces, etc., small campus with a lot of space for conference meetings and other needs.

h) SA - moves to extend by 5 minutes
   (1) GL - seconds

i) IA - could you expand on your plans for sustainability initiatives for the conference?
   (1) ISU has strong recycling options available on campus, planning to go straw free for the conference.

j) PA - in your bid you included a plan for a social justice social; what are the goals for that social?
   (1) The person planning programming tracks is not here, don’t have more information, if you would like I can have that person follow up with more information via email.

k) SA - would you consider rethinking regional breakout time to allow more time since this is shorter than past conferences?
   (1) Yes, that could definitely be accommodated.

l) NCO - was wondering about your thought process for separating delegates and advisors in their housing spaces.
   (1) Talked about that a lot with our advisors and they were okay with this plan, it is a very short walking distance between the two spaces, wanted to give students and advisors breaks from one another and time to connect with other delegates, the advisor rooms also have in-room bathrooms while the delegate restrooms are community bathrooms.

m) SW - do you have any ideas for how you could support RHA President roundtable sessions?
   (1) I don’t believe we currently have a plan in place for those sessions.

n) Annual Conference - could you expand on the distances between the buildings you are planning to use for your conference? Particularly, the distance between housing, mass gatherings, and programming spaces?
   (1) Yes, walked these distances recently to explore the timing, housing and programming spaces are all around five minutes away from one another, the mass gatherings space is the furthest away and is no more than a 10 minute walk.

o) IA - how to you plan to implement and integrate NRHH within your programming tracks?
(1) As an institution we value recognition, would continue to support the recognition and service values of NRHH, want to work closely with our NRHH chapter.

p) IA - can you talk about some general ideas you have to ensure your conference prioritizes social justice and inclusion?

(1) Currently on our campus we hire social justice educators, we would like to work with professionals in this area to support ISU's values of inclusivity and social justice throughout the conference.

q) GL - moves to extend Q&A by five minutes

(1) MA - seconds

r) NE - do you have any plans for hosting socials during your conference, and if so, can you expand on the details for those socials?

(1) The chair for socials is not here but I have been working with them to secure spaces for socials, want to ensure that there is ample space for socials across themes.

s) MA - could you elaborate on your plans for dining throughout the conference and how you will accommodate dietary needs?

(1) Have been working with Dining on campus, we have a large variety of options available, will plan to accommodate any needs and plan meal settings based on needs indicated through registration, also plan to have dining company staff available and present throughout meals to provide support and answer questions.

t) PA - how do you intend to accommodate for institutions coming from different time zones? Particularly on the first day of the conference?

(1) We would like to plan the conference to begin and be scheduled to account for time zones, will extend hospitality times on the first night and end events earlier to provide extra sleeping time for people coming from different time zones.

u) SW - in consideration of your delegate cap, do you plan to set up a process for allowing alternate delegates from larger institutions?

(1) We can account for alternate delegates through the registration process, would depend on the delegate cap set at Semis.

v) CA - are you planning to work with a bus company to lower the cost for commuting delegates to the conference from the airport, and if so, will this be reflected in the budget?
ISU actually works with this company throughout the school year, would plan to look into securing sponsorships to lower costs associated.

NAA - planning and hosting a conference takes considerable time and collaboration, what plans do you have for building and strengthening the team throughout the planning process?

One idea is that we are planning to facilitate a conference staff retreat at the Sycamore outdoor retreat center overnight in an effort to build relationships and plan for the year.

GL - moves to exhaust the speaker’s list

CA - seconds

Annual conference - could you expand on any plans to reach out to local businesses for sponsorships?

We do have a sponsorship chair who has been working on making letters and reaching out to businesses with the support of one of our conference advisors, would like to make different tiered sponsorship packages.

NCO - do you have any ideas for a space where the Corporate Office could host their store during the conference?

Do not have any set plans for that at this point but certainly have space available and would be able to accommodate the Store.

SA - could you talk more about your regional breakout spaces and capacities?

Are planning to use some of the larger mass gathering spaces, larger classrooms, variety of space sizes which we can plan based on regional size.

SA - do you have the capacity for 100 people or more?

Yes

PA - yield to redundancy

IA - could you expand more on ADA accommodations?

ISU already has ADA accommodations available throughout campus, would plan to use accessible spaces, have already began reaching out to people to accommodate hearing or sight needs.

