



NACURH, Inc.

2021 Semi-Annual Business Meeting

Held Virtually
January 8 - 10, 2021

Presiding Officer:

Katie Westermeyer
NACURH Chairperson

Minutes Prepared By:

Jacob Durrance
NACURH Associate for Operations

Parliamentarian:

Daniel Rudy
Central Atlantic Affiliate Associate Director for Administration and Finance

Recording Secretaries:

Becca Franssen
Intermountain Affiliate Associate Director for Administration and Finance

Adam Coshal
Northeast Affiliate Regional Director

2020-2021 NACURH Board of Directors & NACURH NRHH Board

Central Atlantic Affiliate

Dan Laffin - Regional Director
Daniel Rudy - AD-AF
Breanna McGhee - AD-NRHH

South Atlantic Affiliate

Chloe O'Sullivan, Regional Director
Chris Desjarlais, AD-AF
Anna Pietrzak, AD-NRHH

Great Lakes Affiliate

Ryan Moore - Regional Director
Gabrielle Flynn - AD-AF
Theresa Dolasinski - AD-NRHH

Southwest Affiliate

Emily Gentry, Regional Director
Kyler Johnson, AD-AF
Dakota Steele, AD-NRHH

Intermountain Affiliate

Rae Gilmore - Regional Director
Becca Franssen - AD-AF
Jen Garcia - AD-NRHH

Annual Conference Staff

Zoie Hancock, Annual Conference Chair
Charles Sanders, NBD Liaison
Greyson Cox, Finance Chair

Midwest Affiliate

Payton Branson, Regional Director
Nathan Franz, AD-AF
Meredith Finley, AD-NRHH

NACURH Executive Committee

Katie Westermeyer, Chairperson
Jacob Durrance, Associate for Operations
Annemarie Thomas, Associate for NRHH
Noheli Serrano, Associate for Engagement
Mary Gallivan, NACURH Advisor
Jen O'Brien, NACURH NRHH Advisor
Christina Aichele, Conference Resource
Consultant

Northeast Affiliate

Adam Coshal, Regional Director
Sadia Ahmed, AD-AF
Robert Moss, AD-NRHH

Pacific Affiliate

Nahjah Culberson, Regional Director
Mitchell Prost, AD-AF
Hannah Edwards, AD-NRHH



Friday, January 8, 2021

- I. Call to order at 12:30 PM EST
- II. Roll Call
 - A. Present = x ; Absent = -
 - B.

	Director/Chair	ADAF/NBD Liaison	ADNRHH/Finance Chair
CAACURH	x	x	x
GLACURH	x	x	x
IACURH	x	x	x
MACURH	x	x	x
NEACURH	x	x	x
PACURH	x	x	x
SAACURH	x	x	x
SWACURH	x	x	x
Annual Conference	-	x	x

Chairperson	x	NACURH Advisor	x
NAO	x	NRHH Advisor	x
NAN	x	CRC	x
NAE	x		

Quorum is reached

- III. Welcome/Expectations
 - A. Jotform Waiver for Semis
 - 1. NAO | This is an oath of non-conflict. It certifies that you're following the policy in that oath. It also includes a required alcohol /drug and media release signature that we see at regional conferences.



2. Questions?
 - a) NBD Liaison | What does the Annual Conference team put as their entity?
 - (1) Chair | You can put annual conference team, that works great
- B. Today's Overview
 1. "JAMBOARD"
 2. Expectations for the weekend
- IV. ACUHO-I Expectation Setting
 - A. General notes:
 1. Chair | Sheila, Kyle, and Shaun will be joining us. The three of them meet with me, Jacob, and Mary regularly. It is not a surprise that progress has been slow. Also, acknowledging that me and Jacob may not have done the best job communicating updates. But, I'm excited to have ACUHO-I present in order to help convey progress. Please ask questions that are related to their purview while saving some of the questions that may be geared towards Mary, Jacob, and I. About administrative support contract, not OTM database. These individuals are focused on affiliation, inventory, finances.
 2. SA: Is there any context as to what would be under their purview in things that might be coming up?
 - a) Chair | Part of the struggle in getting the ball rolling is on both parties here. Within the NCO transition, it's not a surprise that it's been a rough process for the Executives, because there were passwords that were not transferred properly, the NACURH Accountant was a hill to climb, etc. When you see what Sheila, Kyle, and Shawn are bringing forward, hopefully you can get a better picture of what's happening and how you can hold the Execs accountable moving forward. For example, specific to this presentation, we'll be getting some ideas on how the ADAF position will change.
 3. Chair | Talked to presenters. They are sharing some visuals and a Trello board that ACUHO-I, Mary, Jacob, and I have been working on. Might explore using Trello in the future. Also documents to support ADAF conversation. Unsure if they will stay the full hour. It's ok if you don't have a lot of questions, information is new. Plan to have more updates in the future. Jacob & I can share afterwards how we are feeling too.
 4. NAE | Have a snap form for the weekend!!
- V. ACUHO-I Presentation: Sheila Meyer, Kyle Norton, Shaun Holloway
 - A. Q&A
 1. PA | Wondering, Shawn, you mentioned being in charge of the online store. Would you be coordinating with each region to set up an online store for their merchandise? Would it be a main website or would each region have their own merchandise site?



- a) ACUHO-I (Shawn) | Katie can probably assist in this answer. I know that each region has some support for conferences by an institution. Basically if the NCO has done this previously for you, ACUHO-I will take over the NCO role. This is the best parallel to describe it for y'all.
 - b) ACUHO- (Sheila) | From a change management perspective, reviewing the forms you have in existence, we won't need many forms to do the same things.
- 2. PA | We are wondering if we can open the breakout rooms??
 - a) Chair | Go to Greyson first, then can open those up
- 3. Conf. Finance Chair | Will this new split in duties between NACURH and ACUHO-I, have y'all thought about accountability processes, if any misconduct were to occur?
 - a) ACUHO-I (Sheila) | From a perspective of right now, you will still be writing checks and handling those. We would not have any rights to write checks on regional accounts-- that is nothing different from today. Our access would be like the NCO, just to centralized accounts. Likely you have insurance in place if things happen, as do we.
- 4. Breakout Rooms Opened
- 5. SW | Curious on why the ADAF would not be able to access Xero but BOFA. Also curious on how would this impact if a region wanted to have a all year store
 - a) ACUHO-I (Kyle) | You will maintain online access. The intention on the Xero side is that you only see your single business unit. Under the new model, you will have one location for all accounts. You wouldn't consolidate money, but all regions would be able to see the accounts of other regions. For example, right now, your ADAFs can only see your region's account, but this new model will grant access to all accounts across NACURH. Regarding the store-related question, I will defer to NAO
 - b) NAO | What the NCO has been previously responsible for, the NCO would sell some regional merchandise on the region's behalf at the Annual Conference. Hosting regional merchandise on the NACURH Store, this has not happened before, so it would not be included now. I also know that many regions have created their own stores, so that's been something to look forward to.
 - c) Follow-up, SW | As a region that utilizes Xero to look at financial trends for years prior as well would we be able to get access to years worth of documentation if requested?
 - (1) ACUHO-I (Sheila) | Best solution here is if you have recording needs, communicate it and let us know. We can run reports and get information to you
 - (2) NAO | ADAFs currently have access to annual finance reports from years prior and past budgets. Access to



- budgets won't change.
6. NE | Thank you for your presentation. My big question is about timelines. When we had initially gone over the contract in May, we were given a timeline of flow. Things have changed a lot since then, so we are wondering what the current timeline looks like?
 - a) ACUHO-I (Sheila) | 2020 happened, whatever it was, it happened. Took timelines all over the place. Our goal is to move forward with the affiliation transition this quarter. Good time to do that. Inventory transition will happen in the January/ February timeframe as well to the central office. Global transition of payables, what we needed before we moved forward was hitting a model that worked. Once we come to agreement on if this was the right model, you should see this happen relatively soon. Certainly before the end of your terms.
 7. CA | What would communication look like between regional finance officers and ACUHO-I? What would the ADAFs need to send to ACUHO-I for transactions and what would we be receiving regularly from ACUHO-I?
 - a) ACUHO-I (Kyle) | As you're spending money, you will be filling out a similar form like you do today. Instead of uploading it to Xero you will send it to us. Input information to Xero on a weekly basis. Understanding you have a monthly reporting process. Will keep that going.
 - b) ACUHO-I (Sheila) | We have a centralized finance mailbox for ACUHO-I. We would utilize this or something similar to this as a special mailbox for NACURH. We haven't gotten that far in finalized details yet, but we will make it as easy as possible for NACURH.
 8. SW | YTR
 9. SA | Since we signed the contract in May, do you plan to adapt the initial contract based on the revision presented today?
 - a) Sheila | We can amend the contract language to modify those. Few more changes that might happen as we implement changes. Make all of the changes at once.
 10. PA | We are wondering what the budget update process will look like after reconciliations. We currently take reference numbers from reconciled documents and put it into the budget, but if we don't have access to Xero procedures, then we won't be able to do this.
 - a) ACUHO-I (Kyle) | Don't know, we don't know Xero well enough to know what a reference number is.
 - b) PA | Find Xero valuable because we put reference numbers and forms that we can't use with BOFA. Xero provides a clear overview of our finances. Would like to see all financials relating to the region.
 - (1) ACUHO-I (Kyle) | Our recommendation to start is this



proposal, but as we go through this new process and you find it to hinder you, then we can revisit this process. I suspect that you'll find that you don't need Xero access, more so that it's just helpful to have.

- (2) NAO | Since finance officers are responsible for transaction forms, keeping them in a folder and inputting it onto a spreadsheet to record reference numbers. ADAFs have used that in the past internally. Feedback is valuable
11. CA | Are we still looking to move from Guidebook to the ACUHO-I mobile app for conferences? If so, can you provide some content on what this transition will look like?
- a) Chair | Just began talking about it as the Guidebook contract ends. Shawn and I connected recently.
 - b) ACUHO-I (Shaun) | Not sure if any of you have attended an ACUHO-I event or conferences that uses a mobile app. Experience to Guidebook is similar, some things are superior. Transition is for us to create your area, NACURH area of ACUHO-I mobile app. Works the same way: adds program, pages, events. WACUHO has been using it for years in this same model. Excited for you to consolidate expenses by using a superior experience. Excited for you to come on. Starting conversations in 4-6 weeks. Doesn't take a long time to set up the shell, then we can talk about access to maintain.
12. PA | In the case of a hiccup happening with reconciliations and such, will there be an individual person to connect with on the ACUHO-I side to discuss any issues that may come up with reports or reconciliation?
- a) ACUHO-I (Kyle) | We have an organizational email address that many of us have access to. Don't think you will have any issues reaching us since many people have access to that email. Will get faster response using organizational email over the personal ones.
 - b) ACUHO-I (Shaun) | Additionally, the NAO will always serve as the primary liaison to our office.
13. PA | Last comment sparked something, with this transition, what does it look like between NAO and ACUHO-I and NAO with ADAFs?
- a) ACUHO-I (Sheila) | Are you speaking from a communications perspective? Can you provide more context?
 - b) PA | Just in general, now with that new liaison with NACURH finances. How do roles shift with this contract and finance changes?
 - (1) ACUHO-I (Kyle) | I'll defer to the NAO
 - (2) NAO | PA, are you referring to the communication line between ACUHO-I and the communication lines between ACUHO-I and the ADAF's?
 - (a) PA | Yes
 - (b) NAO | Imagining a scenario if an issue pops up



with ACUHO-I and finances and relaying an issue. Whoever is in the NAO role would serve as the main contact point between NACURH and ACUHO-I. Good comparison is the OTM database, AD-NRHHs are communicating with Annemarie and then she is communicating concerns. ADAFs would do the same with the NAO

(c) ACUHO-I (Shawn) | To join NAO's reference, ACUHO-I contracts with NRHH to serve the database system. ACUHO-I hosts the database, and we're working collaboratively with the NAN to maintain and advance this opportunity.

(d) Chair | Will figure out a plan of action that works for everyone, not the last time you might see someone like Kyle. Want to talk with ADAFs about their role. Have collaborative nature and figure out what's best for people entering these roles in the future.

c) Chair | Send questions to Jacob & I and we can relay those to ACUHO-I friends

d) Sheila | Excited, stay tuned for more changes

VI. ACUHO-I Debrief

A. Chair | Allowing space to debrief this, share feedback, communicate things you want from execs moving forward. Jacob, Mary, and I have things to share as well. Willing to do breakout rooms

B. MA | Super excited by this presentation. They were super adamant and ready to start the transition process, but I was wondering how we will initiate transition with incoming ADAFs based on this.

1. Chair | Combination of every possibility you listed. Part of it is how you feel about the hybrid model. Blue line is what they proposed, Jacob and I tried to voice concerns early on. Following today, if you have feedback on that model, we will give it to Kyle to get it implemented. Work with ADAFs to learn about the process to relay that in transitions. Want Kyle to be a part of the transition process for ADAFs. Hard with a timeline because you don't know when the dominos are going to fall. Planned in many ways.

C. PA | It was a little concerning when they said that they don't know Xero yet, but they will become the main people in charge of Xero.

1. Chair | Thank you for voicing that concern, but that transition to Xero is the same for all ADAF's in this room. I have no doubt that they will learn how to use it well. We can relay that as a concern, but I'm confident in their ability to learn how to use Xero.

D. Conf. Finance Chair | Curious, following up on Nahjah's question. Accounting software that ACUHO-I uses, since they are unfamiliar with Xero, is there a plan to transition to something they use so they have something they are familiar



with?

1. Chair | I yield to the NAO.
 2. NAO | NACURH has used QuickBooks in the past, and Xero came in shortly after that transition away from Quickbooks. It seems that Xero is more user friendly. Like the Chair, I also feel confident in ACUHO-I transition into Xero, as I and all other Finance Officers have undergone that process.
 3. NACURH Advisor | Information about Quickbooks, both were used before Xero. With Quicken, you couldn't use a Mac. Finance officer had to have a PC. Inability to pull up reports for historical documents. Needed to be stored on computers. Don still has a finance officer computer that has 7 years of financial documents on it. Xero was brought in to make the process paperless and to not wait on NACURH advisor to pull the transaction. Not the easiest to use.
- E. NE | More of a statement than a question. I have faith in ACUHO-I's transition into Xero, but Xero has also been super important to the Northeast. I feel that this shift to sending documents to ACUHO-I may be more inconvenient for ADAP's for what we're used to.
1. NAO | Don't think Kyle brought this up, something we want to talk about. In each finance report, part of it is a detailed account transaction sheet. Might be useful to utilize now.
 2. Chair | Plan to ask Kyle to share what he shared with us and send those out.
- F. SA | Referencing the previous question for SA and recognizing that nothing may change right now, will the payment for ACHO-I change at all?
1. Chair | Perfect question, we have many thoughts. Yes. Want to make it clear that we only paid them the initial contract fee. They haven't invoiced us for anything yet. Pass it to Mary & Jacob for more context.
 2. NAO | As far as annual costs go, Katie's correct in Saying that this contract is not financially sustainable for NACURH. WE've considered looking into the contract again, because there's a lot of fluff in there that NACURH may never use. It also depends on NACURH and ACUHO-I meeting partway on what needs to go and what needs to stay. You're right and Katie's right in saying that moving forward with what we have now is not the move to make.
 3. Advisor | My role as advisor is that NACURH fulfills it's financial responsibilities and that we are able to be sustainable. If we did not enter a pandemic this year, there is a greater chance we would have been sustainable in this agreement. Because of the nature of everything (affiliation, income, etc.), we are not sustainable. We have money in our savings, but that's our savings. We should not use it for things like ACUHO-I. Conversations last year about this agreement, was not as forceful as I could have been in providing ideas moreso. Your organization. Found a way to make it work last year, found a way to make it work now. Can't find a way to make it work. Will have to go in and



renegotiate and bring cost. Very apprehensive. Want you all to have an organization in 5-7 years. Want students to go to conferences and do great things. Will need to reevaluate and renegotiate. Have to look and see the costs. If you have ideas, please tell me.

- G. SW | POC | As someone who wasn't in the contracting process last year, could someone tell us how much the original contracted cost was?
 - 1. Advisor | Cost is \$63,000 a year, originally quoted \$65k. They need to equate costs based on a living wage. Got many numbers from them, need to talk them down.
- H. NE | Not caucus relevant. Moreso relevant to the things Mary was saying. Can you provide insight as to what that process might look like. Last year, a big reason we entered the contract was because of the reconciliation portion of NCOs and ADAFs. Looking back in history, what was the NCO wasn't always the NCO. Is there a way to do affiliation, finances, etc.?
 - 1. NACURH Advisor | Anything can be renegotiated with any type of contract. Most of you have only ever known the NCO, but before the NCO there was the NACURH Information Center (NIC) and the NACURH Services and Resources Office (NSRO). These two offices were combined into the NCO to deal with both of the content areas under the two former offices. There was no real discussion around merging them; it just kind of happened, but in that combination process, we learned that both offices used different programs for finances, which is where ACUHO-I can come in handy by centralizing the financial resources at our hands.
 - a) Chair | Want you all to think back about your first introduction to NACURH and how confusing that was. ACUHO-I was very excited, original creators of the contract on both ends had different ideas. Part of this process meant explaining to 3 ACUHO-I friends what NACURH does and what students does. Contract has foals we don't need to accomplish, things need to be adapted. Yes, future conversations with them lie in renegotiating. What they propose is helpful, don't want to work with them on it if it's only going to be around for a year and then we can't afford it. Want to know what you think is important so we can figure out what we need.
- I. SW | Move to caucus for 5 minutes
- J. SW | With the accountant that has been proposed could we have them help us find something to combine what we already pay for that ACUHO-i was going to help us do?
 - 1. NAO | When It comes to finances, what the Accountant has done isn't what's in line with what ACUHO-I will do or the ADAFs currently do. They just file taxes with the IRS and the state of Oklahoma. They don't really work on much besides that and consultation for investments. ACUHO-I has offered to recommend us an accountant to turn to if needed, but not to provide us with accountant services.
- K. PA | Propose that while NACURH-level finances, it makes sense to have



professional staff from ACUHO-I. At the regional level, ADAFs have been doing a good job and it's manageable. If we are looking for a way to renegotiate, keep things the same with ADAFs, and collaborate on the NACURH level and have NCO support with ACUHO-I.

1. Chair | I think that's important to consider, but it's also hard to think about them as separate. When thinking about what's best for NACURH may be the same thing as what's best for the regions. On a separate note, the materials that ACUHO-I provided have been uploaded to the NACURH Semi's website.
- L. NE | You have hinted on it before, can you share where you're at? If you were to go into a renegotiation tomorrow, are there things you would do? Get an idea of where the execs are at right now
1. Chair | The general Exec vibe is :/ that we see such good potential but we have encountered a struggle with it because of the way that we were set up within the contract itself. This makes it hard to know what the contract would've looked like until it plays out. We entered the contract in the last year of the NCO's existence, which I think makes it feel like we have no other choice but to get this passed. For those who were in the actual space when we voted on the contract, we were put into that all or nothing spot when considering to pass this contract. A huge challenge to the Execs this year has been to figure out what the priorities are for this contract. I don't have much else for y'all to take away currently, because we're still waiting to see what all comes from this contract. I'm still holding out hope for 3-4 bigger projects for ACUHO-I to take on for us, but the difficulty comes into play when seeing how we can renegotiate this contract's cost.
- M. PA | Is it possible for us to get access to the ACUHO-I contract?
1. Chair | You all should have access to the contract already.
 - a) PA | Follow-up, can you attach it to the minutes or put it on the current Semi's website?
 - (1) Chair | Absolutely!
- N. SW | Was not in the space when the contract was voted on. Something we were talking about is taking the load off of the execs if we could come together as a committee or task force to help renegotiate. Especially with ADAFs who are very impacted.
1. Chair | I'll be honest. I'm not going to open a new task force for this. I want Kyle to go to the ADAFs directly, and then NAO and I will go to the rest of the Joint Boards with regular updates. Our goal is to provide more consistent updates at Leadership chats, and other NACURH-level chats.
 2. NACURH Advisor | When you get the contract, there's a lot of legal jargon and thus pretty difficult to read. Please know that it has been reviewed by lawyers. The second point is about the renegotiation aspect. What the Chair has said is accurate. The best way for us to proceed is for the Chair and the NAO to acquire feedback from Joint Boards, especially



ADAF's. The process of renegotiation falls to the NACURH Executives. They were elected to do the job to do what's best for the corporation, and this applies to myself and the other NACURH Advisors. Please trust that any decision that they make or that we come to is in the best interest of NACURH

3. Chair | To add on, I've seen the word transparency pop a lot recently. This is the conversation topic that I want to talk with y'all about. I have never had to renegotiate a contract of this magnitude before. I'm trying to be transparent with y'all on NACURH's priorities in this contract. I'm not the sole provider of NACURH's priorities. My current transparency plan is to listen to y'all and bring your concerns to ACUHO-I for the best interest of NACURH. Last year, I felt like my feedback wasn't considered, and I don't want to be your experiences this year.
 4. SW | Follow-up | Instead of opening up another task force could the ADAF meetings be turned into the working group for this? Add a portion of every minute time to be discussed on this topic to allow the feedback to be given to y'all?
 - a) Chair | That's my goal within ADAF spaces, but also outside of that. Ideally, every chat moving forward should have an ACUHO-I section, since they've become an integral part of how we operate. I believe that this is already on the agenda for ADAF chats moving forward, too! More generally about chats too, we can change the agendas at any time. They are super flexible!
 - b) NAO | Yeah, I just want to affirm that this is something that's on my radar. For the ADAF chats moving forward, I really want to focus on what the ADAF roles will look like for next year, and how you can best transition your successors.
- O. Annual Conference | Quick question, in the contact appendix A pages 13-15, they listed some things with check marks and things with dashes. What do those mean?
1. NACURH Advisor | The distinction is in what they can offer us, what we need them to do, and what we don't need them to do. This came about from our very first meeting with them from December 2019, when we just threw all of the possible ideas on the table.
 2. Chair | For example, in the fall talking about affiliation, student leadership component that they don't understand. They suggested a reminder to affiliates, people click a button and they are good to go. Part of being an NCC is affiliating and doing those census questions.
- P. Chair | Can I solicit some feedback about this conversation / presentation. Were they both helpful at all? How is everyone feeling about it?
1. PA | Really grateful for this time. None of us were a part of this conversation helpful. Did not know context. You all giving feedback has been helpful.
MA | From an ADAF standpoint, it was super great to hear and see these updates that will be impacting our roles.



2. SW | 50/50...very helpful but very much have more concerns/questions.
3. NE | Also super appreciative of opportunity, wondering about where progress has been. Good to know and see. New content is exciting and intriguing to consider.
4. NE | Echoing everything that has been said, considering someone who does not work with the ADAF or Director, this provides greater context. Also, giving thanks to the Execs as well. We're here to lend our support as well as we implement this contract.
5. Chair | Gives us a starting point for the spring and how we keep you involved. Will let you know as things pop up and what their priorities are and where we are at.

Q. SW | Move to groove for 5 minutes

1. 2nd | GL

VII. Roll Call

A.

	Director/Chair	ADAF/NBD Liaison	ADNRHH/Finance Chair
CAACURH	x	x	x
GLACURH	x	x	x
IACURH	x	x	x
MACURH	x	x	x
NEACURH	x	x	x
PACURH	x	x	x
SAACURH	x	x	x
SWACURH	x	x	x
Annual Conference	-	x	x

B.

Chairperson	x	NACURH Advisor	x
NAO	x	NRHH Advisor	x
NAN	x	CRC	x
NAE	x		



VIII. ART Presentation, Brian Rock, ART Coordinator

A. Q&A / Discussion

1. IA | Really impressed in listening to all of that, thank you so much for all the work the entire ART committee has put into everything. Blown away by all you've done.
 - a) ART Coordinator | Thank you! The team is truly fantastic, and nothing would get done without them
2. GL | Thank you so much. Wondering if there are any considerations keeping some ART sessions available in an online format once we return to a formal world. Sessions might be hard for an advisor to attend.
 - a) ART Coordinator | Absolutely! Last year when I ran for the ART Coordinator position, this was one of my goals. You're absolutely right that conference attendance has been a barrier to ART completion. Once we go back to in-person conferences, we plan on keeping the virtual sessions outside of conferences for advisors of all kinds.
3. SW | In terms of hall council advising, has any conversation happened in regards that some student leaders have to advise hall councils?
 - a) ART Coordinator | Yes, we do recognize that there are some students, whether undergrad or graduate students, that could benefit from these sessions, too. We've never really turned anyone away from the door. As long as you're coming to learn about advising RHAs and NRHHs, or hall councils, you're invited!! I will say, though, that we currently don't have sessions geared toward undergraduate students who serve as advisors, but we wouldn't turn them away!
4. ART Coordinator | Thank you all for the work you do as well. Thanks for all you do to represent your regions and making things better for students living on campus.

IX. Semis Expectations

A. From Execs to Joint Boards

1. In Boardroom
 - a) Stay present / avoid distractions
 - b) Recognition of all NBD & NNB placards
 - c) Emphasized discussion, workshopping, and reflection
 - d) Intentional time for breaks & communication with entities
 - e) Avoidance of gotcha questions
2. Overall
 - a) Be honest about what you need to succeed
 - b) Come open minded
 - c) Be open to making mistakes
 - d) Assume positive intent; it's us v. the problem, not us v. them



- e) Ask questions to seek to understand
 - f) Be as present as you can be and let someone know if you need to step away
 - g) Try to have fun
 - h) Take time to talk to someone you don't know
 - i) Take your time, nothing needs to be rushed in this space
 - j) Share your unique ideas and perspectives (& YTR!!)
 - k) Listen first
 - l) Have fun
3. Wellness
- a) Go to bed at a reasonable time
 - b) Take breaks as you need them
 - c) Drink water
 - d) Don't skip meals
 - e) Don't get caught up in the drama
 - f) Advocate for your personal needs
 - g) Identify your points of support
4. Questions?
- a) None
- B. Of Each Other
1. PA | Don't be afraid to ask questions!! It's clear that I'm not afraid to ask questions, so please feel comfortable to do the same!
 2. NE | Recognize & appreciate each other
 3. Annual Conference | Be gentle with things people aren't doing correctly, acknowledge people are new to spaces and might need help
 4. NE | Remember that you represent an affiliate. Also remember that some things are bigger than just your affiliate, and impact NACURH as a whole. And remember that there are two different Boards: NBD and NNB. Oftentimes, NNB becomes forgotten.
 5. SW | Be transparent as needed
 6. MA | Be forgiving with parli pro if we make a mistake
 7. GL | One of the disadvantages to an online space is that many of us have a lot of things happening in our respective physical spaces. For example, some of us may be on duty or something, so be cognizant of that and accommodating to it as well.
- C. From Boards to Execs
1. SW | Ask for help
 2. NE | Giving prior context to business. For example, with the ACUHO-I contract, y'all provided that for us because not everyone had access or context on that beforehand
 3. MA | Assuming positive intent, keep that in mind
 4. Annual Conference | You all have made it clear that we need to take care



of ourselves, but please make sure that you're all taking care of yourselves, too! We love you all and want you to survive Semi's!!

5. IA | On assuming positive intent, please make sure that you're recognizing and accepting the hurt that you've caused. This also goes for everyone, not just the Execs
 - a) Chair | On this, sometimes providing context may seem like a defense. I want you all to know that I never want to be read as combative. I want to give you all the information and context necessary to have a fuller picture of what's going on.
6. SW | if you do feel a certain way don't be afraid to reach out 1:1 if you are comfortable with doing that

X. Parli Pro Overview

A. Business Overview & Rules

1. Proponent speech
2. Q&A - 5 minutes, extendable up to three times
 - a) Will entertain a motion to exhaust the speaker's list with or without additions
3. Amendments - only going two amendments deep
 - a) No friendly amendments
 - b) Must be written or sent via email
4. Voting
 - a) Simple majority for most legislation/ bids
 - b) $\frac{2}{3}$ required for budget, bylaws, or articles of incorporation
 - c) Abstentions are removed from calculating majority
5. Points of order take priority over anything else
 - a) Point of information: seeking information or clarification
 - b) Clarification: giving information or clarification
 - c) Personal privilege: request an immediate change in the boardroom environment based on personal needs
 - d) Parliamentary inquiry: clarify the correct parli pro
 - e) Order: call attention to concerns or issues as they arise
6. House rules
 - a) Only read legislation upon request
 - b) Tiered speakers list
 - c) Recognize speaking rights for all placards, DADs can yield to COs and have to remain from your entity and congruent with others (vote remains with Director)
 - d) Not entertaining amendments until discussion has been heard
 - e) Not entertaining straw polls
 - f) Vote by consent is minimal
 - g) Give space to address needs as they arise

B. Q&A

1. Annual conference | Annual conference has speaking rights, not voting rights in these spaces? How does that work and am I correct in this statement?



- a) Chair | There are things you can vote on, Jacob?
 - b) Jacob | Not sure about voting rights, they do have speaking rights though
 - c) Annual Conference | In terms of parli pro, we couldn't be able to 2nd things or make motions. Just comment?
 - (1) NAO | Checking policy now, will follow up individually in a bit!
 - C. MA | Motion to make Dan Rudy the parliamentarian for NBD parliamentarian
 - 1. CA | Second
 - 2. PA | POI | Dan Rudy is the NBD Parliamentarian, but what about NNB?
 - a) Chair | That will take place in NNB boardroom
 - 3. NE | POC | As someone who is hoping to be confirmed as the NNB parliamentarian, if Dan is working on something, my DM's are open. Feel free to direct questions to me as well
- XI. Advancement Society Nominations
 - A. Chair | If you are someone who submitted a nomination, you will 'x' to nominate that individual. I will, then, call for a second, and I will not entertain dissent. Next, we will enter into a period of initial nomination with everyone in the room, during which the nominators will read their submission pieces. Once we get into discussion, I'll go into more depth about how we move forward from there.
 - B. SW | Hypothetically, we didn't write down what our nomination was? Could you pull those and send it to us?
 - 1. Chair | Yes I can do that
 - C. Nominations
 - 1. PA | Nominate Noheli Serrano, NAE
 - a) MA | 2nd
 - 2. IA | Nominate Jen Garcia, IA ADNRHH
 - a) SA | 2nd
 - 3. CA | Nominate Dan Laffin, CA Director
 - a) GL | 2nd
 - 4. MA | Nominate Rachel Cundy, MA CORHA
 - a) PA | 2nd
 - 5. SW | Nominate Alexis Gierzak, SW 2020 RLC Chair/COBS
 - a) GL | 2nd
 - 6. SW | Nominate Dakota Steele, SW ADNRHH
 - a) CA | 2nd
 - 7. SW | Nominate Emily Gentry, SW Director
 - a) IA | 2nd
 - 8. POC - PA | Think NE was skipped over
 - 9. NE | Nominate Aiden Ciaffaglione, NE CORS
 - a) PA | 2nd
 - 10. NE | Zoie Hancock, Annual Conference Chair
 - a) GL | 2nd
 - 11. MA | Jameson Nogowski, MA NRHH Advisor
 - a) NE | 2nd



12. NAE | Annemarie Thomas, NAN
 - a) SW | 2nd
13. CA | Motion to close floor for nominations
 - a) NE | 2nd
 - b) No dissent

D. Proponent speeches

1. Noheli Serrano

- a) Noheli is an individual of many talents. Serving in her roles as delegate, NRHH representative, Conference Staff Chair, ADNRRH, and now as NACURH Executive she continues to be a selfless leader. She is dedicated to connecting with individuals beyond their position and extends herself out to listen to others. She has continued to give herself through the year, and asks "what's next?". Noheli's journey is an example of what it means to be limitless.

2. Jen Garcia

- a) To Jen, NRHH is not just an organization, but a passion. When she was only a freshman at Arizona State University Downtown, she founded the NRHH Chapter of the Phoenix and has served four consecutive terms as NRHH Chancellor since. In those four years, her chapter has grown exponentially and even hit cap. Through vacancies and restructures, she has been the backbone and heart of her chapter. On the campus level, she held a chair position when her institution hosted a conference. In her time as ADNRRH, she has helped support over twenty NRHH Chapters and approximately thirty RHAs, including helping some get off their feet for the first time. She has tirelessly worked to improve IACURH's bidding culture and has organized and overseen three regional conference's award bidding. She has increased award bid submissions at each meeting through her endeavors, now averaging over 30 requests. When conferencing was moved to a virtual setting, she re-designed bidding to be compatible over zoom while still maintaining the process's integrity. Last year, with her support, IACURH saw five bids win at the NACURH level. Authors of these bids remark about how they couldn't have been so successful with Jen's help. She generously guided them through the NACURH award bid process by answering questions and giving them pep talks. Jen has a unique talent for bringing out the best in bid writers by convincing them of their worth and making them feel validated and appreciated. In regional and NACURH spaces, Jen is rarely seen without a smile. She has always represented herself, her institution, and her region with integrity and joy. A large part of why IACURH's NRHH reps feel connected to the area is thanks to Jen's spirit and infectious love



for the honorary. As IACURH has adapted throughout Jen's two terms as ADNRHH, she has risen to meet the challenges and changes at every step. Whether it be re-calibrating regional NRHH culture away from using monkey imagery to the beloved Olaf character, holding intentional rep chats to talk about working through a pandemic, or scheduling countless 1:1s to support reps as they write bids, Jen truly gives IACURH her best by far. As ADNRHH, Jen has now served on two regional boards. While her support structures have fluctuated as she has had three advisors in a year and a half, she always helps move NRHH and her team forward. She has advocated and worked tirelessly on the NACURH level by chairing the IACURH OTM Selection Committee, chairing the IACURH Recognition committee, serving on multiple NACURH level task forces and committees, and stepping into leadership roles in NRHH working groups. Last year, she submitted legislation about NRHH membership, which helped reinforce the values of the honorary. She has attended eight regional conferences and four NACURH conferences. For her personal impact and service last year, she received a Silver Turtle from Rick Cazzato Jr. when he served as NAN. She has lived the NRHH values at every turn, from organizing monthly service initiatives on the campus level and attending a NACURH Alt Break to being an instrumental part of the OTM process. IACURH gives its enthusiastic support to Jen Garcia and hopes that the Joint Boards can see what a diamond she is.

3. Dan Laffin

- a) The Central Atlantic Affiliate would like to nominate our Regional Director, Dan Laffin, to the NACURH Advancement Society because of his commitment to our region for the past five years. His journey started as a first time delegate at the 2017 CAACURH Regional Leadership Conference. Since then, he has attended 10 regional/national conferences as an NCC-IT, NCC, and Regional Director. He has contributed to the writing of 20 bids spanning all but four categories offered in our region; 13 of which became regional winners. Beyond his excellence in bidding, he has served on four regional committees and chaired the Campus Initiatives and Advocacy Committee in 2018-2019. While working on these committees, as an NCC, and as our Regional Director, Dan has also contributed at least seven pieces of legislation to improve Central Atlantic policy. In the words of Christina Aguilera "...it's really great when you stand up for something that you really believe, even if you get heat for it." This principle is one that Dan leads with no matter the scenario he is presented. He encourages our Regional Board as well as our representatives to advocate for their needs no matter if they align with the popular opinion. He



has provided our region with the space to grow as individuals and as a team. Because of this, CAACURH is thriving with a group of student leaders who aren't afraid to take initiative and work together to create a better region. NCC Meredith Weiss says "As a Regional Director during such a difficult time for students, Dan has continuously motivated us to keep moving forward despite the circumstances.". This can be seen specifically through how he has coordinated the first ever utilization of the conference neutral host site selection and implementation process in CAACURH history. The Central Atlantic Affiliate will be forever grateful to Dan Laffin and the contributions he has made and continues to make to our region. For this reason and many others, we believe that he is more than deserving of induction to the NACURH Advancement Society.

4. Rachel Cundy

a) Rachel Cundy began her journey in Residence Life as a first year student at Southeast Missouri State University. Her conference involvement started at MACURH's 2017 Regional Leadership Conference. Additionally, Rachel was inducted into her Sheila E. Pinckney Chapter of the National Residence Hall Honorary during Spring 2018. Rachel previously served as the National Communications Coordinator and RHA President at her host institution. At MACURH's Regional Business Conference, she bid for and received our Coordinating Officer for RHA Development position for the 2020-2021 affiliation year. Within this role, Rachel willingly accepts any task delegated to her. The MACURH Regional Board of Directors has seen four vacancies this affiliation year and Rachel continuously steps up and fills in the gaps whenever needed. She can always be found collaborating with other members on the board to complete projects varying from affiliation to regional merchandise. Outside of our region, Rachel swapped to SWACURH's RLC in November. Later that month, she met with Kelsie, CAACURH's CORHA, to prepare for our RLC. She has started several new initiatives ranging from our Molly Initiative Pin, Moo Crew Guide, and Moo Pals Program!. Rachel Cundy fully exemplifies the MACURH Standards and her commitment to our organization is worthy of being nominated into the NACURH Advancement Society.

5. Alexis Gierzak

a) Alexis Gierzak has dedicated multiple years of service to the corporation as a whole through various realms of service from serving on her RHA Executive Board, The NRHH Executive Board for the Shining Star Chapter at Texas State. Among this Alexis gave up her dream of becoming the CORN when Texas State decided to host RLC 2020 and then she ran for COBS when the



region needed someone to be on the board to help the region as a whole.

6. Dakota Steele

- a) Dakota has gone above and beyond for not only everyone within the SWACURH region, but also NACURH as a whole. He is constantly looking for ways to improve the organization and overall the experience. His passion for NRHH and the overall wellbeing of NACURH shows through his constant motivation to work on bettering the organization. Dakota has written countless pieces of policy to implement within NACURH and SWACURH in the hopes of bettering the organization for future leaders to continue to call NACURH their home. He has made it his mission to make every single member of NACURH leadership feel welcome, and never stops working because he cares so deeply about the work we do for our delegates.

7. Emily Gentry

- a) I nominate Emily for the dedication that she has shown to not only the current regional board of director but also NACURH as a whole. Beyond this Emily Gentry served as a NCC within the SWACURH region and left a standing impact that has transcended the span of just her term on the RBD and NBD, but the dedication and resilience that she has shown in the education and support that she has provided to NCCs all through the region in her two years as a NCC.

8. Aiden Ciaffaglione

- a) The Northeast nominates Aiden Ciaffaglione (they / them) to be inducted into the NACURH Advancement Society. Aiden has been a key player in NEACURH for four years, as they have demonstrated a true commitment to NRHH's values of service and recognition. They have found their home in NACURH, which motivates them to throw their whole self into their work in the corporation. Throughout their four years of involvement, Aiden served as an NCC-IT, then NCC, and while they acted as NCC, they viciously fought to charter and became the first President of the University of Maine's NRHH Chapter, which has been an active chapter in the region since it's chartering. After their terms as NCC, they successfully bid to host the 2020 Spring Leadership Conference at NACURH 2019. While they were SLC 2020 Chair in the 2019-2020 affiliation year, Aiden co-chaired the Inclusivity Task Force and developed a detailed Conference Chair transition guide for future NEACURH conference chairs. At their own SLC, Aiden successfully bid to be the region's Coordinating Officer for Recognition and Service (CORS), which is the position they currently hold on NEACURH's RBD. As CORS, Aiden has gone above and beyond in their work for our affiliates, region, and for



NACURH. They have pushed our new regional philanthropy to new heights by developing a comprehensive guide for NEACURH's philanthropic theme: food insecurity. They currently chair the Philanthropy Task Force in the Northeast, and they're working on a cross-regional collaboration with MACURH's CORS to fight food insecurity on a national level. They have established a beloved Bids and Breakfast course to help prepare affiliates for the bidding processes before both of NEACURH's regional conferences this year, and to further support affiliates in the bidding process, they established NEACURH's Bidding Archive. Beyond just professional work within NEACURH and NACURH, Aiden goes out of their way to recognize and appreciate the time, energy, and efforts of all on our RBD and our affiliates, and they have done so with members of Leadership outside of the Northeast. Aiden brings an unprecedented amount of joy and excitement to this region, making it truly feel like a home for all. They have received numerous pieces of recognition for their dedication to NEACURH: a Bronze Pin (May, 2018), a Silver Pin (May, 2020), and an Outstanding Service Pin (Nov. 2020). Their case study submissions and educational displays have been consistently selected for top three placement. In their chapter's first year of existence, Aiden and their bid team developed an NRHH Building Block of the Year award bid that won on the regional level. All of these items demonstrate Aiden's commitment to NEACURH, and to NACURH as a whole. They have spent both years on the RBD to create a more inclusive and loving region for all affiliates. Reflecting on all of this, the Northeast believes that Aiden Ciaffaglione deserves to be inducted into the NACURH Advancement Society.

9. Zoie Hancock

- a) This nomination is for Zoie Hancock (she / her), the 2021 NACURH Annual Conference Chair. Throughout her three years within NACURH, Zoie has been greatly involved, specifically Zoie has served as an NCC and an RLC Chair in the Great Lakes, and now she serves as an NRHH Advisor and the NACURH 2021 Annual Conference Chair from the Pacific. Going back to her time at the NACURH 2018 Annual Conference, she bid to host the 2019 Annual Conference. While she left Arizona State University - Tempe without being the 2019 Annual Conference host, Zoie continued with her drive to host a conference and won the bidding process for GLACURH RLC 2019. As the GLACURH RLC 2019 Chair, Zoie prioritized sustainability, chairing a zero-waste conference. Regionally, Zoie co-authored a piece of legislation that worked to reshape the regional philanthropy process. For affiliates who are not able to attend regional conferences, she



co-authored a separate piece to better include their thoughts and perspectives on regional business in boardroom settings by allowing them to submit feedback on legislation and bids to be read as the first discussion point for each piece. Additionally, she engaged in NACURH-level opportunities; for example, Zoie was a member of the NRHM 2019 Summer Task Force, where she assisted in the development of the NRHM 2019 Guide. Currently, Zoie has decided to return to NACURH Leadership and to host a unique conference experience within NACURH, as this is our first online Annual Conference and as it is being organized by a NACURH-wide committee -- not an affiliated institution. With all of these achievements, we believe that Zoie is deserving of a NACURH-level induction into the NACURH Advancement Society.

10. Jameson Nogowski

- a) Jameson began his Residence Life journey when he was inducted into the National Residence Hall Honorary - Husky Chapter at St. Cloud State University in 2011. He attended his first NACURH Annual Conference in 2011 at Western Illinois University. After falling in love with MACURH, Jameson successfully pursued the MACURH Regional NRHH Advisor role at the 2018 Regional Leadership Conference. Within this role, Jameson provides assistance to our ADNRHH and CORS position and supports NRHH Chapters across the region. Jameson serves as the only returner to our current Regional Board of Directors. In this capacity he has been a valuable resource and brainstorming powerhouse for our group. Jameson's contribution to MACURH can be seen beyond just the support he provides his students. As a member of the ART Standards Committee, Jameson has worked to improve the database, develop the ART Strategic Plan, and evaluate ART sessions. Additionally, Jameson runs our regional Advisor Involvement Committee. This group recently created an Advisor Handbook to help newer advisors find their footing in the region. Because of this, Jameson Nogowski's commitment to our organization is worthy of being nominated into the NACURH Advancement Society.

11. Annemarie Thomas

- a) Annemarie has dedicated her undergraduate experience to the overall betterment of NRHH within NACURH. Starting with her time as a campus NRHH Vice President, then serving as the Central Atlantic's ADNRHH, and now the NAN, her impact has been felt far and wide. This year specifically, Annemarie has held the Honorary together through several periods of transition, most notably, the OTM database transition. Annemarie has continued to advocate for the needs of NRHH members, serving as a liaison



to acuhoi's staff. Beyond the database, Annemarie has been committed to helping NRHH through some of it's long standing identity issues by bringing conversations to the ADNRRHs and Executive Committee and work towards solutions. She is an advocate for members of NRHH and has been an incredible asset to NACURH.

E. Discussion

1. CA | We would like to acknowledge both the depth and breadth of Zoie's involvement in NACURH, and we thank her for her service.
2. IA | Motion to caucus for 5 minutes
 - a) NE | 2nd
 - b) PA | Dissent, 7 minutes
 - c) Accepted by IA & NE
3. GL | We would like to express our support for the nomination of Jen Garcia. Jen's passion for NACURH and NRHH is unmatched. She has shown a strong support for NRHH through ehr chapters in IACURH, and she has extended support to us in the Great Lakes
4. SW | Acknowledge the efforts of Dan and upload them for their efforts with regional winning award bids and serving the region through advocacy efforts
5. PA | We would like to acknowledge Aiden and their work within the Northeast and their commitment to bringing that into NACURH spaces. Moving from a rep position to Conference Chair and now Coordinating Officer, they have shown true dedication.
6. SA | Appreciate Aidan's dedication to their roles on the RBD and how they commit to others outside of their role.
7. Annual Conference | We would like to recognize Annemarie's commitment to the OTM Database transition. She made sure that everyone on the OTM Voting Committee was least inconvenienced by any issues that arose.
8. IA | Support both Aidan and Zoie, we feel like they are both exceptional student leaders. Acknowledge the work they are doing as a CO and conference staff
9. NE | We move to narrow the field to 7 candidates
 - a) Chair | Not all candidates have received acknowledgement yet, so I will not entertain that until we hear comments on all candidates.
10. PA | Echo the annual conference's point on Annemarie and dealing with the OTm database. It's been a struggle and she has done a great job handling issues and doing it with a smile on her face.
11. PA | POI | We know that outside info was briefly discussed before, but how do we go about this?
 - a) Chair | Since it's a discretion, you can utilize your outside information to better contextualize the nomination.
12. GL | would like to show support for Noheli, her passion for the region &



- NACURH shines brightly and it makes her a wonderful candidate for this
13. NE | Support for Emily Gentry, she transitioned into a director role right after the conference. Has done a stellar role already with a quick turnaround time.
 14. MA | We would like to show recognition for Aiden from the Northeast. They have worked well with our CORS to develop new cross-regional philanthropy resources, and they've greatly advanced philanthropy within their own region.
 15. SW | Extend support for nomination of Jameson for extending support to advisors and historical contributions to NRHH as an advisor and a member.
 16. NE | NE will recognize Rachel. We have seen her work from afar and her ripple effect is great. Her energy in spaces is great and appreciate work she has done in NACURH
 17. CA | We would like to recognize the work of Dakota, as he tries to connect with Leadership as people first.
 18. PA | We wanted to acknowledge Alexis, gave up dream to hold RBD role by holding a conference staff role and then going into CO role.
 19. NE | At this time, the Northeast moves to narrow the field to 7 candidates
 - a) SA | Second
 20. IA | If we are going to breakout to vote can we have three minutes to do that?
 - a) Chair | Yes I'll combine that just do it in 5 minutes

F. Field is narrowed to:

1. Jen Garcia
2. Dan Laffin
3. Aiden Ciaffaglione
4. Zoie Hancock
5. Noheli Serrano
6. Jameson Nogowski
7. NE | Thought it was 7, not 6
 - a) Chair | Option to not put in 7 names, not everyone did that so we ended up with a top 6
8. SA | Motion to reenter a caucus and then vote
 - a) Chair | POC | You have to email votes to me, Jacob, and Mary, too
9. PA | POI | When we go into caucus, do we send you your top 4?
 - a) Chair | Yes
 - b) PA | Follow-up | Is there a time we have to do this in?
 - (1) Chair | We'll just wait until we have all of the votes. Remember to only use the 7 names that have made it to the narrowed field

G. Field is narrowed to:

1. Jen Garcia



2. Dan Laffin
3. Aiden Ciaffaglione
4. Zoie Hancock
5. Noheli Serrano

H. Discussion

1. PA | We are strongly in favor of the votes for Jen, Dan, Noheli, and Aiden. All of them have contributed a substantial amount to NACURH. We want to acknowledge that Zoie is included in this, but we feel more strongly in favor of the aforementioned 4.
2. NE | Stands strong in votes for Jen, Aiden, Zoie, and Noheli. Strong pattern of impact in NACURH. Commend Dan for effort and hope to see him be inducted on the regional level.
3. GL | We would like to strongly support the induction of Zoie Hancock, as her work on the regional level in GLACURH has made a significant impact, and now her work as the NACURH 2021 Annual Conference Chair is bringing her to greater heights within the corporation. Her work on the regional level brought more affiliates in the fold and prioritized inclusion.
4. SA | YTR
5. PA | POI | In regards to Zoie, can either her previous host region or if her nominator can provide more context for her work within the organization.
 - a) IA | We just want to affirm the fact that her conference experience greatly impacts NACURH. Never want to underplay the role a conference chair has in impacting student's conference experience.
 - b) GL | Co-chair of assessment & resources committee in GL. Authored piece that changed philanthropy so Canadian institutions could contribute. Piece co-authored allowed institutions to submit statements at the beginning of discussion if they cannot attend a conference. Other contributions, can't really speak to those
 - c) NE | P.O.O. | Guess hold hesitation going through this if we are not going to hold this for all candidates. Opened the door to where we painted candidates with a bias. Asking what they have done puts fresh information into people's heads before voting.
 - (1) Chair | See where you are kind of coming from. Struggle to see a solution. Trying to get to four
 - d) NE | POC | Through that, Zoie was a huge help on helping to create an NRHM at the time on a task force. Zoie helped us brainstorm quite a bit and she worked with other regions as well to help implement this.
6. NE | Would like to ask about Dan specifically, for more information about what he has done on the NACURH level
 - a) CA | Dan does a lot for our region in communicating with NACURH and linking with our reps as well. Eliminating some



barriers so that our region can continue to contribute to NACURH. Example being we had six hours of RBDs chats before Semis. In terms of the beginning of the year, Dan had a lot of conversations with Christina regarding conferences. He came in with a lot of thoughts on how to potentially move these forward in the future.

- b) CA | To add on, Dan makes an intentional point to not be the most vocal in NACURH spaces. This is something that he has talked about a lot with our Board, as he wants the whole Board to be intentionally involved in NACURH, instead of just him.

- 7. NE | motion to vote
 - a) IA | 2nd
 - b) MA | can we caucus
 - c) That was the intention of the motion

- I. Vote
 - 1. Conclusive majority
 - 2. Inductees are:
 - a) Jen Garcia
 - b) Aiden Ciaffaglione
 - c) Zoie Hancock
 - d) Noheli Serrano

- XII. Recess at 5:40 PM EST
- XIII. Call to order: 7:15 PM EST
- XIV. Roll Call

A.

	Director/Chair	ADAF/NBD Liaison	ADNRHH/Finance Chair
CAACURH	x	x	x
GLACURH	x	x	x
IACURH	x	x	x
MACURH	x	x	x
NEACURH	x	x	x
PACURH	x	x	x
SAACURH	x	-	x
SWACURH	x	x	-
Annual Conference	-	x	x



B.