3. Pro/Con

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Support of local</td>
<td>• Sustainability initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Facility contingency plans</td>
<td>● Delegated integration of social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Conference space distances</td>
<td>● Short regional breakout times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● ADA compliance</td>
<td>● NRHH programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Incorporation of theme</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● First-year delegate social</td>
<td>● X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) GL - moves to end pro/con
   (1) Annual Conference - seconds

C. Louisiana State University
   1. Presentation
   2. Q&A
      a) NE - what unique experiences will your institution bring to the NACURH Annual Conference?
         (1) LSU is one of the most spirited schools within our region, very involved and committed to helping others in our region, would bring that school spirit and regional spirit to NACURH.
      b) SA - what do you foresee being your biggest challenge throughout this conference planning and hosting process and how do you intend on overcoming that?
         (1) One challenge we may face would be recruiting volunteers and additional conference staff members.
      c) IA - could you expand on your programming tracks, particularly your fun track?
         (1) The fun track would most likely include programs that are interesting and exciting for delegates but don’t clearly fit into other thematic tracks.
      d) IA - with your different programming tracks, where would NRHH programming be included?
         (1) Would anticipate adding a ninth programming track to include sessions based on NACURH’s needs, including an NRHH track.
      e) GL - what inspired you all to bid to host the NACURH Annual Conference?
Hosting a conference has always been a dream of mine, have been thinking about bidding for a few years but didn’t like my institution was ready, when this became an option knew we had to take the chance on this opportunity with the support of my school.

f) NAA - planning and hosting a conference takes considerable time and collaboration, what plans do you have for building and strengthening the team throughout the planning process?

(1) One of the things we do with our RHA and NRHH chapter now is have a plan in place with each student leader to balance studying, school, and outside commitments, would apply same approach to conference staff.

g) NE - what do you hope would be the biggest takeaway for delegates who attend your conference?

(1) Having fun is one of the most important things, want to ensure that programming tracks speak to the delegates needs and provide opportunities for learning, also want to showcase Louisiana State University.

h) Annual Conference - what is the capacity of the dining hall since that is the only dining hall you all will be using throughout the conference weekend?

(1) That dining hall holds five hundred people, would plan for three different dining times, dinners will be held in an alternate location.

i) NCO - do you have any ideas for a space that would be able to host the NACURH Corporate Office store?

(1) Yes, would want the store to be near our check in or dining spaces to ensure high traffic and engagement from delegates.

j) SA - moves to extend Q&A by five minutes

(1) NE - seconds

k) SW - what plans do you have for accommodating RHA President roundtables during the Annual Conference?

(1) In our quadrangle we have a lot of programming spaces, could use any of those spaces for RHA President roundtables, any of these spaces could hold 200 to 1,000 people, could also use regional breakout spaces if needed.

l) SW - have you all thought about a process for institutions to register alternate delegates as it relates to your delegate cap?

(1) We will be using the west side of our campus, don’t currently have a planned delegate cap and will be able to
accommodate a large number of people, would work with the NACURH Board to set a delegate cap if needed.

m) GL - how do you envision your team being able to overcome challenges you may face in this shortened planning timeline?
   (1) Conference team members know one another well, would prioritize relationship building and team dynamics, would want to support team members, plan to have bi-weekly and monthly meetings with staffs to ensure a successful conference.

n) IA - could you expand on how your institution will work to incorporate sustainability with your conference?
   (1) LSU’s residence halls are sustainable and will support conference sustainability efforts, additionally our philanthropy projects both connect to sustainability.

o) GL - do you have a contingency plan for your philanthropy if delegates do not bring enough plastic bags?
   (1) Yes, have $500 allocated to conference philanthropy to purchase supplies if needed.

p) CA - what kind of socials are you planning to include in your conference weekend?
   (1) We would like to have the traditional socials (NCC, President, NRHH), would also look at having our RHA and NRHH pay for these, would plan for a LGBTQ+ social and presenter social as well.

q) MA - yield

r) PA - can you all expand on your plans to incorporate NRHH within your conference programming tracks?
   (1) Would anticipate working closely with our campus NRHH chapter, would like to include a variety of initiatives throughout the conference.

s) IA - can you elaborate on programming passport programs? Could you also expand on what delegates would receive from the award since $500 are allocated to this?
   (1) We have plaques we would like to give out for different programming recognition, specifically for top 20 or top 50, etc.

t) MA - moves to extend Q&A by 5 minutes
   (1) SA - seconds

u) SA - could you talk about your regional breakout spaces and their capacities?
   (1) Anticipate using a variety of spaces on campus, would plan locations for each regional breakout based on the
number of people registered per region, all spaces could hold approximately 300 to 1,000 people.

v) PA - yield to redundancy

w) IA - could you share a little more about how your institution is prioritizing social justice and inclusion in this conference?
   
   (1) All facilities are ADA accessible, LSU is the only school in the SEC with gender inclusive housing accommodations, have identity-based centers on campus what we would like to incorporate within the conference.

x) SA - could you talk about your expected delegate cap and the total capacity for the conference?
   
   (1) Have the space on campus to accommodate over 7,000 delegates, would not plan to have a delegate cap unless needed.
   