Chairperson	x	NACURH Advisor	x
NAO	x	NRHH Advisor	x
NAN	x	CRC	x
NAE	x		

XV. MM 21-10

- A. NE moves to bring MM 21-10 to the floor
- B. 2nd: PA
- C. No objection
- D. Proponent speech by Jacob Durrance, NAO
 - 1. Likely won't take long. Addresses the piecemeal efforts NACURH has taken in the past to eliminate gendered pronouns in governing documents. Bylaws changes can only happen once a year, and then NCCs have to approve it at the annual conference. What I noticed here is that there were remaining pronouns in the policy book.
 - 2. Prior efforts to take out pronouns in unrelated pieces of legislation. That left other gendered pronouns remaining. Clears it up in one go and puts it on the regional entities to make those changes in their policy book.
 - 3. IA | Motion to waive readings for legislation
 - a) MA Seconds
- E. Question & Answer (10 minutes)
 - 1. CA | For pieces like this, that will trickle down to regional governing documents, does a piece like this need to be approved by entities, too?
 - a) NAO | As long as there is some type of trickle-down resolution in there, it would automatically apply. If your regional governing documents don't have that, this will act as a blanket policy, which still applies to regions.
 - 2. IA | Motion to end Q&A
 - a) PA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
- F. Discussion
 - 1. NE | In favor, appreciate inclusive practice and it's important to uphold and continue that
 - 2. MA | We appreciate this piece as it pushed inclusivity to the forefront of NACURH.
 - 3. IA | calls the question
 - a) No dissent
- G. Vote
 - 1. 8-0-0, the piece carries

XVI. MM 21-15



- A. PA moves to bring MM 21-15 to the floor
 - 1. 2nd: SA
 - 2. No objection
- B. Reading
 - 1. Waived
- C. Proponent speech by Viviana Faz, SW COMT
 - 1. Introduction of the CO Exploratory Team. We've reviewed the CO Exploratory Report from last year, and we've had many discussions on this topic this year. We're using the term "Working Groups" in this piece, as opposed to "Catalyst Groups" because of the latter's negative connotation. Our timelines span over periods of break and work time. The topic of the working groups will come from the personal goals of the CO's in addition to their passions within NACURH.
- D. Question & Answer
 - 1. PA | We want to ask what you all envision these working groups looking like with CO positions that are not similar. In PACURH, we have our COPR (PACURH Relations), and some regions have CO's for recognition, and one region now has a CO for diversity, so how would these all come together?
 - a) SW COMT | Common goal is for it to be on the person. In the past it has been on namesakes. Most positions are similar to others. Mine is COMT, Tanner's is COLD but we have a similar regional use. If anyone wants to answer they can.
 - b) NE COLD | The big focus here is to move away from the namesake of the CO positions. This is why we propose the gathering of CO's within the first 60 days of office. This way they can determine the topics to pursue moving forward outside of the confines of your roles.
 - 2. NE | In reviewing, one question we have is what will replace the horizontal component of catalysts? Hope now is that they are combined and something comes out of it. This seems to eliminate that component, what is your solution to replace that so COs in similar roles can collaborate?
 - a) SW COMT | Yield to NE COLD
 - b) NE COLD | The biggest part about this is to not eliminate cross-regional interactions. We don't want to do CO work based on the namesake of our positions. From the working groups that we're seeing this year is that they're not based on titles, rather they're based on common goals. Just as you said, the philanthropy collaboration between MACURH and NEACURH is the kind of working model that we want to see.
 - 3. CA | Thank you. Wondering why you picked a 60 day timeline.
 - a) SW COMT | We picked the 60 day timeline to give people enough time to transition into their roles. We need a deadline about how to get things started. We learned this year that the



- working groups should have been started sooner to achieve some of our goals.
4. IA | With the piece stating that people in the working groups will meet twice a month, will this be mandatory or something COs can participate in?
 - a) SW COMT | We chose this meeting schedule because we've seen this year that there was no expectation of meetings for working groups. Some have only met once, and they didn't achieve anything, but we figured that two would be a solid starting point for them to start work.
 - b) IA | follow-up | Is it mandatory for them to participate in this if it passes?
 - (1) SW COMT | Yield to NE COLD
 - (2) NE COLD | I believe that if this piece passes it would fall in line with the previous expectations of catalyst groups. They've been present in CO spaces, but it hasn't been commonly followed. This minimum of 2 meetings per month is an expectation that will be set. When these meetings can happen, however, will be up to the Executives: will these working group meetings happen during a CO Chat or in place of one? So, yes, attendance would be an important factor.
 5. GL | Yield to GL CODE
 - a) GL CODE | The Great Lakes was wondering how the working groups would be structured during the summer, as this is largely a transition period and COs are likely still learning the requirements and duties of their roles and it would be difficult for them to select a working group?
 - b) SW COMT | Yield to NE COLD
 - c) NE COLD | Not to disagree with your point, but every CO enters with goals, and these should be the big focus in these working groups. This piece fosters the completion of goals through working groups that center them in our experiences.
 6. SW | We were wondering if the expectation would be that the execs would be organizing or someone else would be organizing the groups?
 - a) SW COMT | A mix of both!! CO's will get to put in what they want their working groups to be, but there will be collaboration between the two parties.
 7. PA | Wondering with your statement about expecting this to be a requirement for COs, do we then need to change policy books and governing docs? It doesn't mention it's mandatory in the piece
 - a) Chair | I can take this one, if that's helpful. There are a list of responsibilities. No it wouldn't need to be added to regional policy books. This would be under the CO portion.
 - (1) Time called.



- (a) SA | Move to extend Q&A by 5 minutes
 - (b) Annual Conference | 2nd
 - (c) Dissent | None
- b) NAN | Rae and Nahjah, were your x's for the motion or to be on the speakers list
 - (1) PA | How many x's do we currently have?
 - (a) NAN | 1 more
 - (b) PA | That's fine then.
- 8. SA | Will there be a structure for how COs are placed into groups?
Considering size of the groups
 - a) SW COMT | Yields to NE COLD
 - b) NE COLD | By having all of the CO's choose what the 4 working groups will be, there will be interest in all 4. I don't think it's necessary to put a cap on how many CO's can be in a working group then, because there will be representation. So, I don't think it's necessary to put caps in policy
- 9. IA | PPP | I yield my point.
- 10. IA | Can you clarify how feedback was gathered this year and what that feedback was from COs?
 - a) SW COMT | Yield to NE COLD
 - b) NE COLD | The feedback gathered this year wasn't done in the same manner from last year. These came from sentiments that have been told to us in informal settings, CO chats, etc. We pulled evidence and perspectives from the CO Exploratory Report, which has a wide variety of perspectives in it to inform us, too.
- 11. CA | Circle back to a SW question (maybe?). The plan is for COs and Execs to plan these groups. Curious if this group had thoughts on who should have the final authority. If it doesn't happen, who is accountable?
 - a) SW COMT | Yield to NE COLD
 - b) NE COLD | I can't think of a scenario in which that would occur. One of those first CO chats would offer this space to determine the topics within the first 60 days. Realistically, you'll have 4 topics sitting at the top of what everyone wants going into that space.
 - (1) Time
 - (a) NE | Motion to exhaust speakers list with additions
 - (b) IA | Second
 - (c) No dissent
 - c) CA | Follow-up | Do you think it would be wise to include, in this piece, that a vote must be held in the first or second CO chat?
 - (1) SW COMT | Yield to NE COLD
 - (2) NE COLD | Not opposed to making it specific, we want the flexibility for new COs to come into it. If that is something you think is necessary, that can be an amendment at some point



12. GL | Yield to GL CORI
- a) GL CORI | Thank you for being here! When would the summer working groups end and the fall working groups begin?
 - (1) SW COMT | Summer and fall is one working group. The reason we did it like that, if some groups started earlier this year, they would have been more productive. Some groups wanted to create stuff for RLC. Not having winter and spring is because things are busier in NACURH then
 - (2) NE COLD | Just a clarification of the timeline. The summer to fall working groups would start over the summer and run through to RLC's. The second set of working groups would get voted on and started up after Semi's and would conclude at the end of the spring semester.
13. PA | Going back to meeting twice a month business. Want to know what business would take place to make meetings beneficial and how these would differentiate from COs chats?
- a) SW COMT | Yield to Exploratory Team
 - b) NE COLD | Can you repeat the question?
 - c) PA | We are wondering what business will take place to make these meetings more beneficial, and how would they differ from the current CO chat structures?
 - (1) NE COLD | CO chats are focused on updates and informing COs and then splitting COs into groups. A lot of CO chat time has been dedicated to working or catalyst groups. Idea is that they have facetime with the exec committee member, they can provide support structure, and direction when needed. Fostered collaboration when needed so their voice is heard and has increased stakeholderhip. Stepping away from current groups, you don't get any of that. With this, you would
 - (2) PA | Follow-up | since these are required, would that be an addition to their chats or in replacement of?
 - (a) NE COLD | I think that would be up to the Executive Committee, specifically whoever is running the CO Chat each month. It all comes down to whatever is more beneficial to the CO's or what's more important that month. We left the structure loose enough to fit whatever is needed at the time.
14. IA | Seeing as an exec would be assigned to each group, how would this assignment work? Would the execs decide themselves or would the COs decide?
- a) SW COMT | It would be the Executives assigning themselves based on what they can provide the working groups based on their own goals.



15. NE | yield to COEO
- a) NE COEO | The Northeast is curious if there has been any thought to the intended outcomes of these working groups, outside of building relationships between CO's and working groups? If so, how would these working groups differ from task forces?
 - b) SW COMT | Can you repeat your question?
 - (1) Question repeated.
 - (2) SW COMT | Yield to NE COLD
 - (3) NE COLD | the biggest difference is going to be that there's not some sort of required outcome. A task force has a centralized / end goal in mind. For example, a philanthropy task force could strive to produce a philanthropy guide. These working groups will focus around other topics that are broader, such as Regional U's. The ultimate goal for these is collaboration, creating those connections, ties, and stakeholderhip. We hope CO's come to these meetings and then bring it back to their home regions or work to improve a service on the NACURH level.
16. PA | gonna ask a similar question regarding task forces, but we will ask, in the NACURH policy book, there are task force topics. One the PA wonders is if this is something for you to explore, is to what kind of issues?
- a) SW COMT | Can you repeat that? Unless a CO Exploratory Team member has an answer?
 - b) NE COLD | If you have a CO chat and everyone has to discuss the same topic. But, if you create separate passion area groups, you get to break up the number of people in the space, which frees more time. This is, then, a time management issue. Because the needs of the corporation changes so much year to year and because CO's rarely have the same exact goals as each other, we don't want to pigeonhole their thought processes on what these working groups could be by proposing any suggested topics
 - c) COMT | That is why we did summer and fall and establishing it in the summer and reestablishing in the spring because CO goals can change in the year
 - (1) PA | Follow-up | If CO chats have too many voices, why not create breakout rooms in those meetings, rather than creating these smaller targeted groups?
 - (2) NE COLD | Only one exec member is at a CO chat. If you split them up, not gonna have an exec in the breakout room. Lose that guidance and support and direction. Then you'd have to choose someone in that group, it can get messy. More clear with guidance from exec.



17. IA | Yield

E. Discussion

1. IA | Motion to caucus for 7 minutes
 - a) GL | Second
 - b) No dissent
2. PA | while there is good intention to move CO's priorities up more in NACURH, we believe that there needs to be more structure to be more beneficial for those involved!!
3. SW | SWACURH would like to commend the CO exploratory team for the effort that went into this piece, and the intent of making NACURH policy more inclusive to our CO leadership. However, we are concerned about the lack of specificity within the language used to describe the structure of the working groups. We feel that this piece is a great start, but needs more work to truly support the COs within their working groups and make this a necessary part of their role.
4. SA | Yield to CORHA
 - a) CORHA | We are in favor because of its development of the CO role and its aligned with CO's passion areas, while addressing the issues that have been brought forward this year.
5. NE | The Northeast really appreciates the work put into this piece of legislation and the intention behind it. However, we wish this piece included more detail. Catalysts provide a space for horizontal collaboration between COs of similar values and the Northeast would rather see this revamped over the current descriptions of these working groups. Additionally, the Northeast still lacks a sense of conviction on the role of executives, as well as the long term goals and timing of these groups, that would establish this as a necessary change. We encourage the authors to revisit this piece following Semis with the given feedback, as well as solicit more feedback from COs that may not have been consulted in this piece's formulation.
6. CA | Move to amend. The amendment has been sent to the Chair. We move to amend the phrasing regarding the 60 days starting period. We want to make sure that the period of time that is dedicated in the fall semester, so that y'all have a full 4 months at least in the fall to complete the goals of your working groups.
 - a) No second; the amendment dies
7. MA | The Midwest is appreciative of the work done by the CO exploratory committee, and thanks them for submitting this piece. However, the Midwest has concerns about the lack of accountability and dates discussed. We would love to see more structure based on the questions and answers provided. Nonetheless, we'd love to hear the opinions from other regions before making a firm decision.
8. GL | We want to express our appreciation to the authors of this piece. We feel that these working groups need more development before any changes can be formally proposed. We feel that timelines especially



need attention.

9. IA | Upon further reflection and after consultation with our COs, the Intermountain has strong concerns about the vagueness and the additional time commitment that this gives both COs and the Executive team. The Intermountain would be interested in potentially tabling this piece back to the authors, with the request that it be workshopped in a CO space to get more feedback from the group it directly affects.
10. CA | Yield to COMT
 - a) CA COMT |
11. NE | calls the question
 - a) SW | Dissent. We believe that it would be a better idea to table the piece, rather than letting it die.
 - b) NE | retracts
12. CA | Move to table the piece to the authors until, at least, the first Leadership Chat of the upcoming academic semester.
 - a) SA | second
 - b) IA | POI | Will the motioner be willing to amend the motion to allow this piece to be workshopped in a CO space?
 - (1) CA | As opposed to a CO Exploratory Team chat?
 - (2) Chair | That was a part of the feedback given, unnecessary to include it

F. Vote

1. Unanimous consent, piece tabled until the next NACURH Leadership Chat of the spring semester

XVII. Ground rules for Workshop

- A. Chair: Will hear it in a similar way as a regular piece. Once we get to discussion, still open to some follow up being asked. Wanting to know where everyone is at so that they can provide feedback as they see fit

XVIII. WRKS 21-01

- A. MA | Moves to bring WRKS 21-01 to the floor
 1. SW | 2nd
 2. No dissent
- B. Chair | A note before we begin, I will cap this piece at an hour.
- C. Proponent
 1. Kat, CO for Relations & Inclusion for GL, Ashley CO for Recognition and Service in GL
 2. GL CORS: Terms Residence Hall are not as inclusive as they seem, advisor came with me to this idea to make the title of NACURH more inclusive to include on-campus apartments. Didn't feel my voice would matter, unsure how to start that process. No on the RBD, have the platform to make the change, should start conversations. On-campus apartments, Greek like, grad housing. Not always affiliated with RHA, NRHH, etc., but doesn't mean they aren't always involved. Change name to end with residential housing to be more inclusive of living on campus.



3. GL CORI: passed a piece of legislation to use a more umbrella term to include student organizations. Wanted to do this to promote inclusion, did not want to disrupt the relationship an institution has with NACURH. Look forward to feedback.

D. Q&A

1. CA | Are there data or examples of instances where “residence halls” don't include things like this? For example, my host institution UMD - College Park has on campus apartments, which are included under the “residence hall” umbrella.
 - a) GL CORS | Not that I know of, at CMU we say halls and on-campus apartments
2. NE | Thank you all for this workshop piece. We’re looking for a bit more clarity on Greek Life as a housing unit. It’s my understanding that not all institutions that have Greek Life fall under Housing. If you could elaborate on this discrepancy and how an institution looking to affiliate with NACURH might resolve that, we would appreciate it.
 - a) GL CORI | In terms of Greek Life, only for schools where Greek Life falls under housing. Does not impact schools where greek life does not fall under housing. Don’t want our name to exclude them.
3. PA | We are wondering, because some of our affiliated institutions have rules that don’t allow participation in RHA / NRHH if the students do not live in residence halls, so how would this affect those affiliates?
 - a) GL CORI | We don’t want this to disrupt between NACURH and an institution, not trying to tell a school what to do. If an institution is making it clear to live in a hall, that is fine for them. This would help schools where Greek Life wouldn't fall under that
4. IA | Thank you for submitting this. We are wondering how you have seen the name NACURH Impact your members, since you talked about efforts that you’ve made to be more inclusive. How have you seen affiliates not be included?
 - a) GL CORS | Could you repeat the question?
 - b) IA | Repeated question
 - c) GL CORS | It’s more just because thinking about how recently my RHA recently added in the on campus apartments, and we did not feel the “Residence Hall ” name encompassed other types of housing.
 - d) GL CORI | Every conference that we go to, I get to speak with new people from around the region, and I learn so much from all of them. We all do the same things at the end of the day but with different factors in the mix. Some have Greek Life chapters in their RHA/NRHHs, and some don’t. While I don’t know if the current NACURH name actually harms affiliates, but we still feel that it would be a more inclusive approach.
5. SW | If this piece passes, would this trickle down to regions meaning



regional rebranding?

- a) GL CORI | Yield to Chair
 - b) Chair | Yes, so if this was passed by Leadership, it would have to get passed by the NCC's at Corporate Business, and if it passes there, it would, then, impact regional names.
6. PA | Yield to COSB
- a) PA COSB | Is this piece specific more to Greek Life rather than all housing opportunities? Seems like if it's not going to impact institutions and not trickle down and make affiliated schools not to recognize, don't totally see accessibility. Is it focused on Greek life making it open for potential?
 - b) GL CORI | We're not trying to force anyone into anything with this piece. This piece is also not just for Greek Life. This piece is more broadly inclusive of the many different forms of residential housing, such as apartments and other forms of housing recognized under their residential student organizations. I've been talking about Greek Life a lot because I've had many memorable conversations with those who have that aspect in their RHAs & NRHs, so I apologize if that has conveyed a specific idea there. We just want to open NACURH up.
7. CA | Yield
8. SA | as this requires name changes, do we have a way to know if there is a cost associated and what that would look like?
- a) Chair | can you repeat
 - b) SA | repeated
 - c) Time Called
 - (1) SW | Move to extend Q&A by 10 minutes
 - (a) MA | 2nd
 - (b) No dissent
 - (2) NAO | As far as this goes, the only cost associated with NACURH is legally changing our names if this is passed which aligns with the reincorporation piece. When it comes to incorporating anywhere, it has some costs. Only costs a couple hundred dollars. Requires more administrative time.
 - (3) NACURH Advisor | Pay cost to create new doing business as accounts. Range between \$50 to \$150 depending on the state.
9. IA | We have a question about what definition of "residence halls" we're using here. We looked up the definition, which came up with something vague and open already, so we would like to know what specific definition you're going with here.
- a) GL CORS | No specific definition we are going off of, my school has dorms. That's what I was going off of.
10. SW | We want to thank you all for this piece. We are kind of concerned



about what changes will happen at the regional level, and so we're wondering about what those changes may look like?

- a) Chair | You're asking if this passes, what changes happen?
 - b) SW | Mentioned that we would have to restructure at regions, concerned about what that would look like. Impacts delegates and wants to do what we think is best.
 - (1) Chair | When Kat and Ashley were drafting this. They didn't want to jump the gun on this. Solid steps have not been put in place, because this is just a workshop. We would give those changes more consideration and examination if this piece were to pass at some point in the future.
11. NE | This is somewhat an extension of a previous question but you mentioned that this was brought up by your advisor and you haven't consulted regional or national affiliates, but could you elaborate on why your advisor suggested this name change and how they found the current name restrictive when this hasn't been brought up before.
- a) GL CORS | Yeah, at my host institution, we've only included residential housing options that are explicitly categorized as traditional residence halls / dorms. She was saying, when I stepped in as NCC and now as CORS, that I could bring it forward. It was more of a lofty dream / goal. Since I'm now, I wanted to test the waters to see what the perspectives are like.
12. CA | Curious why the approach taken is to change the name and then give residential housing a new definition instead of giving residential halls a new definition in the policy books?
- a) GL CORI | Good point! I think that's an idea of bringing this forward in our working group then. We just wanted to explore the potential, as reincorporation is happening soon. If there is significant interest in this, we might as well operate on this point then. At its core, we found different and unique experiences within our region that extends beyond the traditional idea of residence halls.
13. PA | POI | Just a tad confused. What's the difference between "residential housing" and "residence halls"?
- a) GL CORI | In a residence hall, housing includes halls and on campus apartments fall under here in NACURH. Another institution, Greek like is included and grad housing is involved. Trying to be inclusive of any situation.
14. SA | Would this also change classification for on-campus housing for NACURH Leadership?
- a) Chair | No, any on campus housing that is stated this way already falls under on campus housing. A school might have on campus housing and apartments. If it's falling under housing office, it falls under the ability to be in leadership without exemption.



15. Time called.
 - a) SW | Move to exhaust the speakers list with additions
 - (1) CA | 2nd
 - (2) No dissent
16. NE | Have y'all given any thought as to how this change may impact NRHH? NRHH's name is National Residence Hall Honorary. Additionally, "NACURH" isn't fully spelled out on much, but "NRHH" is fully spelled out on many resources, and we're concerned about how physical items that have the full "NRHH" name spelled out should be dealt with?
 - a) GL CORS | Did not want to jump the gun and include NRHH, NRHM. Wrote it to get opinions on it.
 - b) GL CORI | NRHH is the next logical step
 - (1) NE | Follow-up | NRHH has specific membership induction materials, such as a pin. Would this name change necessitate ordering all new supplies, or would we go through our current inventory first?
 - (a) Chair | I don't think Kat or Ashley may be able to answer that at this moment, because that's not the intent of this workshop. They brought these ideas to me, but I had them pause on all of that work, since they didn't have Leadership feedback. Because of this, would you mind waiting on that response, as we consider moving forward?
17. NE | Yield to NE COEO
 - a) NE COEO | wondering if there was consideration given to costs on regional effort to create good marketing materials with a new name
 - (1) GL CORI | In terms of the money part, I'm not sure. I think all regions could keep their logos, because they'd just be changing "halls" to "housing," but I'll yield to NAO for more financial context.
 - (2) NAO | Paying folks for this would have to be a separate piece to amend FY 2022.
18. CA | Would making this more of an umbrella term open the door to more residence life organizations to affiliating with NACURH? For example if there's a Greek Life organization that is not an RHA or NRHH, could they affiliate?
 - a) GL CORI | great question. Something we want to be more specific on and take this piece back. Don't want this to mess with institutions. Something we would have to look at later on if we wanted to include things outside of RHAs & NRHHs. Be specific when we take this back to our desks

E. Discussion

1. MA | Hello! First, thank you for submitting this piece. We're super excited that this is our first Workshop we're hearing as boards, and thank you for



your intentional proponent. The Midwest would love to see some future evaluation or assessments in regard to the different types of residential housing units in NACURH and how our affiliates define housing. Additionally, we'd love to see a more thorough definition of on-campus Greek Life housing.

2. CA | We commend you both on your job on this. Hard to defend this and you both did great. Closer look and overview on how we are defining who is living where would be a great approach. At this time could not support change-- does not feel aligned with being inclusive.
3. NE | NEACURH really appreciates the submission of this piece and we see the potential in this piece. We would love to see more outreach to our affiliates regionally and nationally to see how the name currently impacts them whether positively or negatively before continuing the piece further
4. SW | While SWACURH applauds the intent behind making NACURH more inclusive, we would like to acknowledge that there is a lack of data to support the claim that this would positively impact our member institutions. Additionally, we are concerned about the potential regional ramifications that this rebranding could have. We would love to hear delegate, institutional, and leadership testimonials supporting the nature of this piece before being in support of the piece.
5. GL | thank you so much. A name change is something in the best consideration of NACURH but maybe not in this time. Maybe bad timing. GL would also like to see authors consider dropping the N on NACURH as we are not a national organization. Something worth considering so we can be inclusive of affiliates
6. IA | As many have said, y'all did so well. It can be very intimidating to do this, so thank you. We appreciate your focus on our member institutions. We appreciate the intention of inclusion. Inclusion is more than an idea, it should be an action. We echo that if this continues, we would love to see more data behind this. We would like to see this be a student-championed decision. The great influence of an advisor on this may be a bit much, so we would like to see more force and leadership coming from students.
7. PA | Moves to end discussion
 - a) IA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
8. Chair | Because this is a workshop, we will table it to the authors automatically.

XIX. Recess to positional time: 9:15 PM EST

Saturday, January 9, 2021

XX. Call to order at 12:30 PM EST



XXI. Roll Call

A. Present = x ; Absent = -

B.

	Director/Chair	ADAF/NBD Liaison	ADNRHH/Finance Chair
CAACURH	x	x	x
GLACURH	x	x	x
IACURH	x	x	x
MACURH	x	x	x
NEACURH	x	x	x
PACURH	x	x	x
SAACURH	x	-	x
SWACURH	x	x	x
Annual Conference	-	x	x

Chairperson	x	NACURH Advisor	x
NAO	x	NRHH Advisor	x
NAN	x	CRC	x
NAE	x		

Quorum is reached

XXII. Opening activity

XXIII. Re-visiting expectations

A. Yesterday's expectations re-read

1. Please stay present & avoid distractions
2. Emphasize reflection, workshopping, and discussion
3. Intentional time for breaks & entity communication
4. Avoid "gotcha questions" and have positive intent
5. Be honest about what you need to succeed



6. Come open-minded
7. Be open to making mistakes, we're all learning
8. Seek to understand
9. Try to have fun
10. Take time to talk to somebody you don't know; check in with your roommates
11. Share your unique ideas & perspectives

XXIV. Considerations for POY

- A. CRC | What is discussed here stays here. Once we have gone through the process and made a selection, I will let you know but it stays here. This is mine to communicate. I will communicate to everyone next week-- might take awhile to reach everyone. Will draft something you can send to your regions along with the winning bid. We do have some of your host institutions represented among those bids. Tough spot to sit in when we are having a discussion. Please be mindful of that and kind in this process. Did send an email out a bit ago, not considering UNLV's letter. Keep that in mind as we go into discussion as well.
- B. CRC | This is the only award that is named after someone who has never served as a NACURH Advisor. Daniel Siler never held any Leadership position within NACURH. He served as a delegation advisor, and his delegations consistently had winning programs. When he passed away, he was the advisor at the University of Wisconsin - White Water. I assumed his previous position there, and when I stepped into this role, I really wanted to remember him, and I do this by honoring this process every year. I want us to have thoughtful and earnest discussion. I want to provide thorough feedback to each of the institutions who submitted. Thank you for your time today.
- C. Chair | Will provide reminders to have thoughtful discussions. Since feedback is given back, how can we share feedback that is helpful and easy to digest.

XXV. Program of the Year

- A. NE moves to bring 2021 Program of the Year to the floor
 1. 2nd | CA
 2. No dissent
- B. Nominations
 1. SW | Nominates New York University
 - a) SA | 2nd
 2. IA | Nominates George Washington University Annual Conference | 2nd
 3. PA | Nominates University of Nevada, Las Vegas
 - a) CA | 2nd
 4. MA | Nominates North Dakota State University
 - a) PA | 2nd
 5. NE | Nominates University of Central Florida
 - a) Annual Conference | 2nd
 6. PA | Nominates Texas Woman's University
 - a) MA | 2nd
 7. PA | moves to close nominations



- a) 2nd | GL
 - b) No dissent
- C. Pro/Con
- 1. NYU
 - a) PA | POI | Is there a limitation of words you can use for pro/con?
 - (1) Chair | Will say it right back to you, summarize it if it is too long and you can let me know if it needs to be changed

Pro	Con
Multiple community resources utilized	Lacking educational components
Detailed explanations of challenges	-
Open to entire campus	Lack of focus on residents
Non-NYU budget example	-
Provides unique opportunities and experiences	Lack of budget adaptability
-	-

- b) PA | Motion to end Pro/Con for NYU
 - (1) IA | 2nd
 - (2) No dissent

- 2. GWU
 - a)

Pro	Con
Detailed consideration of pandemic within planning	Lacking formal evaluation of program
New opportunities for recognition	Lacking expansion on challenges
Large target audience	-
Attention to overall university mission	Unclear student impact
Connections with offices outside of housing	-
Recognized professional and interpersonal relationships	-

- b) SA | Motion to end Pro/Con
 - (1) PA | 2nd
 - (2) No dissent



3. UNLV

a)

Pro	Con
Programming prioritized marginalized groups	-
Recognized student health during pandemic	No elaboration on challenges
8 students lead event	-
Various educational components	Limited elaboration on logistics
-	

b) CA | Motion to end Pro/Con

(1) SA | 2nd

(2) No dissent

4. NDSU

a)

Pro	Con
Strong educational component	Confused on program timeline
Mental health focus	Lack of clear budget
-	Non-specific evaluation
Unique and innovative marketing	Lacks background details
Very transferrable	-
Student impact	-
-	-

5. UCF

a)

Pro	Con
Heavily focuses on program replicability	-
Strong focus on residential experience	-
Nice marketing visuals	Doesn't speak on possible improvements



Strong evaluation	-
Strong educational component	Program uniqueness
-	-

b) PA | Motion to end Pro/Con

(1) IA | 2nd

(2) No dissent

6. TWU

a)

Pro	Con
Great guest speakers	Large budget with limited financial details
Relevant to student population	Lacks detail of four months of planning process
Detailed resource page	Limited evaluation outside of attendance
-	Unclear program goals
-	-
-	

D. Discussion

1. SA | can we move to caucus for 5 minutes
 - a) Chair | making breakout rooms and then you can go. Review in the meantime
 - b) CA | 2nd
 - c) No dissent
2. SW | POI | When we have it typed up, who should we send them to?
 - a) Chair | The dynamic minute taking duo are Adam | NE Director and Becca | IA ADAF. You can also send them to Jacob | NAO, too.
3. MA | The Midwest appreciates all of the award bids submitted for 2021 Program of the Year, and we would like to highlight the University of Central Florida and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas for their various educational components and relevance to residence hall students.



4. IA | Would like to commend TWU's bid. Not all bids focus on empowerment, one of NACURH's values, which also empowers marginalized communities
5. SW | The Southwest would like to commend GWU on their intentionality in bringing more recognition efforts to their campus, utilizing resources provided by ACUHO-I to tailor their work for those being recognized. However, the Southwest would like to note GWU did not utilize a formal evaluation to determine the success of this program, which would provide crucial feedback for the presentation of this program if selected as the winner.
6. CA | We would like to commend NYU for creating a transferable budget, instead of just keeping their own budget, but we are unsure if this is truly useful because of the lack of detail.
7. PA | Like to recognize NYU's program, concerned of lack of student involvement outside of planning process.
8. PA | We want to appreciate the program hosted at TWU's and the importance and meaning of it. The bid lacks detail, which makes us feel less confident in awarding them POY this year.
9. SA | Commend NDSU on their educational components and their emphasis on mental health during COVID-19. Would have liked to see a more detailed budget and evaluation.
10. PA | Believes NDSU has great intention behind their program, confused about timeline and details in regards to program overall
11. NAO | PPP | Please let the minute-takers know if you're going to send them your written comments before you start speaking
12. Chair | Please also slow down when you speak, even if you're typing and sending the comments. That way, we can all listen well.
13. IA | We are very excited about all of these bids. While our letter of support is not being considered, we are truly proud of them, and we hope that you all can understand as we continue to discuss.
14. NE | The Northeast greatly appreciates the bid submitted by UNLV for its strong educational opportunities and support for marginalized communities. However, seeing little elaboration on challenges and a broad scope of program with little to no elaboration on logistics, we caution against over-considering the wide breadth of programs.
15. NE | Moves to narrow the field to 3 candidates
 - a) SW | 2nd
 - b) PA | Dissent. We have a few more points for discussion.
 - (1) SW | Retracts 2nd



(2) NE | Retracts motion

16. SW | The Southwest region would like to commend the University of Central Florida for their outstanding work on their program, Meet Your Neighbors. While the program was successful in meeting its goals and surpassing its expectations, it would be more beneficial to include what improvements could be made to maximize attendance and satisfaction from residents and to assist in the replicability aspect that the bid heavily focuses on.
 17. NAN | PPP | If we can all speak slower, that would be appreciated. I'm having a hard time understanding people when they speak quickly.
 18. PA | The Pacific would like to commend George Washington university and the arability to the pandemic. They have taken in consideration of making connections with other campus resources and utilizing them to support and build connections with residents.
 19. PA | Moves to narrow the field to 3 candidates
 - a) CA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
 20. Field Narrowed to:
 - a) GWU
 - b) UNLV
 - c) UCF
 21. NE | Point of order | Wanted to remind everyone that ADA accommodations was brought up, if it's something we mention for one school, we should mention it elsewhere
- E. Discussion Resumes
1. IA | Move to caucus for 5 minutes
 - a) SA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
 2. IA | We want to start with this comment because it helped us center ourselves when we selected POY at RLC. The intent is to recognize education in student programming, and it focuses on outstanding student initiative in that. We want this to be at the forefront of everyone's minds as they continue to engage here.
 3. PA | UNLV adapted well to the pandemic, recognized student health needs and how its been affected by the pandemic. They talked about expanding their programs to help marginalized communities, which is a great representation of diversity. They even introduced new socially distanced programs and had clear goals for each program



4. PA | GWU clear goals behind behind their programs, recognized relationship outside of the professional realm and provided great detail within their items to support their programs
5. IA | Regarding GWU, the Intermountain would like to note that the focus of their bid seemed to focus not exclusively on serving their residential students, and instead on other campus contributors. We see a lack of discussion of how recognizing those groups impacted students on campus, and we specifically want to name the potential impact of showing such visible support of campus police for students of color.
6. MA | The Midwest would like to re-highlight the University of Central Florida as we appreciated their three goals of information, interaction, and impact as these correlate alongside our Standard of Education. Additionally, we appreciated their thorough descriptions of evaluation tools and marketing that can contribute to the success of this program at other institutions across NACURH.
7. NE | Also like to recognize UCF's bid. Great roadmap for implementing a program. Unique way to bring students back to campus in a way that is safe. Replaced valuable interactions of a welcome week in a way that was adaptable to COVID 19. Really appreciated this program.
8. GL | GLACURH appreciates all of the bids presented today and the time and effort that was given to each one. We would like to specifically express our support for the bid from UNLV. We appreciated the programmers ability to adapt a traditionally in person program online to consider COVID-19 safety precautions, the variety of programming provided, the attention to supporting marginalized groups, and the educational intent behind the program.
9. SW | The Southwest would like to extend its support to UNLV for the hard work and dedication they put into their program. Though we are concerned about replicability of an event of this magnitude at institutions with varying budgets, we are extremely impressed with the outcome of the institution's program.
10. NE | POI | This was something that came up during our region's caucus, and it's something that we're still grappling with. Two of the bids are week-long programs, and one of them is a stand-alone program. When considering POY, we're struggling with the balance of these three bids, because of the great difference in their offerings. Does the Chair or CRC have any insight on how we can navigate this?
 - a) Chair | Let me reflect on that. In the meantime, we will move to the South Atlantic.



11. SA | Shares similar sentiments to the SW. Appreciates UNLV's emphasis on identity groups and health. While concerns around budget came up, we felt like the goals and needs presented outweigh concerns.
12. IA | While UCF showed intentionality with goal formation, the Intermountain didn't see critical discussion of how these goals were executed and we feel like this program, while adapted to COVID-19, is actually very similar to other programs across NACURH and doesn't seem unique. They didn't talk about how they served marginalized communities specifically unlike the other bids presented today.
13. CA | Abstain in discussing GWU's bid. In evaluating UCF versus UNLV, we found that UCF seemed more replicable and closer aligned to what we were instructed to evaluate the bids on. Opposed to UNLV which did not seem replicable or detailed in explaining the events during a week of programming.
 - a) Chair | I think I have a means to address this and NEACURH's POI from earlier. To have a week-long series of events is just one of many ways to implement a program. You can weigh in your mind that as a benefit or a draw back of the program. I hope this helps.
 - b) NE | Point of order | When it comes to recognize areas of growth, reflect on the equity statement and not address it as cons. Go about empowering bids to cater the parts we appreciate more. Would appreciate it if we frame statements and comments in a way that uplift schools instead of knocking them down.
14. MA | motion to narrow the field to 2
 - a) CA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
15. Field narrowed to:
 - a) UNLV
 - b) UCF

F. Discussion resumes

1. SW | could be a different parli pro thing, upon further reflection, we'd like to strike ADA comment we made for NYU's bid. Violated the Equity Statement and we want to rectify that.
 - a) IA | 2nd
 - b) Vote: 8-0-0, comment has been redacted
2. IA | Would like to state that we hear concerns with lack of details in UNLV's bid. In terms of that, we would like to refer you to page 8 of their bid. Addressing the limited page count to desired 18 components came into play in describing more details.



3. CA | We feel that if an institution cannot explain a program based on the requirements for the award. They should not be discounted, because that's a flaw within the bid.
4. IA | PPP | external processing. From an equitability standpoint, I don't know if it's fair to hold it against one candidate that they couldn't fit it in the bid considering they both have to follow limitations and they have to do what they can.
 - a) NE | POC | The Northeast also discussed this in our caucus. We went back to the question to the Chair about the series v. singular program. UNLV could've generalized their bid a bit more, rather than highlight certain programs. It depends on how they define the program and how they want to showcase it to us. They decided to utilize their bid to showcase these many, different programs, instead of choosing to focus on the other bid elements.
 - b) Chair | Conversation remains equitable by critiquing the use of what is in the bid since they are all given the same amount of guidelines.
5. NE | NEACURH wants to highlight UCF's bid again for providing quotes from students displaying the impact of the program which per guidelines under the evaluation section of POY states "must describe the effect on students who attended the program and the lasting impact on the student and campus community" special emphasis on describe as opposed to staying positive or negative
6. PA | We would like to echo a previous point made by the Intermountain. The uniqueness of a program within UNLV's bid innovated social distanced programs. We feel that UCF's bid did not innovate socially distanced programs, rather replicated what we typically see in a different format.
7. MA | Like to recognize a potential issue in equity in specifying uniqueness in UCF's bid. Frequency of the program does not discount the quality of the program.
8. PA | POI | We're curious about that potential inquiry. How is that an issue with inequity, when part of the selection criteria is the uniqueness of the program?
 - a) Chair | Because we have narrowed the field to two, if uniqueness is a component that will continue to be brought up, we should be more specific with how it enhances the program's quality.



- b) PA | As long as we put, “page 2 has unique things” that’s okay?
Like pointing out specific things in the bid that makes it unique.
- (1) Chair | I think that’s helpful. Yes. It makes it more clear than just stating that it’s unique. We’re now at a point where the field has been narrowed twice, so we need more information to have better results from this conversation. We need more specific examples moving forward as to why regions are learning the ways that they are.
9. Chair | Feel virtual tension. Could be beneficial for people to share what is keeping them from voting for something or what is deciding their vote.
10. NE | The Northeast hears concerns about uniqueness, but would like to resurface a comment by the Chair previously that we must review these in the context of the pandemic. Though a floor networking event may not seem original at first, the way that UCF conducted their event filled the void that would normally constitute casual floor discussions in common rooms. The Northeast would instead state that this program is greatly original and works to promote the continuity of the residential experience that would later set up residents for success in their time at university.
11. NAO | PPP | There’s still a couple instances in the earlier minutes that state “forthcoming.” This means that we’re still waiting for your comments, so please send them along.
12. PA | moves to caucus for 3 minutes
- a) MA | 2nd
 - b) SW | objects to ask for 5 minutes
 - c) PA and MA accept amendment
 - d) No further objection
13. CA | POC | want to know why UNLV’s regional letter of support was pulled since IA expressed support
- a) IA | UNLV ran into some time constraints when submitting bid. The letter of support is where issues occurred because of merging. Accessibility was something they wanted but couldn’t achieve that.
 - b) CA | Follow-up | So, it didn’t have to do with the content of your region’s bid then, correct?
 - c) IA | nothing with content, just time.
14. SW | The Southwest would like to commend UNLV for the feat of hosting and executing a series of 18 events within a week-long program as



student leaders. we would like to note that, while other institutions may not be able to replicate the program in full, the provision of 18 differing activities provides a unique aspect for institutions to utilize in their own program planning.

15. SA | The South Atlantic continues to reiterate previous thoughts presented about UNLV, and our appreciation for the focus on social justice. Whereas, we also recognize UCF falls within the South Atlantic & would like to remain as objective as possible in our support for this bid. The south atlantic would like to reiterate sentiments expressed by our NRHH representatives in how UCF had clearly outlined goals surrounding their program and utilized clear evaluation tools to assess the impact the program, which can be found in our letter of support.
16. IA | The vibes in this space don't feel great. We just want to explain our intentions here. Our passion for UNLV's bid comes from the desire to honor this award and emphasize the impact of student experiences across NACURH. When we speak, we're coming from a space of good vibes :)
17. PA | While we acknowledge the fact that these individual programs were not described in as much detail, we want to remind everyone that this bid is for the entire series of programs and not an individual program. TPWLT recognizes UNLV for their unorthodox and unique take on a virtual program. Rather than utilizing the traditional online social sites, UNLV chose to incorporate outside resources to engage students in active and quasi-in-person events.
18. MA | The Midwest would like to show our absolute admiration for both award bids. We truly believe both bids would be entirely deserving of Program of the Year. Moving forward, we would like to show our continued support for the University of Central Florida. We appreciated the integration of both the RHA & NRHH Executive Boards and interpersonal relationships throughout the program.
19. NE | NEACURH wants to highlight that both institutions created programs specific to navigating the COVID-19 pandemic. We feel that UCF's specificity on one event offers a clearer idea of how their program would be adaptable on campuses of all sizes, especially for smaller institutions who do not have as big of a budget or have had their budgets slashed due to COVID, which we have seen a great deal of in our region. We believe that UCF has a more transferable program, which is a point under the written bid selection criteria according to NACURH policy on page 164, "Relevance of nomination to other schools as a



resource for program adaptation and implementation.” The Northeast believes that a Program of the Year is one that has not only value that is beneficial to all of NACURH, but expresses this value in a vehicle that is widely accessible across all our member schools and chapters. We feel that presenting UCF’s bid as the next Program of the Year will allow all our affiliates to explore specific and intentional ways to connect residents and turn a hall into a home.

20. CA | Moves to exhaust speakers list with additions

- a) SW | 2nd
- b) No dissent

21. IA | The strength of the University of Nevada Las Vegas’ bid is that there are so many different components that focus on uplifting and meeting different identities and students' needs. We see the ability for institutions who see this bid to have the ability to choose areas that match what their campus populations are needing. Call special attention to the programs: Black Students Connect, Entrepreneurship Panel, and the LGBTQIA+ social. These programs demonstrate how this group of 8 students went above and beyond to meet specific student needs, in addition to hosting many other programs. In the Intermountain, we find it important to really meet students where they are, respond to their needs, and foster a large sense of community. When it comes to exceptional student-ran programming, which is part of the purpose of POY, we believe UNLV has far exceeded what it means to be exceptional in their programming.

22. Speakers list is exhausted

G. Vote:

1. Tied, must re-enter discussion

H. Discussion resumes

1. NAN | PPP | Do I need to pull the old speakers list, or should this be a new one?
 - a) Chair | We’ll start a new one.
2. PA | PACURH would like to express our support for UNLV in their program and would like to further expand on the uniqueness in their program, specifically in the innovative impact that was made on student siding a pandemic, specifically during Black student connect, in which they not only built community but also educated those that attended. UNLV Cribs and crafternooning allowed students to express themselves creatively. Clash of the complexes, where students were able to expand their social networks to other residence halls. Entrepreneurship panel allowed students to expand themselves on a more professional side, and



etc. We believe that UNLV has taken their student needs and wellbeing in consideration throughout their entire planning process and took the time to evaluate what was successful during the program as well. And for these reasons, we will be in support of UNLV

3. CA | Like to recognize that UCF included more tangible details about their evaluation tools, successes, and challenges in their bid. A consideration in POY guidelines.
4. Chair | I think that when we left the discussion last time, I didn't hear what I saw in the vote. It didn't seem like we were going to tie, but we did. I would like people to ask for what they're looking for in POY. What are you all putting emphasis on as an entity? What would make your region feel more comfortable to change your stance?
5. PA | Where we stand, taking consideration of both programs overall in considering impact and components they placed into programs. UNLV touched on building community, social networks in a responsible way. We considered them touching base on marginalized communities which is important to our region. Built a network and educated others through their program. These components are true values the pacific holds and that decided our program of the year.
6. SW | Whereas the Southwest recognizes that both programs are exceptional, we would like to provide support to UNLV again for the ability for all institutions who will see this in the future to have an upwards of 18 programs to bring back to their own institutions.
7. CA | In the nature of making it a discussion, we will respond directly to that point. We look at UNLV's bid, and while it's very impressive, we see necessarily none that you can bring back. The detail isn't there, and what's provided isn't very available. You can't take this bid and turn it into any one program, because you lack the detail necessary. This is why we feel that this is difficult for us to lend our support to it. In replicating the bid and in achieving what we're supposed to be evaluating, this does not appear to be the top choice.
8. NE | When reviewing POY candidates, the Northeast values most the things that participants walk away with. A program is nothing without a purpose, and POY is not a game of numbers--it's a game of impact. After reading through both bids again, we see this intentionality for impact more behind UCF's bid. When looking at the two evaluation forms, it's worth noting that UCF specifically asked participants one thing they took away. The evaluation of UNLV centered more on the programs



themselves as opposed to what people left with. This is why the Northeast supports UCF shows a greater importance on impact.

9. IA | In terms of how the Intermountain came to this, we looked at both bids and saw many similarities in terms of what these programs offered. They're both welcoming and transition-oriented. How they went about these ideas are different. UCF's bid is good and commendable, but we feel that UNLV took a different approach and offered spaces that may not typically be offered on a college campus.
10. SW | Moves to caucus for 5 minutes
 - a) SA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
11. SA | The South Atlantic would like to echo sentiments expressed by our NRHH reps, shown in our letter of support, and their feedback regarding UCF's "intentionality in creating the program itself and their knowledge of the student needs at the University". They also expressed the program's ability to be replicated at smaller institutions with a "zero-dollar budget".
12. PA | The Pacific would like to acknowledge the detail and dedication to the bid, but we want to express that UNLV's bid allows for institutions to become inspired, adapt, and implement on their on campus utilizing this as a true resource.
13. SW | While the SW recognizes that UNLV could provide a deeper explanation of each activity put on throughout their welcome week, we would like to note that on pages 9-13 of their bid, several of the activities are outlined to allow institutions the chance to make them their own.
14. MA | The Midwest is thankful for the open discussion we're currently having as joint boards. We echo the same discussion points provided earlier by the Central Atlantic and Northeast. We've been searching for educational components and ease of transferability for Program of the Year. We are in support of the University of Central Florida. UCF provides tangible evaluation information for institutions to utilize for reimplementation, and we continue to highlight the interpersonal connections created.
15. GL | The Great Lakes would like to elaborate on our support for UNLV's bid. We echo all previous statements we've made. When looking at UNLV's bid, we saw many components that institutions tend to struggle with, especially in regards to social justice and advocacy initiatives. We openly state that we as a region and our affiliates have struggled in this



area. We recognize the needs in our region, and this bid offered us tools and ideas to fit the needs of our campuses.

16. NE | The Northeast wants to view the question before us from a different angle: what gaps in each bid are forgivable? If you were handed each bid, the Northeast feels as though the gaps in UCF's bids still allow for the program to be put on with no prior knowledge of context. Conversely, the Northeast believes that the gaps in the bid submitted by UNLV prevent an institution that is starting from scratch from putting on this program and having participants leave with the same takeaways. We're eager to hear input from other affiliates on how they are able to justify gaps in each bid and which they deem more viable for POY from that angle.
17. PA | Would like to understand what you see as as gaps for both
18. IA | To answer that question, it sounds like there's a question of value. We've heard others emphasize the value of supporting marginalized communities. For us, this matters more than transferability, especially this past year. It seems that we're weaponizing replicability as the end-all-be-all. We don't see the gaps, rather the differences are areas of strength. Having these different programs with their outlines can be very beneficial for schools across NACURH.
19. NAN | PPP | Just a gentle reminder to speak on behalf of your regions when speaking in this space.
20. NE | Understand things are being judged as values, support marginalized communities but how to do that wasn't there. Transferability wasn't there. Looking at a program as a whole, while there are components you can break away from. Can't even take away a smaller component. Pages 9-13 there are descriptions of the program. Those are descriptions, not how to implement on a specific level. UCF does have that step by step, which is more transferable to schools without a budget.
21. SW | In SWACURH, we support family and individuality here. The reason why we support UNLV is that we see their program as a way to bring people together to best support the wide variety of types of institutions in our region. Just having the descriptions to us is a positive. It shows readers how one experience went, and then it allows a different institution to take that and adjust it to their own campus' needs.
22. IA | Would also like to point out that it does decide how they implemented some programs. Complex Cupid, says participants fill out a questionnaire, after receiving, a board would go through applicants. Go into other specifics. With LEGO competition, they are divided into 4



categories, judged based on creativity, use of color, detail, explained prizes that go with him. With Black students Connect, it states programs being held on Zoom, explaining what students were given beforehand, and then what they did in the event. UNLV cribs had students submit 3 minutes to showcase their rooms. There are components that describe how. They go into materials needed in supplies and what is needed for personnel and other resources. IA would like to point out that there are ways a campus can look at this and implement it in the community.

23. NE | Calls the question
 - a) No dissent
24. NE | POC | is this a bid you can no confidence or abstain
 - a) NAO | yes, will add it to the form
25. Vote:
 - a) Both candidates reached a tie
26. Chair | Same results, even split tie. Leads me to believe that entering discussion again won't help us. People are comfortable with their votes. Three options to vote upon: do not have a POY winner, exec committee could be the tie breaker, abstain.
 - a) IA | POI | why is not giving this award to both an option instead of giving it to both
 - (1) Chair | we have to have a winner
 - b) SW | POI | Can you provide some clarification on the abstain part. Would it be a region abstaining, or the abstention from the award?
 - (1) Chair | Both options are viable.
 - (2) NAN | abstention is that you don't want execs to break a tie or you can't decide
27. GL | PPI | for parliamentarians, have more than 12 people in here, but only 8 people. Robert's rules allow the chair to break a tie in a smaller..
 - a) Chair | looked into it, yielding to Dan
 - b) Parliamentarian | when the chair breaks a tie, it has to be in governing documents.
 - c) Chair | Because it isn't in policy, why we are putting it into a vote is for you to make a decision on what you want
28. IA | curious as to why only one can be awarded, more specifics, both are exceptional, going back to what Rae said, seems none of these or two exceptional ones is the option. What that would entail
 - a) CRC | While you all are voting on this and this is a co-sponsored award with ACUHO-I, our agreement with them, specific to this



- award, there is a winner. Part of this process is to send that winner through their conference. That's how the award is structured.
29. PA | in the case that the execs break a tie, can we go back into discussion, want to gauge where you are at?
- a) Chair | We've sat in on the discussion that's been had. We've listened to the conversations that have already happened, and we will be informed by those conversations. This means we wouldn't have to enter into another period of discussion.
 - b) PA | follow-up | will you explain why?
 - (1) Chair | yes
30. CA | So, the Executives will vote, and assuming it won't tie, will we know if it's unanimous or what the vote looks like?
- a) Chair | Yes, I'd be willing to share that.
 - b) NAN | To further elaborate, the Executive Committee gets one vote as a whole entity, not four separate votes.
31. CA | PPP | To outline for everyone before the vote is announced, we can refer this to the Executive Committee to resolve the vote.
32. Result
- a) Unanimous that executives break the tie
 - b) Chair | Thank you for extending trust in an impossible situation
 - c) POY Winner | UCF
33. CRC | Each institution will receive written feedback, which was provided when we distributed the bids to y'all. The notes that you entered in that spreadsheet, in addition to the discussion from today (with the removal of which regions made which comments) and pro / con for their respective POY submission. They will all receive a packet with this information from me within the next few days. I will also be making phone calls, because I feel that it's more appreciative and appreciated. It may take a few days, depending on how soon someone picks or returns my call. The winner is the last to be contacted, so please keep this quiet until I give you all a signal, which will be done in an email after I've connected with the winner. I will work with the institution throughout the next two months to prepare them for their presentation at the Annual Conference and ACUHO-I's Annual Conference.
34. Chair | I will now entertain any questions that you all have on this matter.
35. PA | POC | can you state the reasoning behind the vote for UCF?
- a) NAE | felt the accessibility and adaptability of a smaller budget was the main reason for the 4 of us to vote in favor of UCF



b) NAO | centering on what Noheli said, that was the main deciding factor

36. CA | Was it unanimous?

a) Chair | Yes.