   (2) SA - with not having a delegate cap, how would you accommodate dining since there is only one dining hall being used for the conference?
   
   (a) Actually have two dining halls on campus which we would plan to include if needed based on the number of people registered.

y) GL - would members of your RHA and NRHH chapter be able to attend any of the positional socials they are sponsoring?
   
   (1) A lot of our RHA and NRHH chapter members are on the conference staff and would be involved in these socials.

z) SW - can you talk about your plans for outreach and communication for the conference?
   
   (1) Plan to continue attending regional conferences and form personal connections with regional/NACURH members, plan to continue to reach to the LSU community, would plan to send newsletters and video updates to NACURH members.

aa) IA - moves to exhaust the speakers list
   
   (1) CA - seconds

bb) IA - could you elaborate on your staff development budget line item?
   
   (1) We allocated funding to a conference staff retreat in the fall and spring to ensure staff development and preparations, may not use this full budget but have the funding set aside to build a successful team.

3. Pro/Con

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of Louisiana culture</td>
<td>Programming tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of RHA/NRHH chapters</td>
<td>NRHH plans in programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ample regional breakout time</td>
<td>Budget practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited conference team</td>
<td>Excited conference team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter socials</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional conference outreach</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) NE - moves to end pro/con
   (1) SW - seconds

D. Discussion

1. SW - moves to caucus for five minutes
   a) NE - seconds

2. NE - really appreciates time and effort presenters put in each bid, are currently in favor of Louisiana State University (LSU), not only did they do a great job with the bid, but they did a great job incorporating Louisiana culture with their planned conference.

3. NE - would also like to acknowledge the philanthropy projects for LSU, feel like they presented two interesting and unique ideas that were very much connected to their campus and local community, liked that the philanthropy activity for the conference was connected to NRHH.

4. GL - would like to acknowledge all of the schools with the given timeline, currently in support of LSU and felt their presentation was very polished, also were impressed with the philanthropy plans as well as care for relationships on their team, lastly were impressed with representation of race within their conference staff, wanted to lastly recognize both Indiana schools, would encourage Indiana University (IU) to incorporate plans for Semis.

5. IA - believe that both Indiana State University (ISU) and LSU stood out, considering the differences between bid and presentations, LSU’s presentation wowed us where ISU’s bid seemed to be better developed, overall think that the representation and intentionality of LSU’s conference plans will be exciting, LSU did seem to focus more on the Board experience where ISU seemed to focus more on the delegate experience.
6. NAF - feel like all three schools did a great job touching on the foundational pieces, wanted to remind of a few contextual errors, for example, Semis is paid for by NACURH and will not impact the total conference cost, would encourage you all to consider foundational elements of each bid and presentation.

7. SA - LSU is the only institution that presented a capacity for regional breakout spaces that would meet our region's needs, also the only institution to present ample breakout time.
   a) Chairperson - would encourage you all not to consider too heavily the times that were presented for regional breakouts, those pieces could be easily adjusted in the planning process.

8. CA - would like to acknowledge all three schools, IU’s bid and presentation were fairly complete considering the timeline, however felt their budget could have used more fine tuning, ISU’s bid was strong, loved the incorporation of their theme, also appreciated that their focus on the delegate experience was clear, thought their programming and social justice focus was lacking in bid and presentation, overall think LSU seems the most poised to host this conference and would be able to create meaningful experiences for our members.

9. Commends all three institutions for bidding, at this moment feel that IU and LSU showed the strongest ability to adapt to the needs of NACURH as compared to ISU.

10. PA - for IU, felt they had a plan for social justice and inclusion but were also concerned about their specific goals, do appreciate their plan to build a strong team dynamic for the start of their planning process, appreciated ISU’s transportation plan but were concerned that there was not a plan for the NCO space as well as ideas for incorporating social justice, do think these plans could be further developed, are in support of LSU currently but think that LSU should reconsider adding another dining facility, LSU was able to consider RHA presidents, the NCO, and plans for building a strong conference team which we appreciated.

11. MA - appreciate all institutions who took the time and stepped up to bid for the NACURH 2019 Annual Conference, feel that each institution presented the structural elements required for a successful conference, a school needs people to plan and implement a successful conference, for ISU saw their conference team as better developed, appreciated that LSU was already planning to consider the experiential components of the conference as well.

12. NAA - when thinking about what NACURH needs for the 2019 Annual Conference, had discussions about needed an institution was a strong framework and structural elements of the conference planned for, feel like two of the three institutions currently have those foundational elements planned, ISU and LSU, feel like one thing that is being overlooked is the way that ISU focused on leadership development for members which does align with NACURH’s upcoming strategic plan, but
did also appreciate LSU’s poise and preparedness for the conference and think either school would present a great experience for delegates.