37. NE | Move to groove for 60 seconds

(1) MA | 2nd

(2) No dissent

XXVI. FY 21 Budget - Re-adoption

A. GL | Moves

B. CA | 2nd

C. No dissent

D. Proponent Speech | NAO

1. This budget is on the Semi's website, and there is a finance overview resource on the Semi's website for your review, in case you need to refresh on NACURH finances. A brief overview for what's happening. This is for the current fiscal year, which ends on March 31st 2021. We've rearranged long-term funds for projects this year, but also rearranges the ways that long-term funds were initially used. Things to watch out for:

a) Long-term funds, such as Vanguard, EMA, etc.

b) Lines that deal with ACUHO-I

c) Charitable contributions

d) Postage

e) Annual Conference

2. The changes that I'm highlighting are firstly in "regional dues." The price of Xero went up unexpectedly toward the end of the fall. To account for that, there is a \$50 increase in each region's annual dues to NACURH to cover this. With our endowed management account, each region has a checking, savings, and other monies stored away in an endowed management account. We made this change because the funds were initially slated to come out of our NACURH Reserves Fund and our long-term Investment accounts, such as Vanguard. The first issue here is with the current NACURH reserves, it was listed to be about \$45k initially slated to come out of the NACURH reserves, when we only have about \$36k in the reserves at the moment. This is thus unrealistic. With Vanguard, this acts as our long-term investments, which provides NACURH a bit of revenue each year and some dividends, too. Since our EMA account is where more of our savings are located but with a higher interest rate, the EMA is the next best location to draw money from for this upcoming year. We also see an increase in technology expenses because we realized that the NACURH Executive Committee will not need as much money in technology in the near future. For expenses and specifically under charitable contributions, we made a commitment to BLM over the summer to match the receipts of those who donated and submitted their receipts, which added up to ~\$3k. This, in addition to



our matching, equates to ~\$8k under this expense line item. With the Annual Conference, since it's not being hosted by a host institution this year, it all falls under NACURH at this point. Because we're in an awkward spot right now, because it's happening in June, we found it to be more appropriate to allocate the \$10k. We also believe that we will make these expenses up with delegation fees. Since Semi's was at no cost, we reduced that expense to \$0. Because we've mailed a lot out this year, I've raised that expense. To counterbalance this, we're pulling money from NACURH's P-card, but we're pulling money from the NCO's former account to balance it out. Travel has been reduced to zero across the board, because no travel will be occurring this year for anything. The rest of the changes to expenses took into account the leftover travel dollars that are no longer needed for travel. Alternative Break was not zeroed out, but was reduced by \$5k because of our Black Lives Matter statement, which declared that we pull funds from the Alt. Break subline item, but we're still anticipating some expenses for a virtual Alt. Break. We're still accounting for a \$6k deficit. OCM gave us a large sum of \$25k a few years back, which was meant to be divided across four years, but because we're not actually taking that money in (because it already exists within our accounts), we're seemingly taking a deficit, when it's not a true hit to our budget.

E. Q&A

1. CA | Am I correct in saying you expect some annual conference expenses this year and won't be getting the revenue until next year?
 - a) NAO | Correct, because we're in that awkward in-between phase with the Annual Conference.
 - b) CA | Follow-up | Is this accounted for in next year's budget?
 - (1) NAO | I didn't account for the \$10k mark in next year's budget because the Annual Conference is using money that we have available. We're not exactly sure how much the Annual Conference will need because their budget is in draft form. As far as what to expect there, it'll be easier to account for those expenses in FY'22
2. PA | In regards to the deficit, with the money originally deposited from OCM, was that deposited into the checking, EMA, etc.? Could you have the budget not represent the deficit if you account for the transfer in so we don't reflect a deficit on paper
 - a) NAO | That historical part is unclear. I want to say that this trend is at least a couple years old because we're on the latter part of this four-year timeline. I'll defer to the NACURH Advisor for a clearer answer.
 - b) NACURH Advisor | Deposited into checking. Runs a deficit because it's already in the checking account.
3. PA | Could clarify about how the donations work again, specifically the Black Lives Matter donations?



- a) NAO | Basically it comes from a couple places. Reason why it's deposited into charitable contributions part, we weren't authorized to make contributions previously. In the memo, it mentioned if Alternative Break would be virtual, a portion of those funds were going to be donated. Did not specify what portion though. In order to account for that, that's where \$5000 came from. Remainder came from Semis and then Semis was zeroed out as well
 - 4. CA | Could you just elaborate on the division between the NCO and NACURH budgets? Specifically, why is the NACURH budget covering the shipping costs, instead of just sending them straight to the NCO?
 - a) NAO | The NCO credit card doesn't exist anymore. Comes down to using Mary's card which comes out of NACURH's account and that's what we have available. To accommodate, we record what purchases are made and then the NCO reimburses NACURH from that transfer.
 - b) NACURH Advisor | Just to add on, the NCO credit card is in the name of the former advisor. Now that they are no longer an advisor, that card ceased to exist. Because I'm the one that manages the credit cards and paperworks related to it, it's just easier to do transactions on my NACURH credit card and then to do a line item transfer.
 - 5. IA | Motion to end Q&A
 - a) SW | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
- F. Discussion
 - 1. MA | Appreciate Jacob's hard work and getting this together. Appreciates transparency, communication, and getting us through the rest of the year.
 - 2. PA | POI | Are we voting on this?
 - a) Chair | Yes, we will be voting on this. Because it is budgetary, we will need a 2 / 3 vote to pass this.
 - 3. CA | Also echo we appreciate Jacob putting this together. Appreciate that recognition and identity networks were left funded and other cuts were made to align the budget with reality
 - 4. PA | We move to caucus for 5 minutes
 - a) SW | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
 - 5. NE | Echo what was said earlier, appreciate thoughts and consideration. Appreciate transparency. Time and consideration shows. Important to receive updates on the budget. In favor of proposed adjustments. Thank you
 - 6. SA | POI | Will this budget account for the money received from the NCO?
 - a) NAO The reason why I didn't make changes there is frankly, I



don't see our affiliation numbers meeting previous expectations. Left it as is.

7. SW | Thank you for your presentation. We voice our support for these proposed changes. The work put into this budget is substantial and transparent. They comfort the current financial plan in mind, and we appreciate that.
8. GL | GLACURH would like to thank Jacob for his hard work on this budget. It is very clear that Jacob has a strong understanding of NACURH's finances and what is important to the regions. The presentation was clear and easy to understand, leaving us with a strong understanding of the changes being proposed. With that, GLACURH would like to show our support of passing this updated version of the FY 21 budget.
9. SW | Motion to move into a vote
 - a) PA | Second
 - b) NE | POI | are ADAFs voting on this
 - (1) Chair | was about to ask. If you are not having your ADAF vote, speak now

G. Vote

1. 8-0-0, the budget passes

XXVII. Chair | Moving forward, NNB will go into their split space for positional time, but Directors and ADAF's will return to this code for positional time to pass the remaining two budgets. We will start after break with the case study presentations!!

XXVIII. Recess: 5:00 PM EST

XXIX. Call to order at 7:00 PM EST

XXX. Roll Call

A. Present = x ; Absent = -

B.

	Director/Chair	ADAF/NBD Liaison	ADNRHH/Finance Chair
CAACURH	x	x	x
GLACURH	x	x	x
IACURH	x	x	x
MACURH	x	x	x
NEACURH	x	x	x
PACURH	x	x	x



SAACURH	x	x	x
SWACURH	x	x	x
Annual Conference	-	x	x

Chairperson	x	NACURH Advisor	x
NAO	x	NRHH Advisor	x
NAN	x	CRC	x
NAE	x		

Quorum is reached

XXXI. Case studies

- A. DEI
- B. Restructure
- C. NACURH and Politics
- D. Dynamics
- E. Dynamics and Restructuring will present in one space while DEI and NACURH and Politics
- F. Notes will be taken by some advisors in this space and feedback will be sent along at a later date.

XXXII. Roll call

A.

	Director/Chair	ADAF/NBD Liaison	ADNRHH/Finance Chair
CAACURH	x	x	-
GLACURH	x	x	-
IACURH	x	x	-
MACURH	x	x	-
NEACURH	x	x	-



PACURH	x	x	-
SAACURH	x	x	-
SWACURH	x	x	-
Annual Conference	-	x	x

Chairperson	x	NACURH Advisor	x
NAO	x	NRHH Advisor	-
NAN	-	CRC	x
NAE	-		

Quorum is reached

XXXIII. NACURH Fiscal Year 2022

A. MA | Motion to bring budget to the floor

1. SW | 2nd
2. No dissent

B. Proponent speech | NAO

1. Welcome to your annual budget presentation. What you'll notice is you'll laugh and cry but know you will be ok in the end. Overview, FY22 runs from April 1, 2021 to March 31, 2022. Fits weird with affiliation, but it's like that because that's how the IRS functions. Keep an eye out for new challenges. As the pandemic is ongoing, NACURH has encountered challenges. Incorporated higher predictability from FY21.
2. Watch out for incorporation of the annual conference, increased NCO related costs, use of longer term funds, updates in regional dues. Revenue changes: adding the add-on fee backs. For this past fiscal year, the past conference was free. Annual conference is considered here. Christina and I were talking about potential for budgets as far as delegates go 1,000 is the lower of our estimates. Requested some regional leadership conference data because this is the first online cycle-- helps us infer what we might be able to expect. As far as OCM goes, every year, OCM presents NACURH an annual gift. Part of it stays with NACURH and part is distributed. In revenue, it's reduced, part of that is a flat rate of what we expect, in addition, we get extra dollars based on



how many programs OCM has at affiliated schools. Budget to plan for surprise. Price increase in services covered by regions, NCO, and NACURH. Explains where it is coming from for each region fee. All of the fees are encompassed into one fee that all regions budget for. Reiterate that the endowment management accounts hold short term savings and Vanguard holds longer-term savings. We do not touch Vanguard because we receive interest and dividend income.

3. Top half is our revenues. Find conference add-on fees and other fees (Guidebook), reflected on what annual conference pays for guidebook. Bottom of revenue is regional dues including services mentioned before. Are in an unavoidable situation where we need to take in additional dollars from savings. To balance the need to draw from EMA, did budget for a slight transfer in from reserves but kept those accounts about \$30,000 still. Have a feeling affiliation will be flatter next year, keep numbers the same. They pay dues.
4. Expenses: the annual conference is a neutral host committee. Usually, a school is fronting the cost and they are recovering the cost through fees and they reimburse NACURH for add-on fees. This time around, NACURH is fronting the cost. NACURH is fronting \$15,000 they would news between April 1st and the annual conference. Would recover those costs in the form of delegation fees. Difference there is that we had to account for set-up fees. ACUHO-I contract and OTM. Now, we don't need to account for set-up fees since they occurred. Needed to encompass annual fees in those contracts. Similar to this year, we are mailing everything. Amount of postage required for transition is the same as last year because we needed the whole amount. Left mailing for merch is pretty high. Recognition changes, since ACUHO-I and annual conference are virtual, POY travel reduced to 0. Programming grant was not funded until readoption. Added some funding. Virtual programs probably do not cost as much. Board for next year will be able to split up money to some schools as winners. Up to them. Something new from Robert is an NRHH induction scholarship. Work for institutions for schools who buy induction materials. Since this is a test trial not in policy, added a couple hundred in there. Once it's in policy, the next boards can consider an increase. Subscriptions are things we pay for the regions, Xero, our accountant, JotForm: reimbursed partially from the regions but NACURH pays for its own part as well.
5. Do make an annual donation to ACUHO-I for programs. Those are donations that occur yearly-- did not change. Result of a longer



relationship between us and ACUHO-I. Conference expenses have to budget for a loan that is reflected in revenues as to when it is paid back. Professional fees: ACUHO-I services along with accountant. Recognition breakdown. Induction scholarship is a new line item. Identity networks. Reason why it's at \$1500 instead of \$300 is because it was increased at the annual conference to cover an emergency COVID scholarship. Originally slated to have \$1000. For general, they will get \$500 more than last year. Transfers out occurs for OCM and other programming funds. Travel is zeroed out, left \$500 for alternative break. \$200 in general travel to encounter any unknowns. Had to reimburse some gas receipts because of passing off items. Mary has to take NCO to Ohio soon.

6. Total revenue \$158,710. Expenses: \$164,561. Deficit: \$5,851
 - a) Deficit is from the OCM \$25,000 gift that came through a few years ago that is split up among 4 years. Have to budget for a max \$6,250 deficit to account for those.

C. Q&A

1. CA | Thank you for this presentation. Looking at the revenue's interest income, there was about \$4k in FY'21. Why is nothing budgeted there for FY'22?
 - a) NAO | That is the actual number of what we received. In general, not best to account for interest. Dependent on stock market. Could decrease investments in the long run. Not a good way to indicate it.
2. PA | Regarding the Annual Conference loan, for \$5k, is the Annual Conferenceferent NACURH account? If not, do we need an initial loan of \$5k, or should it be up more like \$20k?
 - a) NAO | Loan and annual conference sections are two things. Loan would be in consideration for 2022 annual conference because it's within the first 60ish days, whoever the host is can request up to a \$5,000 loan from NACURH. That's why it's accounted for. We still have the option of schools bidding for AC 2022, that's why the need for the loan is not clear yet.
3. SW | Thank you for this beautiful budget draft. Under postage and freight's general subline item, it's budgeted at \$49k, but there's a \$400 difference between this one and the budget we passed earlier today. Do you know why that is?
 - a) NAO | Good question, let's see. So there wasn't much of a reason behind it. Between this year and next March, the \$4500 would



cover it. This time around, I accounted for other transition materials that we did not account for in the past. Mostly because this time around, if any additional NCO stuff needed to be purchased, it would transfer from the NCO. With ACUHOI transition, we will not need to make that for the NCO. ACUHOI can manage that.

4. GL | We see that travel for spring conferences is at \$0, but what would the plan be for the regions that are planning for an in-person spring conference next year?
 - a) NAO | As far as RBCs go, to be honest, it is not something we have thought about too much. We assumed most will be virtual. Might need to be edited later on. Particularly when we have a better idea of how many schools are hosting RBCs-- RBC 2022s haven't been solidified yet. Once we have a number, we can plan to edit it to reflect what's happening.
5. CA | Looking at expenses, recognition, Advancement Society, operation expenditures subline item, what is that spent on this year? And why is not being budgeted for next year?
 - a) NAO | Yield to NACURH Advisor
 - b) NACURH Advisor | Cost for shipping out Advancement Society plaques was much higher than it should have been because of the plaque purchased. Cost-saving measure to find something less expensive to save money on shipping
 - c) NAO | Generally plaques fall under the general recognition subline item, so I guess that this was just an anomaly
6. PA | If you thought it would be valuable to include the Canadian exchange rate if Candidan affiliates were looking at this? And if the title and date range would be updated for an accurate fiscal year?
 - a) NAO | Yes, the Canadian exchange rate is valuable and easy to encompass, and for your second idea, I'll fix it now!!
7. SW | You set meals for \$200, looked at past budget and meals were not accounted for. Can you expand on that?
 - a) NAO | That falls under the general and emergency travel expenses, too. It would fall under the same logic. For example, if a meal needed to be reimbursed while delivering the NCO stuff to Ohio, it would come from this.
8. SA | We noted that the annual conference pre-bid accounted for an in-person semis, are we using same mentality for RBCs for travel?
 - a) NAO | Yield to CRC



- b) CRC | A pre-bid typically are just thoughts that are presented to us. They may or may not happen. If the conference is going to be virtual, we follow suit with what we've done this year. Looking at optics, pulling this group together for Semi's or Pre-Conf but not the rest of the corporation doesn't look good on us. If the Annual Conference is virtual, then all aspects of that conference experience need to be virtual.
- 9. PA | The Pacific was wondering if the proposed hybrid model of achuoi passes would NACURH still front that cost for Xero?
 - a) NAO | Since the price of Xero encompasses each account, it's something that tNACURH should still be accountable for.
- 10. CA | Looking at expenses inventory and revenue sale of inventory. Wondering why NBD apparel lines aren't equal?
 - a) NAO | Generally no. When it comes to NBD apparel, we mostly try to meet the cost of the creation of the items and their shipping.
- 11. MA | Motion to exhaust speakers list with additions
 - a) CA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
- 12. PA | POI | What line item were you looking at in the budget, so we can connect the dots?
 - a) CA | Looking at expenses, inventory, NBD apparel then revenue, sale of inventory, NBD apparel
- 13. CA | Looking at expenses, recognition, and just in the awards line. Wondering why Dan Ocampo scholarship isn't in its own line and if it could be in it's own line in the future to add transparency to that.
 - a) NAO | Previously it was lumped in somewhere else in the budgets of the past. If it's something that NACURH simply funds and that's it, then we can change it around, but if it's tied to the Annual Conference, then we'd need to examine it more. I'll yield to one of the NACURH advisors for more context.
 - b) CRC | It's definitely not an annual conference expense, it was intended to be separate and we did fundraising for it. Moving forward would be a NACURH expense.

D. Discussion

- 1. PA | We move to caucus for 5 minutes
 - a) CA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent



2. SW | The Southwest region applauds the NAO, Jacob, for his clear explanations and intelligible insight for the forthcoming FY22 budget. With the changes to accommodate the foreseeable virtual environment for the next year, the southwest region supports the passing of this budget.
3. MA | The Midwest wanted to thank Jacob for his hard work once preparing us a new fiscal budget. Budgets are usually just a guideline and best projections, and we understand that changes might have to be made down the road, especially given the current state of things, but are confident that Jacob is setting us up for success. We support the passing of this budget as is.
4. CA | We also support this budget, and we thank Jacob | NAO for his hard work in putting this together and believe that it's a solid vision for what next year will look like.
5. NE | Would like to commend Jacob for putting this together and the adaptability of it and we fully support this budget.
6. GL | calls the question & requests we yield votes to ADAFs
 - a) No dissent

E. Vote:

1. 8-0-0, the budget passes

XXXIV. Recess to positional time: 10:25 PM EST

Sunday, January 10, 2021

XXXV. Call to order at 12:30 PM EST

XXXVI. Roll Call

A. Present = x ; Absent = -

B.

	Director/Chair	ADAF/NBD Liaison	ADNRHH/Finance Chair
CAACURH	x	x	x
GLACURH	x	x	x
IACURH	x	x	x
MACURH	x	x	x
NEACURH	x	x	x



PACURH	x	x	x
SAACURH	x	x	x
SWACURH	x	x	x
Annual Conference	-	x	x

Chairperson	x	NACURH Advisor	x
NAO	x	NRHH Advisor	x
NAN	x	CRC	x
NAE	x		

Quorum is reached

XXXVII. Opening activity

XXXVIII. 2022 Annual Conference Pre-bid Feedback

- A. CRC | Hopefully we all had a chance to look at the bid. There is not a lot of content to discuss. We know what's missing in relation to the list provided. Couple areas we can be flexible on truly because we are figuring out what it means to be a part of a virtual experience. Don't need to focus as much on those right now, but components that need to be there: registratio, mass gatherings. Hopefully that list is a good guide. Want us to spend time on providing ideas and questions that spark ideas for them. Any thoughts you can gather. Anyone on this screen should have been through one or two virtual conferences at this point. We should have something to work off of. Anything goes, no bad questions or suggestions. Let's do our best to help them fill some gaps in and have things to work on. Usually due on May 1st, since the conference is later, planning to give them until June 1st.
- B. Chair | From what CRC said, I'm looking to hear from each entity in a general way, and then, we can guide the conversation from what points come up initially.
- C. CA | This was feedback we saw from many regions. As far as chairs, they list transportation which seems unnecessary. Bolstering a second technology chair or Zoom chair because that is a hefty role.
- D. Annual Conf | We really noticed that this conference seemed like a plan for a physical conference that was just translated to a virtual format. We really think that given the virtual setting, they should really play into that. In a physical



space, we're in one time zone, but we can split this virtual conference up by time zones to make things easier for attendees.

- E. NE | Similar sentiments to the AC. Reading the bid was a road how to host an in person semis and then a conference. Want perspective on delegate experience. Would encourage the bid team to flush out the registration process. Excited to see what the team has in store if it is presented later.
- F. PA | The Pacific would like to see more from their schedule. We're hoping that they can look into time zone's more. Their proposed times, specifically for Hawai'i, is not good because they would be starting at 5am HST. We're hoping that extra care is given to the Pacific's time zones.
- G. SW | Some more discussion that we were interested in is ADA accommodations, we struggled with this. Recommend adding an accessibility chair to conference staff.
- H. GL | YTR
- I. Annual Conf | YTR
- J. SA | We want to echo the feedback of CA and SW on conference chairs. We recommend an accessibility chair or philanthropy chair.
- K. MA | Really excited to see philanthropy in a virtual setting. Wondering about intention of doing the crisis one. Curious why the decision to lean on philanthropy and if any alternatives were offered outside of transcribing documents.
- L. NE | The Northeast would like to see a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Chair added to their conference staff. We really appreciated how they included educational components on It's On Us within their bid, and we would like to see education and awareness raised for other marginalized communities, such as race, ethnicity, religion, disability, gender, and sexuality.
- M. PA | Noticed that they had some confusing points to clarify. Had a train car display and an institutional one, what's the difference? Same for institutional and regional roll calls. Are they two different things? Did it happen accidentally twice? Explaining that
- N. SW | Digital banner. Not all schools have the same access to editing software. Adding more detail to the banner to give more specification. Even if they used a camera and made a banner to submit it that way. That way we can see schools participate.
- O. CA | We were looking at the institutional train car displays and have concerns for costs to mail them. We would like to bring this to the conference staff's attention.



- P. IA | Echoes what other regions have said. One area we would like to see considered is NRHH considered in the programming track. Also thinking more critically about how NRHH values can be incorporated in the conference.
- Q. GL | We would like to see the conference staff consider a provision of more breaks between sessions for attendees. A big piece of feedback from our RLC was that people needed more breaks because we did business back-to-back. We currently only really see a break for dinner and one 30-minute break, so we'd recommend to include more breaks.
- R. Annual Conf | Have two comments about finances. Regarding in-person semis, we mentioned it was off the table. Want to bring to their attention that bringing people for semis would increase delegate cost with no benefit to delegates. Poor idea. Planned sponsorships for conferences, think they should not rely on those at all. Would encourage them to not rely on that to reduce the delegate cost at all.
- S. NE | We want to echo sentiments made by IACURH on NRHH involvement. We wish that there was a space more generally for NRHH members in socials, not just representatives. We also want to call attention to a point made by MACURH. We recognize how important that work is, but it could be triggering. We do challenge the idea of using the Smithsonian, in light of more relevant and impactful topics that NACURH is grappling with currently.
- T. MA | Would like to see more intentional around scheduled philanthropy time. Recommend it does not run at the same time as lunch due to Zoom fatigue.
- U. PA | We're going back to the timeline topic. When finalizing their schedule, we recommend extending regional time. It's currently listed as an hour, but that could be too little for what some regions may need.
- V. CA | Would like them to revisit the timeline and make sure they have open and close for all things like educational sessions. It has a close month but never an open one. Reevaluate and make sure it opens twice and it's an open and close and that it's done intentionally.
- W. Annual Conf | We also encourage the bidding institution to re-examine the dates of the conference. ACUHO-I's Annual Conference runs at the same time, in addition to the STARS College opportunity. This conflict would be difficult for advisors and students who are considering a future in student affairs.
- X. PA | Really appreciated the opportunity to have representatives make meals at home and include dietary restrictions. Excited to see discord used for communication in these virtual times.
- Y. SA | We are looking at the items that will be mailed out to institutions. Who would pay for it?



- Z. NE | Like to have the conference team to evaluate communication plan.
GroupMe is more commonly used across regions. Hope they will use GroupMe.
- AA. NE | We move to caucus for 5 minutes
1. GL | 2nd
 2. SW | Dissent. Can we caucus for 10 minutes. This is a big moment, and we would appreciate more time to process through this.
 - a) GL | Retracts 2nd
 - b) NE | Does not amend motion
 - c) Vote on the dissent:
 - (1) 08-00-00, main motion carries, caucus for 5 minutes
- BB. GL | Wanted to touch on communication and the use of Discord. We would like the bidding team to know that the GL RLC used Discord and it was highlighted as one of the best things about our conference. We know NACURH used GroupMe, and want them to know to not give up on alternative forms of communication. Our delegates and CCs benefit from it.
- CC. SW | Just a little bit of feedback on the registration timeline. In the pre-bid, it's set to open at the start of February, but we suggest pushing it back to March because many spring conferences are in February.
- DD. Annual Conf | Echo concerns discord. Outstanding idea to explore other communication options.
- EE. NE | As stated earlier, we still have hesitations about switching to Discord. Under the assumptions that regions will be using GroupMe or Slack, we have hesitation about adding another networking platform. We also call attention to the safety and security section of the bid. We want to see more about how they will promote safe Zoom usage. We currently only see a note on police presence if there's an in-person portion, but given that we may not have that, we believe that more attention should be called to virtual security.
- FF. SW | YTR
- GG. CA | Like them to consider switching spirit themed days, regional apparel day should happen on regional roll call.
- HH. SA | POC | Just to be helpful, recent updates to Discord have made it to be not screen-reader accessible. This is an on-going concern and issue. GroupMe does not appear to have this concern, but we cannot speak to Slack.
 1. SW | POI | SW uses Slack and sometimes there are outages like GroupMe. Other than that, we do not face other issues with services offered by Slack. Could be beneficial to look instead of Slack, too.
- II. IA | We want to point out that institutions within NACURH have different social capital. With the help of the CRC, they should be able to bring forth a successful conference. We feel that things are becoming redundant.



- JJ. SW | Wants to commend the use of the point system for spirit. Keeping an individual at points instead of the school could keep things outside of the delegate's control.
- KK. MA | The Midwest would like to see more descriptions and clarifications on socials, especially the Diversity social, and we would like to suggest adding a BIPOC or Identity Networks Social. Also, we recommend swapping the LGBTQ social to LGBTQIA+. Additionally, the Midwest would like to see some information centered around conference assessments, and we would love to see them implemented on Guidebook or on their Conference website!
- LL. PA | Motion to end discussion
 - 1. IA | 2nd
 - 2. No dissent
- MM. PA | POI | Christina, are they going to see the notes here along with the spreadsheet? Are you going to contact them? Send it out to them?
 - 1. CRC | Similar to POY, they will see all of the info in the spreadsheet as well. They won't know it's coming from your region. It will be emailed but will allow them to follow up over the next several months.
- NN. Annual Conf. | Move to groove for 5 minutes
 - 1. NE | 2nd
 - 2. No dissent

XXXIX. International Affiliate Task Force Presentation

- A. Presentation Part 1: NACURH Acknowledgement Statement Feedback
 - 1. PA | I appreciate the statement and think it's a nice way to move forward. Started including it in our practices, appreciated that it will be more common and included in other regions.
 - 2. Annual Conf | This is a question. At the last virtual conference that I was at, we knew that there was a standing NACURH Land Acknowledgement Statement, and we were wondering if that was taken into consideration with this Acknowledgement Statement?
 - a) PA Advisor | Thank you. When it comes to land acknowledgment, thinking about who is affected and who is involved. Mitchell and I went to our institutions and gained feedback and edits either through a meeting or Google doc. Even though I am a part of Hawai'i and I work here, do not want to speak on behalf of everyone. Acknowledge that this is an intention for exploration. As you know, acknowledgement, exploration, inclusion, equity is a lifelong journey. Definitely can draft it, but be sure to include the parties involved. Have to do the research and exhaust resources to ensure it's complete.



- b) NAN | Hoping to include this in policy with other guiding principles. Not expecting this to be read at conferences but to use it as a guiding principle around our operations in NACURH. Not expecting it to be read, hope you are using it as a guiding principle.
 - 3. CA | YTR
- B. Presentation Part Two: NACURH's Name
 - 1. PA | Hypothetically, we passed the name change and then if it fails in corporate, all of that drops again?
 - a) NAN | Had this discussion with ADNRHs, the way the legislation goes through Corporate, it would be heard in NBD and then to corporate. If Corporate failed it, it wouldn't happen.
 - 2. Annual Conf | First off, we would like to say that we really appreciate your intentionality to be inclusive of our affiliates outside of the States. We would also like to ask if you have preliminary estimates on what this name change might cost?
 - a) NAN | We haven't had that conversation. Would need to have it with NAO & NACURH Advisor to talk about merchandise. We foresee some financial costs but would try to minimize as much as possible by trying to keep it the same. Not many items that spell out NACURH. No specific hard numbers yet-- wanted to wait for feedback before we gathered numbers
 - 3. CA | We yield.
 - 4. SW | Thank you for this presentation, very informative and exciting. You have it as North American, would the A from American be dropped or would it be the NAACURH?
 - a) MA | We will maintain NACURH to maintain most of our branding. Think of it like the "of" and "and" benign dropped in our current NACURH name; this would be the same thought and practice.
 - b) NAN | Discussed hyphenating it, after researching, there are significant implications if we hyphenate it. Would have American or Association be a silent name. At one point, CA and NE were called NAACURH so want to avoid that.
 - 5. NAO | Thank you so much for your presentation. I want to add context that NACURH has attempted to recruit institutions outside of North America, such as the Caribbean, Hong Kong, etc. NACURH has previously not recognized that other countries and continents have their own associations, like NACURH such as Australia.



6. CA | Has there been thought put into acronyms where NACURH and National are in the same title? For Annemarie, she would become the NACURH Associate for NACURH Residence Hall Honorary.
 - a) MA | It's not out of the scope, but it's not something that we really focused a lot of attention to. We can definitely reflect on that more and see how we can rework those titles, if this is what is desired.
 - b) NAN | We often don't see, in my title, you would never fully spell out the full title. When we talk about NRHH, refer to it as the NACURH Residence aHall Honorary. Doesn't happen very often in NACURH, have considered options besides replacing the N in NCC or NRHH in NACURH. Open to feedback on it.
7. IA | Similarly, thinking about how this will affect NRHH chapters, such as when someone is trying to recruit NRHH, a chapter would more likely write out the full acronym to better educate potential candidates. While this doesn't happen much on the NACURH level or even on regional levels, we think that this could really impact our institutions.
 - a) MA | Going back to the original point, don't usually spell things out. Think of redundancies in organization: RLC Conference Chair. Overlaps in names to begin with. Prompts us to not spell everything out.
 - b) NAN | Yield for now, will return.
8. SW | Wondering, in reference to Jacob's point, we do have some international affiliates from places not in North America. If this passes, if regions who have tried to get affiliates outside of NA, would they no longer affiliate with those?
 - a) MA | We're not trying to shut doors, but we're recognizing our scope and limitations. We have historically been unable to support affiliates outside of the North American area. When we had an affiliate from South Africa, we know that we couldn't really accommodate them in our organization because of timezone differences. We are definitely in support of the fact that, if in the future there are affiliates outside of the North American sphere, we could definitely do more outreach to them and include them in our corporation.
 - b) CA | Nathan covered a lot. Added something from our perspective as we have had the UAE and Qatar affiliate in the past. Saw struggles supporting them, did not come to regional conferences, only annual. Trying to observe what we did to



implement on their own. Clause in policy that says the NBD can approve an affiliate outside of normal bounds in the region. Can take that into account.

- c) PA | To give you more context, one of the things when we thoroughly discussed this year is recognizing our limitations. We already struggle to accommodate our timezones in North America, especially in PACURH because we had to update some of our time zones and such to be more inclusive. At the end of the day, we want to learn and make sure that we support our students in an equitable way to provide the best NACURH has to offer. We will be as inclusive as possible, but we also need to be upfront with our limits.
9. NAN | To IACURH, in terms of the campus level, this could be a great opportunity as to how we educate our campus reps in situations like these. One of the biggest things that's been an identity struggle for NRHH has been our place within NACURH (are we a sister organization, or are we a branch of, etc.). Thus, is changing the "N" in "NRHH" a good decision? I don't know, but we can definitely improve how we educate our affiliates moving forward.
- a) NE | Point of order | Believe the NE has two points.
 - b) NAN | Correct, my bad.
10. PA | YTR
11. NE | Thank you for your presentation. Preface this by saying I don't expect an answer. Mentioned conferences and working around time zones. Even the current model, supporting geographically, has not done well. Have you considered more with conference support: maybe asynchronous conferences, or what support NACURH could offer to affiliates from Canada/ Mexico with visas, travel, etc.
- a) MA | That's a wonderful thought! That's something that our group wants to dive into this coming semester. The name change is just the start of beginning more intentional support for international affiliates. At this time, we do not have a lot of support for our international affiliates, but we definitely want to explore that in the near future. We need to establish a foundation first before going into the greater and more complex details.
 - b) NAN | provides a good segway, too to say we can only do so much. First step we can take for current affiliates to feel like NACURH for them. Invested time and energy here because that was an important step for us.



12. NE | I want to circle back to the land acknowledgement idea. It's a bit disturbing to see how many people shared their thoughts on international affiliates, rather than the Acknowledgement Statement. How did this statement come to be? Was there intentional outreach to Indigenous people for their context. We do not believe that one statement is enough. There should be more resources provided to be as supportive as possible to Indigenous peoples moving forward.
- a) Chair | Kind of feels like this is a big piece of feedback and maybe a whole workshop on the land acknowledgement. If you are interested in giving that feedback to the group, you can email them. If you want to lend an answer quickly, you can.
 - b) MA | Yeah, so the University of Hawai'i at Manoa definitely reviewed this and provided a ton of feedback. We definitely want to continue to work on this to enhance it more. I will yield to PA Advisor for more context.
 - c) PA Advisor | This first did come as an acknowledgement draft, when I brought it to my institution, aiming to make it an acknowledgement of exploration for understanding. Acknowledgement is a one and done deal. We kept the name as land acknowledgement because it is used across NACURH. Looking to change name to Acknowledgement of Exploration. Gives us the opportunity to explore, do workshops and case studies, and give affiliates space to share. Want to bring in Indigenous peoples and provide that space. Lot of work to do is very exciting.
 - d) NAN | First steps, not the end. Just addressing policy points.
13. CA | It's framed as a question, but is more intentionally feedback. As a corporation, we shouldn't seek to change our name with the asterisk to change it again later, as we heard from a previous response from the task force. We suggest that we should change it in a way that is more inclusive now for the longest security of the name. We're in favor of reverting back to "ACURH," but we recognized all of the acronyms and such. We do think that it's better to be broader to be inclusive of all of the international affiliates within our short-term recruitment goals.
- a) MA | Staying far away from that because we aren't the only one to do this. Other areas do their own thing. Didn't want to frame it as WE are the only association for halls. Important feedback. Important to note that things change, don't see us coming back to this in 5-10 years. Don't think we should change it a bunch.



Don't see us leaving North America because in the foreseeable future, we can't see us going outside of that bounds.

XL. OCM Updates, Scott Singleton, scott@ocm.com, 609-235-7678

A. Q&A

1. CA | We are wondering what OCM's communication with schools is at this point, especially with social justice initiatives and the pandemic. Have there been any operational changes to your communications methods?
 - a) Scott | We've been in touch with direct campus contacts. Going back to early March, began to make plans to adapt. Already had care packages in progress. Stayed in contact to manage changing situations. Thinking back to last summer up to move in. Some places planned to have move-in and then cancelled days before. Lots of back and forth and changes, clean-up afterwards. Had to track people down, get them their items. In the fall, schools with people on campus, we tried to be as supportive and normal as we could. Stayed in touch to plan for the upcoming. Tried to be respectful. Worked with people on COVID responses. Housing pros have new challenges. Plan for a general communication to update everyone on where we are and what we've done. Made considerable contributions to folks around social justice issues that sprang up last summer. This week was shocking, a dark day in history. Have to remain on the front burner, whether BLM or other movements. Other concerns with COVID inequality, not sure how equipped we are to make change but we are trying. Make donations. Our work with NACURH and ACUHO-I has informed a lot of what we do and think. Knew some stuff because of our work. Have gotten great education, acknowledge my privilege and there's always more to learn and do. In communicating with schools and sponsors now, trying to understand where they are. Provide good programs, work on programs.
2. OCM | On a personal note, it'll be 23 years that I've been with OCM. I've been with the company through many strikes that have had great impacts on us, such as a UPS strike. We've lived through great disasters, such as 9/11 and Hurricane Katrina. There have been so many more campus events that have been disruptive, but not as disruptive as this current pandemic. However, we are confident that we will overcome this challenge and emerge even stronger.



XLI. NBD/NNB Split

A. NBD

B. Roll call

1. Roll Call

a) Present = x ; Absent = -

b)

	Director/Chair	ADAF/NBD Liaison	ADNRHH/Finance Chair
CAACURH	x	x	-
GLACURH	x	x	-
IACURH	x	x	-
MACURH	x	x	-
NEACURH	x	x	-
PACURH	x	x	-
SAACURH	x	x	-
SWACURH	x	x	-
Annual Conference	-	x	x

Chairperson	-	NACURH Advisor	x
NAO	x	NRHH Advisor	-
NAN	-	CRC	x
NAE	x		

Quorum is reached

C. Chair is yielded to the NAE

D. MA | motion to move to groove for 5 minutes

1. GL | 2nd

2. No dissent

E. MM 21-16



1. MA | Move to bring to the floor
 - a) SA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
2. Proponent Speech | NAO
 - a) To give a brief background on what promissory notes are, these are used during conference times. They come into play when attendees arrive at the conference and we have not received their payments for conference fees or affiliation dues. We have them sign this note, which grants them a 30 day extension to pay. If they don't pay, then current policy sets a late fee for 5% per month from whenever the initial amount is due. Right now, it allows a continuous charge until they pay. This poses an issue for an institution that falls out of NACURH for a while, because the late fees become so overwhelming that they cannot re-enter NACURH. This piece has a cut off of 12 months on the 5% late fee charge.
3. Q&A
 - a) CA | When it says 5% of the principal value, it doesn't mean compounding, correct? Meaning it will not increase in late fee payments as it gets later.
 - (1) NAO | Still goes off of the initial principle
 - b) GL | Have we seen people go past the 12 months recently?
 - (1) NAO | Not quite sure. This has thankfully not come up this year, but it may have come up earlier last year. Previously, we've had schools in bad standing for a while, and so they don't reaffiliate, and then years later, they attempt to come back into NACURH. They, then, get hit with years and years worth of late fees.
 - c) IA | Is there a specific reason as to why the cap was set at 12 months?
 - (1) NAO | Keep it at 12 because a lot of what we do runs on a yearly cycle.
 - d) Annual Conf | YTR
 - e) GL | Wondering if you aren't sure if what was beyond 12 months, let's say someone has an outstanding note of 2 years, would the 5% still apply to them or would it then be revised?
 - (1) NAO | I theory this would be retroactive, but in practice, when it comes to late fees beyond a couple of years, it becomes difficult for NACURH or the regions to enforce.



In practice, that's where a lot of these come to fall out of notes, and so they are not kept.

- f) PA | Motion to end Q&A
 - (1) Annual Conf | 2nd
 - (2) No dissent
- 4. Discussion
 - a) PA | Thank Jacob and express support for this piece. Find it valuable to add a timeline to late fees. Don't want this to lead them to not coming back and not being able to pay the fees.
 - b) NE | We appreciate this piece and are in support of it. It's a reasonable and respectable piece that can hopefully bring about accountability.
 - c) SA | Appreciates that schools are being held accountable to promissory notes while also adding a cap so fees do not occur
 - d) GL | We echo everything from PA. By limiting the amount of interest that incurs, this can make things easier for an institution to come back into NACURH instead of dissuading them even more.
 - e) IA | Motion to end discussion
 - (1) NE | 2nd
 - (2) No dissent
- 5. Vote:
 - a) 8-0-0, the piece passes!!
- F. MM 21-11
 - 1. SA | Move to bring MM 21-11 to the floor
 - a) MA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
 - 2. Proponent Speech | NAO
 - a) Excited for this piece. Little bit of background on the accountant position. It was brought into existence after the 2012 annual conference. However, this position has never served in NACURH capacity ever since it was created. Whole point of the role was for them to be an ex-officio exec along with fulfilling a lot of accounting functions in NACURH: providing advice on investments and doing our taxes. In reality, having an accountant do that for free is not realistic because services for an accountant are vast when navigating the IRS and handling our assets as well and keeping those on file for the IRS.



- b) When it comes to removing this role, rewriting it into policy. Changes here is that the NAO and NACURH Advisor would manage the services of an accountant and that the accountant is doing their job. Have to be in accordance with what the NBD allocated for us in terms of an accountant. In terms of qualifications, these are the same standards listed in NACURH accountant role: having professional experience and being licensed. Going without an accountant for a period of time is not reasonable. If we were in between accountants, we would have to move swiftly.
- c) NACURH had an accountant for a long time, until a few months ago. Old accountant filed taxes a year and a half late and NACURH was assessed a penalty by the IRS. While this is being paid by someone else, Mary and I found this situation warranted a new accountant, Eleanor who is located in Buffalo. Maintaining fiscal allocations of the NBD. When it comes to replacing titles, the only thing eliminated was that the NACURH Accountant won't have decision making authority in spaces. Items reported to the accountant goes to myself or Mary. We also have to report anything needed to the accountant in a timely manner. Yield to questions.

3. Q&A

- a) PA | We're wondering do we pay the NACURH Accountant out of the NACURH budget?
 - (1) NAO | Yes. It is also a long-term trend as well, years past. We have always had line-items dedicated to pay for the accountant and it is a part of regional dues as well. NACURH provides a larger share of accountant fee compared to the regions but the regions pay for a share as well.
- b) SW | We just want to clarify, would this be an annual contract with whoever ANCURH chooses, or is there no limit on any particular accountant?
 - (1) NAO | The reason why mainly it's up to the NAO and Advisor is because they are the only two who interact with them. Regional finance officers never interact with them either. When it comes to the contract, it happens until it is no longer beneficial to NACURH. Not a cap on it



- (2) NACURH Advisor | To follow up to NAO, our previous Accountant had a 4-year agreement. If it was a yearly agreement, we would've broken that agreement when the initial issue with them first came up. We really recommend this yearly model because it will allow us to be more flexible with our relationship.
- c) MA | Searching for context, wondering if ACUHO-I contract offers accounting services or if we needed to outsource this?
 - (1) NACURH Advisor | It does not. They can recommend an accountant, but ACUHO-I handles their own taxes.
 - (2) NAO | In the contract, it mentions they will recommend services but they do not do any of that with us.
- d) SA | We want to inquire about the process that they Execs went through to recruit the new accountant.
 - (1) NAO | When it comes to recruiting a new accountant, standards we go on are through the qualifications in the policy book and this new one met all of those. Also someone who is geographically close to Mary. Since Mary is the legal owner of accounts, she has to handle passing these along as well
 - (2) NACURH Advisor | Past Chair, NAF, and myself investigated accountants in areas we lived in. Accountant that met our criteria and charged \$500 less than the past accountant was in my area. Did find 3 different locations. Accountant can be anywhere, past one was in AZ. Don't have to have an accountant in any area.
- e) CA | We move to end Q&A
 - (1) Annual Conf. | 2nd
 - (2) No dissent

4. Discussion

- a) PA | We move to caucus for 5 minutes
 - (1) SA | 2nd
 - (2) No dissent
- b) IA | We are in full support of this piece. We think that it gives the NAO and the Advisor the ability to act quickly, especially knowing that this piece was inspired by a great error on the Accountants part.
- c) Annual Conf. | Enjoyed that this piece aligned policy with practice in the world. Previous policy talked about accountants in training,



realistically, they will not train each other. Pushed NACURH into a more professional space.

- d) MA | We echo the sentiments of IACURH and the Annual Conference. We appreciate this piece because it gives greater power to the Advisor and the NAO. We also appreciate the adjustment to the timeline because it's not feasible.
- e) PA | Shares similar sentiments. In full support of this piece, agree with MA that removing the timeline allows for more flexibility and realism.
- f) CA | Moves to amend the piece to add "in writing" in Article X Section 1 Line 3 after "The NACURH Associate for Operations shall notify the NACURH Board of Directors"
 - (1) NE | 2nd
 - (2) No dissent
 - (3) CA | Proponent Speech | This is a small amendment to add this for future Executive teams and ANO's to make sure that there is a papertrail for continuity of information to the NBD for future reference.
 - (a) Q&A
 - (i) Annual Conf. | move to call the question, reclaims time
 - (ii) Moves to end Q&A
 - (a) SW | 2nd
 - (b) PA | dissent, had a question
 - (i) SW | 2nd retracted
 - (ii) Annual Conf. | Retracts motion
 - (iii) PA | just to make sure, just adding that communication would happen in writing instead of spoken instead of
 - (a) CA | Yeah, that's the intention. I would assume it would normally happen in writing, but this would ensure that there is no issue with policy interpretation from year to year.
 - (iv) IA | We're wondering as to why we have to add "in writing." If it's communicated in a



chat environment, it would still be in writing.

(a) CA | Intention it's shared in writing and not digging in minutes to find an announcement to that. Not meant to add burden to add something super formal. Make sure everyone has read and easy access to that.

(v) GL | YTR

(vi) SA | Move to end Q&A

(a) SW | 2nd

(b) No dissent

(b) Discussion

(i) SW | The southwest supports the amendment in that it keeps accountability in mind and assists with the records process

(ii) GL | We are a bit confused about why this amendment is deemed necessary. It doesn't seem to be necessary, but we're not against it.

(iii) IA | Similar to the GL, find this kind of silly because you would either be looking through your

(iv) Annual Conf. | We would like to bring to light that maybe in the future, when we're no longer in a fully virtual environment, that the NAO could just communicate this in speech, which is what the amendment is trying to avoid. Therefore, we support this.

(v) NE | Is in agreement with the Annual Conference staff to set a precedent later on to keep people accountable for things and decisions made in other spaces

(vi) NE | Yield.

(vii) PA | motion to end discussion

(a) SA | 2nd

(b) No dissent

(c) Vote:



(i) 8-0-0, the amendment passes

5. Discussion

- a) SA | In full support of this piece, especially the benefit of a one year contract.
- b) MA | We move to end discussion with additions
 - (1) GL | 2nd
 - (2) No dissent
- c) Speakers list was exhausted

6. Vote:

- a) 8-0-0, the piece passes

G. MM 21-12

1. GL | Moves to bring MM 21-12 to the floor

- a) SW | 2nd
- b) No dissent

2. Proponent Speech | CA Director

- a) This is something that was brought to our attention by a rep in our region. What happens to programs in the mid to late October period, as mentioned in the fifth whereas. If you host a Halloween event, the ability to apply for POY for that year on the regional level passes, but you could bid for POY on the NACURH level. And then, you could retroactively bid for POY on the regional level in the following affiliation year. This could put one region's bids in competition with each other. We want to adjust the timeline for POY with the implication that regions can adjust their regional policies on POY to better align. We want to make sure that POY bids have the opportunity to bid for POY on the regional level before going to the NACURH level. This was brought forward to the Central Atlantic at RLC and was passed, and so it is endorsed by CAACURH.

3. Q&A

- a) MA | Wondering if you did any reach-out to the current CRC to see how that would impact the current timeline for POY?
 - (1) CA | Yeah, we did. You'll notice that in the very last line. The chairperson has to send out on Sept. 1st, and the policy change here was from Oct. 1st to Sept. 1st. Everything following this would be the same. The window of who's eligible to bid isn't December to December, it's October to October.



- (2) CRC | Clarify the question was if there was outreach to me? Beyond there being a question at the end of a chat, I was not reached out to. Can clarify if needed.
 - (3) CA | Yeah, I was referring to that exact chat, if you'd like to ask for more info from that, we can provide it. I also chatted with Katie about this, too.
 - b) IA | Because this came out from your region, we are wondering if you did outreach to other regions to see if there are complications across NACURH?
 - (1) CA | Would think it was the same. No did not do outreach, assuming it was the same for all of you.
 - c) Annual Conf. | YTR
 - d) PA | We have a lot of discussions, trying to understand the timeline, with the new timeline, would that open an opportunity for a region to support two institutions?
 - (1) CA | What could happen is an institution could bring a program to NACURH as a nominee and run it against their regionally endorsed program. In the third "therefore" statement, if that wasn't there, your regional nominee could be valid for this year and for next year. So, our piece disallows that. I also don't think it would happen anyway, but this makes sure that it cannot happen, instead of assuming that it won't.
 - e) NE | motion to end Q&A
 - (1) PA | 2nd
 - (2) No dissent
4. Discussion
- a) SA | We are in full support of this piece. Our region has faced similar concerns with POY. We thank the author for this, and we hope that this yields more support for bid submissions at the regional level.
 - b) NE | Fully supports this piece since current affiliates have struggled with this piece.
 - c) Annual Conf. | We are in support of this pece we feel that it fixes the issue of bidding at the national level instead of the regional level, which we believe to be a slight oversight.
 - d) PA | Also like to extend support, even though we were confused, we feel like this could be beneficial not only to national and regional level to receive bids.



- e) NE | calls the question
(1) No dissent

5. Vote:

- a) 8-0-0, the piece passes!!

XLII. CRC Selection Conversation

A. Roll call

1. Roll Call

- a) Present = x ; Absent = -
- b)

	Director/Chair	ADAF/NBD Liaison	ADNRHH/Finance Chair
CAACURH	x	x	x
GLACURH	x	x	x
IACURH	x	x	x
MACURH	x	x	x
NEACURH	x	x	x
PACURH	x	x	x
SAACURH	x	x	x
SWACURH	x	x	x
Annual Conference	-	x	x

Chairperson	x	NACURH Advisor	x
NAO	x	NRHH Advisor	x
NAN	x	CRC	x
NAE	x		

Quorum is reached

- B. Chair | Want to be aware that we have an hour until our break. As we go through this conversation, it might be more than an hour. Will ask where you're at with the break when the time comes.