(1) PA - are in support of LSU but also would like to extend support to ISU, do think that LSU’s dining plans will need to be further considered to support the number of people that would be attending the conference and ensure means are planned in a way that supports the conference experience for delegates.

(2) NCO - looking at IU, appreciate their plans for transportation and programming, would have liked to hear more information about the distance between conference spaces, for ISU liked the plan for single restrooms for advisors, as well as their theme and volunteer plans, echo sentiments about learning pieces from the NAA, concerned about bussing and breakout spaces for ISU, would like to echo support for LSU.

(3) GL - wanted to offer additional thoughts on the two Indiana schools, appreciated the thought and intentionality behind IU’s theme, were somewhat concerned about their confidence in being able to secure conference locations as well as some of the other structure elements in their plans, appreciated ISU’s intentionality in their planning, feel that ISU demonstrated an interest in continuing to connect with experts to further learn and implement the components of a successful conference.

(4) SA - would like to talk more about the Q&A sessions, feel like there was a clear difference between IU’s responses, which were more foundational, and ISU’s responses, which featured more add-on experiences.

(5) NE - would like to discuss the two Indiana schools as well, both schools presented strong bids and had delegate-centered plans, ISU had a strong team who seemed prepared and were able to answer questions.

(6) GL - moves to narrow the field to two institutions, withdrawn

   (a) SW - seconds, withdrawn

   (i) IA - dissent, feels like the room is at a clear majority and think that it is not necessary to narrow the field

(7) Annual Conference - yield to redundancy

(8) PA - wanted to recognize the delegate-centered experiences included in ISU’s bid, thought their focus on delegate learning was important.

(9) IA - calls the question
(a) PA - dissent, would like to hear further discussion

(10) PA - moves to caucus for two minutes

(a) GL - seconds

(11) CA - would like to talk about IU, feel there is a difference in perception of presenting alone vs. presented as a team, think IU would be able to host this conference if given more time.

(12) NE - fully in support of LSU, are however nervous about distance of second dining hall and additional dining options, would have also liked to hear more opportunities to integrate social justice and social experiences.

(13) IA - would like to reiterate that presentations are only one component of the Annual Conference bid process, think that LSU’s bid had little to no content in it, feel like the room is choosing the conference based solely on their presentation, would encourage reflection of bids submitted.

(14) SW - would like to point out that IU presented on a lot of positive experiential components for members that were not included in LSU’s bid.

(15) NCO - appreciate the sentiments of the Intermountain, do believe though that a lot of conference bid teams develop plans between bids and presentations, also want to acknowledge the differences in having a full team of people to help with the presentation compared to a single person.

(16) PA - would like to recognize IU for their bid, however feel like there was a lack of information regarding accessibility and are wondering how they would approach this.

(a) NAA - all universities are required to follow ADA requirements, university spaces will be ADA accessible, NACURH has ADA fund to support accommodations as needed, ADA accommodations should not be heavily considered in decision making.

(17) CA - moves to end discussion

(a) NE - seconds

b) Outcome

III. NBD 18-88 | ACUHO-I Parthenon Award

A. NE - moves to bring MM18-88 to the floor
1. PA - seconds

B. Proponent Speech

1. Andy has worked for OCM and provided diligent leadership for many years, the Parthenon award is the highest honor awarded by ACUHO-I; people recognized through this award are typically people who have worked in the field of higher education, Andy contributes through work with OCM, value our relationship with OCM and are always looking for opportunities to further our connections, Andy and OCM have contributed a lot to NACURH as well, we also value ACUHO-I and our partnership, this is a great award to contribute to in general, financially, we are proposing taking funds from the recognition/general line item, would like to make a contribution to the ACUHO-I Parthenon award on Andy’s behalf, is a secret until presented at the annual conference.

C. Q&A

1. GL - how would the funding for this award and award in general work?
   a) This would be considered a donation made on behalf of NACURH, for the Parthenon award, five people can be nominated and then contributions are made on the individual’s behalf, recognizes people who have been active in the field for at least ten years, donation would be made to ACUHO-I.

2. CA - yield to redundancy

3. IA - what is the selection criteria for this award?
   a) Must reach a fundraising amount, have already reached the required funding so this recognition will take place, more about the sentiment of the contribution.

4. SA - moves to end Q&A
   a) CA - seconds

D. Discussion

1. GL - feel that this is a great way to donate and think that this could show our appreciation for Andy and OCM.

2. IA - OCM has given a lot to our corporation, particularly for the academic scholarship, want to recognize OCM and Andy in particular, in full support.

3. NE - in support, feel that this is a perfect way to recognize a person who has positively impacted NACURH on multiple occasions.

4. CA - moves to end discussion
   a) GL - seconds

E. Vote

1. 8-0-0, motion carries