C. Re-visiting expectations

1. Speak with respect. We deserve to speak to each other as we would like to be spoken to in this space. Be intention with word choice and tone, so we can foster an environment that is constructive and positive.
2. Remain open-minded, CRC process is something your boards have had time to sit with your feelings, hope it doesn't mean you're coming in with just one frame of mind, can break-out as needed
3. Remain focused. There can be a lot of distractions. Today, I noticed a lot of private messaging, and I would assume that some of that is across regions. Please keep the integrity of this space by being focused.
4. Please make sure you are relaying expectations to entity-members entering the space
5. Executives have speaking rights here. As the Chair of this space, I will draw the line between my chairing and them speaking, so that this space isn't compromised. I will be speaking, of course, because there will be questions addressed to me as the Chair and questions that I can provide extra context on, too.
6. Human to human level, everyone has been looking at events as the pinnacle of semis and when things get spicy. Appreciate passion, hope we don't lose a sense of ourselves or attitude we've had during the weekend
7. As Chair, I want the attitudes in this space to be consistent. I mentioned to the Directors last night that I will be very intentional and attuned to the conversation in this space, and I will address items that go against our expectations here.
8. There is a resolution, bringing it to the floor as a workshop to engage with it loosely. When space was made for semis, we wanted us to have time to share thoughts. Certain members of leadership felt like this was a way to do that. Use it as a guiding force for conversation.
9. Since we're going through the resolution as a workshop, I want people to remember that a workshop is a lot more laidback and is more freeing to explore possibilities with the content. What I don't want to see when it comes to this workshop, please think very intentionally about the questions you ask. I've heard many people say, when asking questions, "You may not have an answer to this..." I think that these questions can be "gotcha" questions and can really put people on the spot, which is not fair.
10. Chair | I refuse to let anyone be demonized in this space, that means exec, people who signed the resolution, people who didn't.



11. Avoid assumption making. Look and listen to what someone has said and take it at face value without assuming anything, unless you're willing to ask them directly about it.
 12. Chair | any questions or if other things want to be relayed in the space?
 - a) Annual Conf. | Seeing as how the Annual Conf. is allowed to vote on this, and as we only transitioned in the past week or so, we are familiar with the memo and the resolution, but we are still confused about the whole situation. May we get a brief run down with all of the context?
 - (1) Chair | Feel like it might happen in the proponent. Are you ok if we wait for that?
 - (2) Annual Conf. | Yes and if that doesn't answer my question I will revisit
- D. PA | Moves to bring the CRC Resolution to the floor as a workshop
1. SW | 2nd
 2. No dissent
- E. Proponent | IA & SA Directors
1. SA Director | As some of you already know, from Dec. 31st, you've received a few emails from myself and the IACURH Director about next steps in the CRC process. I want to lay out a timeline from the initial social media posts to today. On Sept. 15th, the initial social media post was made. On Nov. 1st, bids were due for the CRC process. On Dec. 17th, a memo was released from the NACURH Chair about where the process is at and how the CRC process would be halted. To our knowledge there were meetings with the candidates and bids were presented, but no interviews were offered. There was a Director chat a couple weeks later on this to address questions. Some of us left the room with more questions than answers, and we questioned next steps. It appears that the process would be halted, and that we would spend some time on this at Semi's. Some Directors came together and unpacked this very resolution idea. IA Director began the outreach to NACURH Leadership with this resolution. A resolution is similar to policy, but is more longevity and accountability focused. We feel that a resolution will outline next steps in a way that contextualizes everything that's happened. We hope to address everything that has happened with the CRC selection process.
 2. SA Director | January 1st, resolution draft released. Edited it with feedback. All of the feedback was shared, we wanted to make sure everything that was received was incorporated. Also met with people 1:1



who shared feedback to ensure it was not just siloed to our board in the SA and IA. Was supposed to be presented as a resolution not a workshop. Met with execs to talk about this. Wanted to look for how we could move forward in a productive way. One concern by execs is timeline being feasible. But we want everyone to know here is that our intention is for this to be a collaborative environment and to incorporate exec feedback.

3. IA Director | I will add on to what the SA Director just said. Let's level with you. We recognize that the timing is difficult, and the wording of resolution may be candid. We as the authors want to reiterate that we want to give the opportunity to make a decision among the Joint Boards for our future as a corporation. We know that there are no simple answers to these questions. We want to deeply express our appreciation to the Selection Committee for their initial investment. We look forward to this workshop.

F. Question & Answer

1. MA | POC | Wanting to seek clarification on COs speaking rights. Do they have to yield to ADs?
 - a) Chair | Thank you for this, and yes, they do
2. Annual Conf. | The Q&A is about the resolution and for the authors, correct?
 - a) Chair | Correct.
3. Annual Conf. | Wondering why the authors felt the CRC memo and selection committee violated the equity statement in this situation?
 - a) SA | Thank you for this question. When we went through this process, we went through, line by line policy items, and one of these was the Equity Statement, which protects candidates from things that are out of their direct control. We feel that the Selection Process was halted because the Execs held expectations outside of policy against the candidates. The idea of not holding an incomplete position description from continuing this process.
4. GL | motion to caucus for 10 minutes
 - a) MA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
5. NE | Seeking clarity on a line where you talk about amending policy to change the CRC role in the future, talks about collaboration between execs and NACURH leadership?



- a) IA Director | Good question. That line responds to what the Execs say about being a discrepancy in policy. So, we're hoping to see an edit to the policy book to make this process more successful moving forward. We would bring in the current CRC, the CRC-elect about how this process could work / look like. We would extend trust to the Execs about bringing in Leadership members when it comes to the Selection Committee.
 - b) Annual Conf. | POI | Personal question, they were recently discussing change in policy. Who originally was looking to change policy? Execs? Christina? Authors?
 - (1) IA Director | I will look to the Execs to add clarification. We listened to them mention that there could be updates to policy, so I'll yield to them for more.
 - (2) Chair | Student executives interested in that. CRC can't write legislation as a consultant.
6. MA | We appreciate the honest and open discussions that we're having. If the process was truly deemed inequitable, then why are we attempting to revise this process, instead of cutting the process of and starting fresh?
- a) SA Director | We went back and forth on. Spent a lot of time on it. Thought about what it would be like if this was on our board. Tough to hold something against them, but want to make sure that candidates are aware and have what they need to continue successfully. If this passes, look at having intentional conversation about where the role is at, where it might be going. Part of where supplemental questions came from. From safeguards, hope to balance the system and set candidates up for success.
7. NAO | POI | A quick point: wherever we go from here, the candidates that we had are not disqualified. from this process. If we resume or start fresh, those former candidates can also re-apply.
- a) IA Director | To add on, looking through the lens that candidates invested time and energy into the process, they already got support. Instead of asking them to restart, looking at a perspective of honoring what they have given to the process knowing that they didn't have everything they needed to be successful
8. CA | A few of the "therefore" have the language of "recommend." Why was this the choice instead of something more definitive?



- a) IA Director | Intentionally chose that. Recommendation, in the spirit of resolutions, sharing the voice of the assembly but also trusting and honoring execs where that might not be the most viable path. Did not want to box us in as an org to where we would have to pursue that path.
 - b) To add on to IA Director's point, we looked at the NAN vacancy based on how things were received. We want to extend autonomy to the Execs. We don't want to mandate, but we do want to provide suggestions and guidelines moving forward.
9. NAO | YTR
10. Annual Conf. | Wondering how you decided on who would be involved in legislation writing and the selection committee?
- a) IA Director | To start with the Selection Committee, we went back and forth on this. Firstly, we wanted to center the CRC job description and who they support, while paralleling the NACURH ADvisor and NACURH NRHH ADvisor positions. There appear to be two students on each of these other advisor's selection committees..
 - (1) Time called
 - (a) Annual Conf. | Motion to extend Q&A by 10 minutes
 - (i) MA | 2nd
 - (ii) No dissent
 - b) IA Director | To resume my answer, there's two Annual Conference members who are supposed to be on the CRC Selection Committee, which is good. We questioned how we can bring in additional voices that were left out to begin with. We really thought over who should be included, and we're very flexible to this, too. If y'all have other ideas, let us know!
 - c) Annual Conf. | who was drafting the legislation and how you decided that
 - (1) SA Director | The resolution itself was born after the Director chat. We reached out to all Directors with an open invitation. Some accepted to join and others did not. We realized the time that we were under to include other voices. That's why we opened up the feedback form, and we worked to meet with all those who submitted feedback. We were intentionally inviting all of NACURH Leadership in this so we didn't exclude anyone.



11. IA | You all touched on the concerns with timelines, and we're wondering what that concern was and what they may look like moving forward?
 - a) SA Director | Yield to Chair.
 - b) Chair | Brought this to them. Moving forward, whatever is decided, that communication between candidates falls to me and Christina. Would hate for you all to talk about this and move forward in a way that wasn't feasible for me as a student leader moving forward
 - c) SA Director | We learned of this after we published the resolution, which is why it's out of nowhere. We also met with the Execs before Semi's about potential dates for their deadlines, and then we plan to meet with the Execs after Semi's to better solidify plans.
12. PA | Motion to end Q&A
 - a) IA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent.

G. Discussion

1. PA | POI | Because it will inform some discussion, can someone on the Exec team what the first 2 dates for the Leadership Chats are for this term?
 - a) Chair | Yes give me just a second. Leadership chats specifically?
Lay out the next three chats
 - (1) Jan. 17th, week from today for joint boards
 - (2) Jan. 24th, positional chats
 - (3) January 31st, Leadership Chat
2. CA | from initial draft to final piece is something we've discussed is that this is almost two pieces in one. There is addressing and resolving current processes and then the policy amendment to the process in general which transcends to other selections moving forward. Why we aren't so aggressively one way or the other is that there are thoughts about the current process and the process in general. Opening that this could be two pieces together
3. SA Director | POC | As it is a resolution, it will not change policy for the future. This doesn't put anything in policy for future Selection Processes, only for this current one.
 - a) CA | Follow-up | Yield.
4. Annual Conf. | Is slightly concerned with the addition of a regional director or AD to the selection committee. We feel that that seems to be sort of an overstep, seems odd. Inviting a member of the annual



conference team to regional advisor selection process since conference chairs do not work with advisors

- a) Chair | POC | Speaking to that directly, outside of this resolution, I was going to directly recommend someone in a Leadership role like Director or AD in this process. Something that has been thrown around a bit is accountability. For me, that is a good compromise to include someone in that space for that purpose.
5. PA | Has some similar sentiments as the CA and this being able to be split into two. Talking and discussing. Concern with the timeline and recognizing in the period of January we also are starting school again, semis, taking a break and getting life things together. Concerned with taking those into consideration, maybe extending it, that's why we asked about chats. Fully thought out timeline to move forward. As far as the process being taken, believe steps need to be taken where candidates have an opportunity. Agree a representative should be in those spaces so the steps are taken.
 - a) Chair | For clarity, can you restate concern around the timeline. Moving parts. Did you have a solution, or what you would like to see moving forward.
 - (1) PA | We thought that the first Leadership Chat would be closer to the beginning of February, so we were going to propose that a plan be fleshed out by then. Now knowing what the chat dates are, maybe Jan. 31st would be a better option, but then there's a conflict in the resolution's timeline. We just want a plan that is really put together and detailed, so more time would be required for that, as opposed to something that would be thrown together quickly.
 - (2) Chair | No that helped me
6. CA | Another potential hesitancy is the 7th let it be resolved. Wise to include others on selection. Think another one could be a CO as opposed to a D+AD. Also hesitancy that it comes from undersigned, just with the acknowledgement that people didn't sign because they wanted more other information.
 - a) Katie | POC | I don't think that the Executive Committee would entertain a CO in that space because DAD's are required to sign a Corporate Liability Form, which CO's do not.
7. Annual Conf. | Like to express concern about the order in which things happen. Regarding second and third "let it be resolved," CRC elect in



this process would be selected before changes to policy were made. Team is concerned that if the policy changes changes, and the CRC is selected, not having understanding of what the position looks like might influence legislative change and be confusing over time. Want to see policy set out and solidified before the CRC is in role. Relies on equity foundation, it is not equitable to bring someone into the role that they don't understand. Have given questions to bridge the gap. Legislative conclusion, difficult way to change where we are going in the process

8. NE | POI | Seeking more clarification going forward from Execs. The resolution outlines a path, and while we're not doing anything final right now, if we were to abandon this resolution, can you all inform us about what your initial thoughts were moving forward?
 - a) Chair | Depends on where conversation goes, from the memo, intent was for this to be an open space with several ideas. We have our own thoughts that are aligned with resolution and some things we aren't willing to entertain. Don't have an answer. Game plan is contingent on thoughts shared today. Concern I shared was that I wanted it to be open for thoughts. Train of thought in resolution that it is hard for people to always bring thoughts on. Resolution with a clear path looks good for people worried about what's next. All factors that lead us to today. Add in context that by the end of the day we will have a clearer picture moving forward, can't say for certain we will know what's happening after tonight. Fine with that.
 - b) X
9. Time Called
 - a) Annual Conf. | Move to exhaust the speakers list with additions
(1) | 2nd
 - b) Chair | Can we close discussion and then open it after the break?
(1) Parliamentarian | Since this is a workshop I see no issue with it
 - c) Chair | I will entertain the Parliamentarian's recommendation as the initial motion.
(1) CA | 2nd
(2) No dissent.
10. GL | Feels that this comes as a convenient time as our point might prompt discussion. Unanimously, we struggle to understand how this was found as a violation of the equity statement. It does not bar people from



rebidding. Open to input from other regions and would like to hear some input from other folks. Might be lacking clarity.

11. MA | We yield.

12. Annual Conf. | Would like to sort of revisit an earlier point after hearing a POC from Chair. Since this is a workshop, with the third to last let it be resolved statement, we feel there is a compromise where additional people could be added to promote accountability while also restricting their ability to influence selection of the CRC. This would be a good compromise to allow both sides to promote accountability and keep autonomy.

13. Chair | The speakers list has been exhausted. Let's review some ground rules as we enter a break. I recognize that many you want to connect with your Boards. Use your break however you want to, and that's okay, but still spend some of this hour away from screens and from NACURH. Secondly, keep your conversations within your entity. I don't want us to re-enter this space with group-think happening. Let's return an hour from now X:05

H. Recess at 5:05 PM EST

I. Call to Order at 6:05 PM EST

1. Roll Call

(1) Present = x ; Absent = -

(2)

	Director/Chair	ADAF/NBD Liaison	ADNRHH/Finance Chair
CAACURH	x	x	x
GLACURH	x	x	x
IACURH	x	x	x
MACURH	x	x	x
NEACURH	x	x	x
PACURH	x	x	x
SAACURH	x	x	x
SWACURH	x	x	x
Annual	-	x	x



Conference			
------------	--	--	--

Chairperson	x	NACURH Advisor	x
NAO	x	NRHH Advisor	x
NAN	x	CRC	x
NAE	x		

Quorum is reached

- J. Chair | At this time we will resume discussion on the resolution. I did not include an end time on the schedule, but I want us to be aware of the fact that this is the last piece of business that we have. People have training going on and school starting, so I want us to be respectful of time by getting into the heavier / meat of this topic. Let's home in on those expectations that we read earlier, and YTR as needed.
- K. Discussion
 - 1. PA | POI | Because there's no end time and because we don't want to go back in circles, what are you hoping for during this time period for us to be able to get the discussion going?
 - a) Chair | Are you asking me?
 - (1) PA | Anyone. You, authors, anyone.
 - (2) Chair | Looking to keep the stress level down, fine leaving without a plan. Want some sense of calm leave
 - (3) SA | To add on, I know that the IA Director and I have discussed where we can implement the feedback. It seems that a vast majority of the feedback provided already has been incorporated into the resolution.
 - 2. IA | We heard concerns over the timeline, but we don't know how clearly the feedback has been given as an edit in the resolution. We want to know what from the student Exec perspective what y'all prefer in giving feedback.
 - a) Chair | If the main concern is the timeline, then every event that you want a date on would be helpful for me. In order for me to navigate all of my obligations, I need to know what is expected of me to provide. Leaving here today, if I can leave here with the specifics of what y'all are looking for, I can get it together for y'all.
 - 3. NE | yield to COEO



a) NE COEO | NEACURH is concerned about the last “therefore” on the second page regarding the individuals allowed on the Selection COmmittee. Regional Conference Chairs do not have to sign a corporate liability form, and so we feel that it’s not fair to then exclude CO’s from that process.

(1) Chair | The first time I didn’t speak to include the regional conference chairs in the corporate liability form. In the normal selection process in the fall, we did not have an Annual Conference Staff selected, because it happens simultaneously as we did not have one selected at the start of the year. Now restarting the process, the Execs would work to align with policy as much as possible to align the Annual Conference staff in this process as much as possible.

(2) NE | Follow-up | Confused, in the resolution it states regional conference chairs. Is that change going to be made to the resolution or is that now, reading the resolution.

(a) Chair | I addressed it the first time as a POC, as something that is not something the Execs would consider to be honest with you all to put up further clarification for y’all as to why CO’s will not be serving on the Selection Committee.

4. MA | YTR

5. PA | This is more for the CRC. Trying to envision this, your term is over by the annual conference and want to gauge how you plan transitioning the next person. Have a concern requiring you to do work after your term. That is not your obligation moving forward.

a) CRC | Thank you for asking about this. I wouldn’t be here if I didn’t care. When that gavel drops on June 27th, I will not just walk away if we don’t have someone fully transitioned or if we don’t have someone lined up at all. I would walk them through the year and every process they need to know, knowing that they will probably wrap this current conference up. I will be there for those things; I plan to be available to whoever this person is. I was not transitioned. My predecessor was asked to step down. My transition was the sending of the physical CRC items to my doorstep. I did not appreciate that, and I do not want that to be another’s experience.



- b) Annual Conf. | POI | More of a personal question. Know the minutes for the director chat were shared. Looking through them, what we are discussing is policy and practice. Not clear on what minutes say, would execs be able to elaborate as to what they see between policy and practice and where they would see that changing?
- (1) NAE | When it comes to policy v. practice, as we know our policy books can say something but it can be interpreted differently than how we read it straight from policy. When we were going to advertise for the CRC process, we tried to be as intentional as possible in our marketing, so that those who were interested would know what' in policy...
 - (2) Time called
 - (a) SW | Motion to extend discussion by 10 minutes
 - (i) NE | 2nd
 - (ii) No dissent
 - (3) NAE | Resuming. We're trying to be as intentional as possible with marketing. We went straight to policy to not blur the lines between expectations. As we went through the process, we realized that what we think the CRC does is different than how any other person in Leadership interprets the CRC, which is also different from what policy dictates that the CRC does. In the Director chat minutes from December, we discussed the different perceptions, specifically with the priorities of the conferences. We see this most in the advising of the Annual Conferences, but the consulting of regional conferences.
 - (4) NAO | Only thing I'd add is also that the CRC is also the backup owner to NACURH accounts. Mary is the primary but also the CRC is on the accounts as a back-up. Like Noheli mentioned that blur the lines between advisor and consultant and Christina has adopted more of the advisor role in the past 8 years.
 - (5) CRC | Hope this is helpful. What I am doing is outlined in policy, and haven't strayed far from it. Where lines are blurred between priority and primary conferences between the annual and regional conferences. Two years ago, when we included regional chairs in leadership and we started training them, it fell under the CRC. That was



not the original intent of the role. Primary responsibility is the annual conference. Even right now, work is cut out for us. Person in this role is here to provide advice, to consult on regional conferences. Not their primary responsibility. Have offered chats in semesters to touch on pieces the CRC oversees: administrative, liability, Guidebook. Suddenly, this role was taking on 5 weeks of training for conference chairs. Not where that role's responsibilities should be leading up to the annual conference. Regional conferences fall under Regional Advisors. Conference Chair's primary advisor is the person advising the conference. Where we get our impressions from. I do sign on all accounts, there is some responsibility there.

6. PA | Move to caucus for 10 minutes
 - a) MA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
7. IA | Answer a question GL posed before the break. Thank them for that. When it comes to equity, we understand the author's perspective of the past process not being equitable because it seemed like candidates were being evaluated based on expectations in practice that were not clear in policy, which is accessible to them. What we appreciate about the resolution is that candidates would be able to expand on areas that have been labeled as areas of concerns through the supplemental questions. We also would add that we just find it kind of crummy to halt a process and do that to people who invested their energy. Halting a process for these reasons is not something we see in NACURH or at our own institutions.
8. CA | See a lot of value in a working list of potential policy changes to the CRC role. Like next expectations communicated to candidates just for us to better understand the situation and for us to share with our own boards. Obviously not needed right now, but something we would need.
 - a) Chair | Thank you for adding that not about this being something that we may not get to today, but I appreciate the clarity there.
9. GL | Appreciate IACURH's input. Want to say where we're at as a region and can provide feedback. Kind of gotten into narrow details. Insight might be beneficial, as it stands, GL struggles to support the resolution on the basis that we are concerned that changes would be made to the role after someone is in it. That might not be what they are looking for. Want to see the authors and execs to collaborate on a list of potential



- changes that the execs anticipate making and gauge where we are at as an organization. Instead of immediately going back into the process.
10. SW | We also want to answer the question posted by GL earlier. We resonate with a lot of the sentiments expressed by IA. The main concern that we had with the resolution is that if this were to happen on the regional level, like a vacancy filling, and we received two completed bids but refused to entertain interviews. We would expect our region to hold us accountable.
- a) Chair | POC | Want to appreciate concerns, want to call back attention to minutes from the Director chat where context was surrounding the process. You can also consider those perspectives when there were questions about this.
11. Annual Conf. | We also would like to respond to GLACURH's point. We feel that there is a good argument to be made that the initial halting of the process was inequitable, but we feel that if the candidates are allowed to continue with the process without putting in an excess of work, the equitability of the entire process was not necessarily compromised. We want to start that because of the way that the Equity Statement is written, it's very easy to make arguments for or against equity. We caution against leading the entire discussion on this. We feel that gathering initial thoughts is important, but to be conscious of time, we feel that we should dedicate energy elsewhere.
12. CA | After discussing this in caucus, we want to formally recommend as feedback for this piece that it is split into two. One that is focused on the timeline, candidate needs and then one on the selection process and committee. Not entirely comfortable with the idea that one of them should come from signing the piece. It's its own corporate thing.
- a) Chair | Just for clarity, what do you feel about the undersigned, again?
 - (1) CA | We feel that they should not be a part of that Selection Committee.
 - (2) IA Director | Want to give clarification. Haven't been presented with feedback we are not willing to accept. Friendly to what has been said so far.
 - (a) CA | Response to Chair, I don't think that we're in a position to actually propose this, but if we hear these as pieces in a week or so, then we would make this consideration / recommendation.
 - (3) Time called



(a) Annual Conf. | Motion to extend discussion by 10 minutes

(i) SW | 2nd

(ii) No dissent

13. SA Director | IA Director and I would like to consult y'all. We hear two thoughts: one to pick up the process where it left off and the other as the initial process stopping and the new process starting, with the current CRC position being kept the same. We wonder which would be more favorable.
14. NE | POI | Something that came up earlier in the Northeast is what has been communicated to the candidates at this point? We've reviewed the Director Chat minutes, but we'd like more clarity on what they have been informed of regarding the CRC Selection Process.
- a) NAN | There are two points. Firstly, talking about communication about how the process was finished and how feedback was sent to the candidates, we told them about not extending interviews to the candidates and encouraging them to re-apply when a new application was open. The current process that we're in saw two candidates: one of whom is in Leadership and thus knows everything and the other is not and thus knows nothing.
 - b) Chair | Context being sought right now was provided at director chat. Want space to be focused on moving forward.
15. PA | The Pacific proposed a recommended timeline in order to keep the process flowing and keep the executives accountable to move the process along. We want to note these are recommendations and not us mandating them and that these are not proposed dates but timeframes by our first leadership chat, an update of where the execs are at in the process. Throughout February defining the timeline and also selecting new members to be a part of the selection committee and to reach out to the current applicants. Throughout March, hold interviews and select a candidate and somewhere between late March and early April, present the candidate to the board of directors. Again this is only a recommendation and can be formed with what suits you, but these are some key components we as the Pacific believe needs to be accomplished in order for us to move forward. We believe this "process" could allow for the executive a three month allotment to continue the process and take components from the resolution to select a crc and give them time to start their transition prior to the annual conference.



- a) Chair | To respond and use the Pacific as an excellent example. None of these recommendations need to be voted on here, but we're all trying to come together for the needs of our regions on what they need to move forward in this process. By being in a workshop, it feels that we need to end something in a vote, but I want you all to know that everything here will be considered, even if there is no vote.
16. NE | Move to caucus for 7 minutes
- a) MA | 2nd
 - b) IA | Dissent. We feel that we had a caucus very recently and thus do not feel like we need one at this time
 - c) Vote:
 - (1) 5-3-0, the motion carries
17. Annual Conf. | Feel it would be good to synthesize some ideas PA & CA have proposed and propose this idea. We would like to see by the end of February that the sections of legislation, if it gets split, we would like to see the pieces/ piece address the issues of the selection committee and any policy changes needed. That way we can continue on with a timeline while also ensuring candidates have an idea of expectations they will be held to
18. NAN | As was stated earlier, since one of the candidates was in NACURH Leadership and is privy to everything, this is why the Execs are concerned about restarting the process. This is why we would like ideas as to what the process should look like moving forward from y'all.
19. IA | We talked in our caucus and we know that the IA and SA Directors wanted time for feedback. Knowing that people put a ton of energy in this and people signed this, we feel that we need to give IA and SA Directors items to continue to consider and have completed by a certain time. This is why they worked to complete this before Semi's.
- a) Time called | Motion to extend discussion by 10 minutes
 - (1) SW | 2nd
 - (2) No dissent
20. MA | The Midwest shares similar concerns to the Central Atlantic in regard to waiting for more context and the seeking of information as mentioned earlier tonight. As a Regional Board of Directors, we saw inequalities alongside how the interpretation of the Conference Resource Consultant's positional duties were used against the applicants for the role. We agree with stopping the initial process and starting anew, as



Chloe mentioned earlier. Additionally, we are interested in seeking the NAO's interpretation of the Conference Resource Consultant Role.

21. PA | POI | In the event that we stop the initial and start a new process, we have the potential to open it up to new candidates, correct?
 - a) Chair | Correct.
22. PA | Yield to COPR
 - a) PA COPR | Hope execs give the space to adequately evaluate candidates that submitted bids in the timeline set. In regardless, we want to note there is a difference between when we recognize policy changes and when changes are enacted.
23. SA Director | On the previous question from the Midwest, IA Director and I really want to hear about perspectives in stopping the process where it's at and editing policy v. not changing the policy but continuing with the previous candidates while enacting a new timeline.
 - a) NE | PPP | Can you restate for the minutes?
 - b) SA Director | Restated
24. NAO | Reiterate what Annemarie mentioned about reentering the process. When it comes to expectations, with entering the compromised process, with one candidate receiving access to information over one candidate. Reason why moving a new process forward is important. Establishing expectations in policy changes the PA made, want to affirm that. It would be setting firm guidelines for what we are expecting from a CRC. Changing expectations in the middle of a process would be the same as changing policy during a regional election
25. PA | We believe that the process should continue with the current candidates to give them that space and timeline that they weren't given initially. This is, however, the first time that we're hearing about one of these candidates being within NACURH Leadership. If this is the case, then we either shouldn't have invited them into this space, or we should have invited both candidates into this space. We're now stuck because this new information is causing struggle on how we should move forward.
26. CA | To SA Director, are you saying the options, the ones you're presenting, are continuing the process as-is or stopping the process and starting over without changing the description. Are we not discussing changing the position before starting the process?
 - a) SA Director | Yes, part of the reason is that this will allow candidates to re-apply with their bids without having to redo them completely, while allowing them to make some adjustments if they choose based on the new information that is released. The



new content that comes after a potentially successful election here would then be able to be transitioned to this potential CRC-elect as it comes to light.

b) IA Director | Speaking as an author, also leveling with everyone about waiting for legislation. Recognize we need updates. Finding resistance in where we are on updating policy. Might be disagreements about how that manifests. If we know we don't know what we are changing, it might take time. Changing this role takes a lot of intentionality and evaluation. Takes away transition time CRC could have.

(1) Time called

(2) PA | POC | What are our time restraints on this situation?

(a) Chair | Time checks are helpful. Want to see where we go in the next 30 minutes or so

(3) SW | POI | YTR

(4) SW | Move to extend Discussion by 10 minutes

(a) PA | 2nd

(b) No dissent

27. Annual Conf. | We feel that after hearing all that IA Director shared about the changes to the policy potentially being contentious, we believe that we're reading it as something that we address as soon as possible. We would like to see some time dedicated later in the evening to how the authors will discuss and update this piece, and perhaps we can see a revised edition before Semi's to allow votes and legislation to come forth.

28. SW | Motion to caucus for 5 minutes in light of information that this is a member of leadership and that alters things in the process right now

a) CA | 2nd

b) NE | Dissent. We do feel as though we just caucused and there are still lingering discussion points to express before re-entering a caucus.

(1) CA | Does not retract.

(2) Vote:

(a) 3-3-2, motion does not carry and discussion resumes

29. PA | POI | wondering if there is an updated policy book. The last one was updated in February 2020. Anything passed after that is not in the policy book.



- a) NAE | I have an almost updated policy book. I need a bit more time completed.
- 30. IA Director | POC | YTR
- 31. IA | POI | Can we confirm that the candidate who is a member of NACURH Leadership is or is not present in this space right now?
 - a) NAN | Wasn't gonna answer. Space wasn't a concern, but resolution itself was sent to candidates because it was through the ListServ.
 - b) Chair | Would have not gone through this conversation if this isn't the case
- 32. SW | POC | SWACURH Is interpreting the situation as the candidate has received all of the information prior to this conversation.
- 33. GL | Respond to Chloe's point. Something we are considering a draft of the process. We don't want people going into this role thinking it's something it's not. That is what is weighing on us.
- 34. PA | YTR
- 35. CA | Understanding that neither candidates have been in this space? Do they have access to minutes?
 - a) Chair | Want to provide clarity. In order to do that, would entertain a motion to caucus
 - (1) CA | so moved
 - (a) MA | 2nd
 - (b) No dissent
- 36. Chair | To provide some clarity, earlier we stated that the impacted candidate in Leadership is not in this space. I do not want to provide more context because I do not want assumptions to be made. What I want to discuss moving forward, now, I'm sensing some contradiction that's making things a struggle to move forward. When I set this space up, I wanted all of Leadership to have a stake in providing recommendations moving forward. Some commentary in discussion relies on sending things back to the authors to then discuss with the Execs. I think that it's strange that this is putting weight on the IA and SA Directors to have more of a voice in what is happening than other Directors. I find this to be a bit contradictory from our initial intent with this space. The Executive Committee within this conversation is relying on this discussion, to leave this space with your recommendations, and put a plan together to move forward with and inform y'all at a later time. Like I stated, I think that it's okay if people disagree, but within



discussion, I've seen a moving target through the expectations, which has been confusing.

37. Time

- a) MA | Motion to extend discussion by 10 minutes
 - (1) Annual Conf. | 2nd
 - (2) No dissent

38. PA | Was able to talk about the new information received. Do recognize the treatment between two candidates. Do still believe in that the candidates have a chance. We envision it that candidates still bid on what's in policy now and as we move throughout the process we can propose new legislation. Creating equivalent as NACURH execs restructuring. They bid for positions not per policy and not what they actually should be doing. That is how we are making correlation. Provide candidates with current information and moving forward and create policy and put things in policy as we move along.

39. Annual Conf. | The eight entities in this space may want to talk about the fact that one candidate is in Leadership and the other is not, and they may want to discuss the intricacies with that. We also want to recognize that IA and SA Directors have been provided much discussion and feedback, and so we suggest that at 15 minutes past the hour, we can recess to allow IA and SA Directors to sit down and discuss these points, so we can come back for discussion one step closer to achieving a conclusion.

40. SA | Wondering in reference to resolution being sent to leadership if the CRC memo was sent to one or both candidates .

- a) Chair | Both CRC candidates had access to the memo. Is this what you are asking?
 - (1) SA | Yes, thank you.

41. NE | Reflecting on previous comments, the purpose of sitting in this room is to use the resolution as a vehicle to meet an end. With this in mind, the Northeast believe that NACURH should resume the initial CRC Selection Process with the return of the previous two candidates with interviews, and the stipulation that they are both introduced to as much context as possible as to why they are being called back and what we have discussed thus far. We believe that this will be the best to set them up for success, and we believe that this will allow them to be integrated into the changes that come to the CRC role moving forward.

42. SA Director | Two things. First, we have yielded votes to ADAFs and we don't do caucuses with our ADAFs so we can be focused on gathering



feedback. Rae and I are close to having it done. Biggest thing is coming down is continuing the current process and starting or stopping.

43. MA | We would like to acknowledge that one candidate having access to this information as a Leadership member is better evidence of why we should end the process. We support the author's proposed idea of ending the process and starting fresh. Reiterating the point that the NACURH Policy Book has not been updated in a little under a year adds to our conviction on this. Once these changes have been made we will feel more comfortable with the CRC process moving forward.

44. IA | Move to recess for 20 minutes

a) Chair | I am hesitant to entertain this motion because it would seem that this recess would be more important later on once the IA and SA Directors feel that they are better suited to procure a revised resolution or some more specified solutions.

b) NAE | POC | not relevant to motion but MA, about the policy book. Although the version on the website

c) Chair | Returning to the initial motion, if you would still like to entertain your motion, you can.

(1) IA | I yield to the authors for their perspective here.

(a) IA Director | I would appreciate the 20 minute recess personally.

d) Chair | Think there is weight on resolution. Consider to center the issue in general if we come back after a recess

(1) Annual Conf. | 2nd

(2) CA | Dissent. We have a point before the recess, related to MACURH's point, and we believe it could be beneficial to hear more thoughts before we enter recess.

(a) Annual Conf. | Retracts 2nd

(b) IA | Retracts motion

e) NAN | POI | YTR

45. Time Called

a) IA | Move to exhaust the speakers list with additions and to recess for 20 minutes following

(1) CA | 2nd

(2) No dissent

46. IA | POC | Did the CRC position change since the gavel order change? There were changes to the CRC position when policy changed



a) CRC | Those would have been at Semi's last year, so the current copy of the NACURH Policy BBook includes those changes. There have been further changes on the CRC role since then.

47. CA | Knows that the authors were sticking a distinction between options. Agree with the Midwest that stopping the process and starting a new one is the most appropriate and most ethical way to handle that as well.

48. Speakers list is exhausted.

L. Recess at 8:05 PM EST

M. Call to Order at 8:25 PM EST

a) Roll Call

(1) Present = x ; Absent = -

(2)

	Director/Chair	ADAF/NBD Liaison	ADNRHH/Finance Chair
CAACURH	x	x	x
GLACURH	x	x	x
IACURH	x	x	x
MACURH	x	x	x
NEACURH	x	x	x
PACURH	x	x	x
SAACURH	x	x	x
SWACURH	x	x	x
Annual Conference	-	x	x

Chairperson	x	NACURH Advisor	x
NAO	x	NRHH Advisor	x
NAN	x	CRC	x
NAE	x		

Quorum is reached



N. Discussion

1. SA Director | What is the easiest way for the IA Director and I to drop the drafts that we currently have prepared for Leadership? (LINK -
2. GL | POI | seeking clarity that this is a workshop, correct?
 - a) Chair | Yes, still a workshop.
3. SA | Moves to bring "Revised CRC Resolution 1/10/21" to the floor for a vote
 - a) IA | 2nd
 - b) NE | Dissent. This piece was handed to us after a recess, we have not had time to read or prepare for it. The Northeast still has hesitations and would like more time to discuss before moving forward.
 - c) IA | POI | Isn't a house rule to not dissent to bringing an item to the floor, or is that only relevant to legislation?
 - (1) Chair | I do not believe that was a house rule, and I add that you all have had access to the legislation for a week.
 - d) Chair | IA do you retract your 2nd?
 - (1) IA | POI | To NE, why would you like the dissent to go forward? We want the vote because it will allow us to go through the motions of Q&A, Discussion, and then vote.
 - (a) NE | We feel as though this amended version was dropped on us right now. We have also not decided on many dates, and so we feel that this would be better suited to a workshop continued, rather than working to amend it as we go through the voting process now. We would prefer to hear this in a week
 - (2) PA | POI | Confused. Are the Execs determining the official deadline, or is that us now?
 - (a) Chair | Per the revised version, it seems that this is based on the feedback provided.
 - (3) Chair | To the Intermountain, again, do you retract?
 - (a) IA | Does not retract
 - (4) Annual Conf. | POI | We have voting rights on this piece, correct?
 - (a) Chair | Yes.
 - (5) PA | POI | May we vote in breakout rooms?



(a) Chair | I want you all to have anonymity within your vote. You will be moved into breakout rooms with a Google Form to vote. Does this sound good?

(6) Vote:

(a) 6-3-0, motion is brought to the floor

O. Reading of the Piece by the authors

P. Proponent Speech | IA & SA Directors

1. IA Director | Going to go through changes we made through the editing process. Can we screen share? *Chair thumbs up*
2. SA Director | Current selection will open again to new candidates and the timeline will be established by January 2021. Caters to questions to bids but how to cater to the role how the position might change.
3. IA Director | Like SA Director said, this was basically the same for the additional supplemental questions, and it aligns it with the proposed process. Knowing that, we have changes in the works to better align practice and policy. We heard CA's statement about splitting the piece and so we removed the latter half of the split from this piece.
4. SA Director | Looking at the end of January 2021, previous sentiment about dates not being filed in and wanting to match exec wishes to have the desire to pick a deadline. 31st is when we know to expect deadlines. Hopefully we give them time after semis to choose a timeline.
5. IA Director | The next cross-out addressed the splitting of the piece, and it addressed the potential conflict of who can serve on the CRC Selection Committee. Additionally, we included the recommended items that need dates, but the Execs will come up with those dates.
6. SA Director | Wanted time to decide what the committee would look like. For CRC positional update would be through different pieces. But asking that boards are aware through upcoming chats so we know what to expect moving forward.

Q. Q&A

1. NE | Thank you both for your quick turnaround here. Would it be possible for you both to explain how you came to determine the edit for your first "therefore" statement, which is the opposite of the initial resolution proposal of re-entertaining the initial candidates?
 - a) SA Director | Two trains of thought. Sentiment expressed around what do members know versus not know. Easiest way to get around is to restart the process. Thought there were more concerns to continuing the process that we wouldn't answer.



Same candidates can apply. What we heard, it seemed to be the predominant view, thought it was the best way to address it.

- b) IA Director | We found out information tonight just like you and that provides us with some clarity as well.
- 2. CA | YTR
- 3. Annual Conf. | We are wondering if you can elaborate on who you were thinking would be writing the three questions to address the extra concerns for the Selection Committee?
 - a) SA Director | Something that would go to committee. Did not see it as our job to outline every single part of it, byt addressing themes, the execs and selection committee could work on the questions. They will know what areas to hit on in questions and supplemental materials.
- 4. CA | Can you clarify your January 31st date?
 - a) SA Director | January 31st is about 3 weeks away, granted there are holidays. Wanted to account for sime if execs take a week off after semis and then by the 31st some form of communication can come out. Fair way to have a deadline, there are a lot of deadlines there they might have.
 - b) IA Director | If the Execs do not think that this is a reasonable deadline, we are more than happy to amend it to become more reasonable.
- 5. MA | POI | Seeking clarification regarding if there was a chat scheduled on the 31st.
 - a) Chair | Yes, the 17th is Joint Boards, the 24th is positional chats, and the 31st is Leadership Chats.
- 6. PA | Motion to end Q&A
 - a) SW | 2nd
 - b) No dissent

R. Discussion

- 1. NE | Motion to caucus for 5 minutes
 - a) IA 2nd
 - b) No dissent
- 2. CA | The Central Atlantic greatly appreciates the removal of the language regarding the selection committee membership as it directly addresses our concerns on the matter. As such, the Central Atlantic is ready to support the piece as written and thanks the authors for their quick turnaround.
- 3. NAO | Moves to bring an amendment to the floor.



- a) PA | POI | To clarify, we aren't doing friendly amendments correct?
 - (1) Chair | Correct
- b) IA | 2nd
 - (1) No dissent
- c) Proponent Speech
 - (1) The proposed amendment is a brief change in details released to committee. Details would be released at the chat on January 24th, 2021.
 - (2) Reason is to give the execs more time after semi. It was feedback from us and you all to give us time to debrief and take a break. Gives us an extra week to take a break and it gives us time before the other deadline to make sure other information is still coming out
- d) Chair | Now, to enter a period of Q&A for the amendment at hand.
 - (1) CA | Point of order | Author of the amendment can have a proponent if they so desire
- e) PA | POI | Is this new amendment in the minutes?
 - (1) Chair | It's in the piece itself. It's been highlighted in the "REVISED" document
 - (2) PA | POI | Two links were shared previously, which of those is the proper one?
 - (3) Chair | SA Director just shared a new link
 - (4) PA | POI | The new amendment then is just changing the date?
 - (5) Chair | Correct.
 - (6) IA Director | POC | Would it be helpful if I
- f) Question & Answer
 - (1) CA | Move to end Q&A
 - (a) MA | 2nd
 - (b) No dissent
- g) Discussion
 - (1) MA | In support of this and appreciates the execs are advocating for their needs
 - (2) Annual Conf. | We echo MACURH's sentiments that a break is conducive after Semi's. We feel this does not change the timeline significantly. The resolution will still be able to be completed by Jan. 31st.



- (3) NE | calls the question
 - (a) No dissent
 - h) Vote
 - (1) 9-0-0, the amendments passes
- 4. SW | the southwest overall supports this piece, as it incorporates feedback given by the entirety of NACURH Leadership, and provides autonomy to the NACURH Executives while still outlining a process of transparency for entering the new CRC process.
- 5. MA | The Midwest is in full support of this piece as it addresses our previous concerns of stopping the initial process, beginning anew, and fostering a more equitable process. We appreciate the flexibility given to the Executive Committee to decipher their own dates. This resolution creates tangible action for the Conference Resource Consultant Selection Committee, and the Midwest appreciates the Joint Board's and Executive Committee's open conversation tonight.
- 6. PA | Yield to COPR
 - a) PA COPR | The pacific would like to shine some light on the fact that If we reopen the bid submission process, one interested candidate potentially has access to information from these conversations that they can use to update their bid that other candidates may not be aware of; even if we continue with the current process we have one candidate who potentially has access to certain materials. The Pacific requests that this fact be on the minds of the selection committee as they approach whatever process we move forward with.
- 7. NE | POI | we've heard this come up a bit, guess we are seeking clarification on how someone might have access to these minutes and other information. If the process was reopened, want to make sure they wouldn't be barred just because they have this information
 - a) Chair | So you're asking if the candidates that have already applied will not be barred from our future process?
 - (1) NE | Yeah we brought this up that if regardless if we brought it up that the candidate would still be able going through the process. Found it difficult to give it consideration
 - (2) NE | POI | Do we have an estimate as to when we'd release minutes from semis?
 - (a) NAO | POI | 45 days



8. GL | GLACURH thanks the authors for the time that they've dedicated to this piece. We want to highlight a statement that we made in the former session about being hesitant to recognize this decision as a violation of the equity statement. We find this case to be a disagreement of decision making, rather than equitability and GLACURH wants to recognize the important distinction between the two. We also want to express our concern that we feel this proposal does not address potential changes regarding the CRC role. However, in the best interests of NACURH, we are willing to vote in favor of this piece if the NACURH Executive Committee finds this proposal realistic and acceptable.
9. PA | Commend authors for new changes. Much more supportive. Not only does it keep execs accountable but it also gives them flexibility for setting up their needs.
10. NAO | Move to bring another amendment to the floor stating "that the interviews of candidates contain at least three questions that will provide..." in replacement of "that an additional written application be developed that..."
 - a) MA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
 - c) Reading of the piece
 - d) Proponent | NAO
 - (1) The main reasoning behind this is to switch the application out with an interview. With the application process, their bid would be the application. Additionally, we want to provide an opportunity to address concerns, which was a point of feedback from earlier this evening. This will allow them to address concerns based on how the position is anticipated to change.
 - e) Question & Answer
 - (1) IA | Move to end Q&A
 - (a) Annual Conf. | 2nd
 - (b) No dissent
 - f) Discussion
 - (1) Annual Conf. | We would like to recognize that a change from a written application to an interview reduces work in the creation of this process. It allows candidates a seemingly more casual way of responding to these questions, while allowing them to elaborate on these concerns.



- (2) MA | Calls the question
 - (a) PA | Dissent. We have a point to be made on this amendment.
 - (b) Chair | Motion dies.
- (3) PA | Yield to PA COPR
 - (a) PA COPR | Move to amend the piece to remove the supplemental materials section from the timeline
 - (i) CA | 2nd
 - (ii) NE | Point of order | Aren't we discussing the amendment at hand, rather than the overall piece?
 - (b) Chair | Question is if this falls into the amendment of the amendment?
 - (i) CA | Yes, at your discretion, whether the supplemental questions in this second amendment are relevant to the content in the primary amendment, it is allowed.
 - (ii) Chair | PA COPR, submit it in writing
 - (iii) PA COPR | Highlighted in the document right now; our amendment is just removing that line
 - (iv) PA | POI | YTR
- (4) Proponent | PA COPR
 - (a) If the supplemental questions aren't going to be drafted or distributed, hard to expect them to be updating us on them if that is not going to be part of the process anymore
- (5) Question & Answer
 - (a) GL | Moves to end Q&A
 - (i) MA | 2nd
 - (ii) No dissent
- (6) Discussion
 - (a) GL | Moves to call the question
 - (i) No dissent
 - (b) PA | Motion to vote by acclamation
 - (i) No dissent
 - (ii) Secondary amendment passes
- g) Discussion on Primary Amendment Resumes



- (1) PA | Move to end Discussion
 - (a) IA | 2nd
 - (b) No dissent
- (2) Vote:
 - (a) Motion to vote by acclamation
 - (b) 9-0-0, primary amendment passes
- 11. CA | Maybe a point that is not a discussion point, CA is prepared to make an amendment to the preamble, which has to happen at the end of discussion.
- 12. IA | The intermountain is in full support of this resolution and in terms of the concern that one candidate has more information than the other would recommend for the NACURH chairperson to reach out and give this candidate any pertinent information such as documents pertaining to the resolution and the business that we are currently doing.
- 13. Annual Conf. | Motion to end discussion
 - a) SA | 2nd
 - b) No dissent
 - c) PA | POI | Aren't we waiting for an amendment from the Central Atlantic
 - d) Chair | Waiting for a moment
 - (1) CA | Discussion has to fully end before we can propose an amendment to the preamble
- 14. NAN | POI | CA walk me through this again. Discussion on the piece ended as a whole. There could be a motion to end the Preamble, which goes through a regular amendment procedure. After that whole process is done, we enter a vote on the piece as it stands after that Preamble amendment. Correct?
- 15. CA | Moves to amend the preamble by striking the 7th "whereas" clause
 - a) GL | 2nd
 - (1) No dissent
 - b) Proponent Speech | CA
 - (1) The Central Atlantic believes that GLACURH has the correct viewpoint that this was not necessarily a violation of the Equity Statement, just a misunderstanding of the process. We do believe that the context on the process itself should be included for context. This being said, we're doing this to give the region's a chance to discuss this thought, and it does not alter our stance on the piece overall.



- c) Question & Answer
 - (1) NE | Moves to end Q&A
 - (a) Annual Conf. | 2nd
 - (b) No dissent
- d) Discussion
 - (1) GL | We want to express our appreciation for this amendment. This effectively declares that the Executive Committee was not in violation of the Equity Statement, rather than leaving it to those outside of this space to determine that for themselves.
 - (2) CA | The logic behind this amendment wasn't to say that the Equity Statement wasn't violated nor that nothing bad did not happen, rather it's to re-imagine everything happening moving forward without the language of "violation" in place.
 - (3) IA | Moves to caucus for 5 minutes
 - (a) IA | 2nd
 - (b) No dissent
 - (4) SW | While the SW appreciates the sentiment of this amendment, we want to emphasize that some of the intention of this entire piece was to hold our leadership across NACURH, on each level, accountable to follow policy. This breach in policy was a core reason for the original creation of this piece, and will provide further context for the future if this particular piece is referenced. However, we would like to provide the caveat that even if this amendment passes, we will be voting in support of the piece
 - (5) PA | Moves to propose an amendment to the current Preamble amendment. Our suggestion regards the same "whereas" statement, but adds that there is "evidence that suggests that the NACURH Executives violated the Equity Statement."
 - (a) IA | 2nd
 - (6) Reading of the Piece
 - (7) SW | POI | Can you repeat what the secondary amendment was?
 - (a) Chair | PA, can you state that in your proponent?
 - (i) PA | Yes.



- (b) Proponent Speech | PA
 - (i) Discussing this and trying to find a way to go in between where we see a divide where some feel the equity statement was broken. To be in the middle, instead of completely striking it, we propose the new amendment states that there was evidence that suggests the NACURH Executives violated the Equity Statement. Looking through documents gives areas where we can see where parts were violated and it resonated with our values.
 - (ii) CA | POC | want to make sure last word is statement and not selection
 - (a) PA | yes
- (c) Question & Answer
 - (i) IA | Moves to end Q&A
 - (a) SW | 2nd
 - (b) No dissent
- (d) Discussion
 - (i) CA | The Central Atlantic is in support of this amendment to the amendment as it expresses our region's stance. However we want to ensure that a majority of regions actually believe that the equity statement was potentially violated. If a majority of regions feel there was no violation, this amendment should fail and the original should pass. If a majority of regions feel there was a violation, this amendment and the original should both fail.
 - (ii) IA | thank the PA for submitting this and are in full support of this as we believe the committee did potentially violate the equity statement and did indeed violate policy which we want to make clear
 - (iii) GL | We reiterate our point made earlier today that we still find it hard to believe that this process violated the Equity



Statement. We, however, recognize that some regions do find evidence for that, we are comfortable voting in favor of this if regions strongly believe that this evidence of violation to the Equity Statement.

- (iv) NE | The Northeast does not support this amendment. We don't stand here today to determine if the Executive Committee is in violation of the Equity Statement or to search for evidence—we are here to find a resolution to the CRC Selection Process. If affiliates hold concern on the equity of the Execs, this is something to be resolved in a different arena. Leaving this still insinuates that those in favor believe this piece was geared toward determining fault, and we disagree. This amendment should be failed, and if affiliates feel confident that there is evidence that matter should be reviewed at a later date.
- (v) SW | calls the question
 - (a) NE | Doesn't feel like we are on the same page
- (vi) Annual Conf. | We believe that this disagreement is fine in keeping with the original intent of the amendment. We believe that moving into a vote would not substantially affect this resolution.
- (vii) PA | motion to end discussion and enter voting period
 - (a) Annual Conf. | 2nd
 - (b) No dissent
- (e) Vote
 - (i) 5-3-1

(8) NE | YTR

(9) PA | POI | Because that amendment was changing it and replacing the initial amendment, would we still need to vote on this primary amendment?



(a) Chair | Yes, the secondary amendment was passed, which now combined with the primary amendment to the preamble the resolution

(b) PA | So, we're now asking to place this new primary amendment to the preamble.

(i) Chair | Yes, so there was a primary amendment that saw a secondary amendment proposed. The secondary amendment was passed, which means that the primary amendment was adjusted to fix this. Thus, we are now voting on this adjusted primary amendment.

(c) Vote

(i) 9-0-0, the amendment passes

S. Chair | Now that the preamble amendment process has concluded, we will enter into a voting period on the overall "REVISED" resolution, which has all of the proposed amendments included in it.

T. Vote

1. 8-1-0

2. The resolution carries

XLIII. Closing remarks

XLIV. Adjournment at 10:00 PM EST

