



NACURH, Inc.
2026 Annual Business Meeting

Hosted at Texas A&M University
May 21-24, 2026

2025-2026 NACURH Corporate Business Meeting Roles

Presiding Officers:

Cade Perkins
2025-2026 NACURH Chairperson

Parrama Chouhan
2024-2026 NACURH Associate for Operations

Minutes Taken By:

Nathan Lilla
2026-2027 NACURH Associate for Operations

Minutes Compiled By:

Nathan Lilla
2026-2027 NACURH Associate for Operations

Parliamentarians:

Orin Smith
Great Lakes Affiliate Regional Director

Recording Secretaries:

Carson Markovic
NACURH Corporate Office Director

Connor Lane
SAACURH Associate Director for Administration and Finance



2025-2026 NACURH & NACURH NRHH Board of Directors

Central Atlantic Affiliate

William Chiacchira - Regional Director
Ryan Schmidt - ADAF
Olivia May - ADNRRH

Great Lakes Affiliate

Orin Smith - Regional Director
Kyan Stuart - ADAF
Leyana Keener - ADNRRH

Intermountain Affiliate

Thomas Schartner - Regional Director (2025)
Sydney Grom - Regional Director (2026)
Miriam Reichsfeld - ADAF
Saul Montenegro Jr. - ADNRRH (2025)

Midwest Affiliate

Braden Fels - Regional Director
Nathan Lilla - ADAF
Laila Doyle - ADNRRH

Northeast Affiliate

Kiara Wisniewski - Regional Director
Finnigan Deeley - ADAF
John Williams - ADNRRH

Pacific Affiliate

Isha Khirwadkar - Regional Director
Ian Tjan - ADAF
Anthony Ching - ADNRRH

South Atlantic Affiliate

Morgan Lakey - Regional Director
Connor Lane - ADAF
Lindsey Hood - ADNRRH

Southwest Affiliate

Genevieve Snider - Regional Director (2025)
Riddhi Patel - ADNRRH

NACURH Corporate Office

Carson Markovic - Director
Jacob Shoulders - ADAF
Isabelle Higgins - ADNRRH (2026)

Annual Conference Staff

Evelyn Figueroa - Annual Conference Chair
Riley Pritzlaff - NBD Liaison
Albert Jara - Finance Chair

NACURH Executive Committee and Consultants

Cade Perkins - Chairperson
Parrama Chouhan - Associate for Operations
Justin Luster - Associate for NRHH
Keri Nguyen - Associate for Engagement
Dr. Jamie Lloyd - Advisor
Patrick Rosengrant - NRHH Advisor
Bethany H. Stafford - Conference Resource Consultant
Rick Cazzato Jr. - ART Consultant
Cassandra Weston - Alumni & Development Consultant



Friday May 22nd, 2026

Corporate Information Session

- I. Call to order: Friday, May 22 2026 at 8:38 AM CST
- II. Roll Call
 - A. Yield to Regional Directors and Associate Directors for NRHH
 1. 84 institutions present
 - a) CAACURH: 14
 - b) GLACURH: 21
 - c) IACURH: 12
 - d) MACURH: 10
 - e) NEACURH: 10
 - f) PACURH: 13
 - g) SAACURH: 17
 - h) SWACURH: 10
 2. 64 institutions present
 - a) CAACURH: 14
 - b) GLACURH: 11
 - c) IACURH: 11
 - d) MACURH: 6
 - e) NEACURH: 5
 - f) PACURH: 11
 - g) SAACURH: 17
 - h) SWACURH: 6
 3. NCC Quorum is established
 4. NRHH Quorum is established
- III. Corporate Information Session Agenda Overview
- IV. Statement of Fairness
- V. Appointment of Parliamentarians
 - A. NCC Corporate | Orin Artsmith as NCC Corporate Parliamentarian
 - B. NRHH Corporate | Lindsey Hood as NRHH Corporate Parliamentarian
- VI. [Parliamentary Procedure Presentation](#)



- A. Q | SW - University of Texas Dallas | Who should we email amendments to?
1. A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Director | We're going to put them in the minutes. Please send to chair@nacurh.org and nao@nacurh.org. If in NRHH corporate send to nan@nacurh.org.
- B. Q | PA - University of California, Los Angeles | Are we allowed to motion to end Q&A without additions?
1. A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Director | When we move to end Q&A and discussion, there's a couple options. You can end it immediately or exhaust the speaker's list with or without additions. With additions means everyone will get to speak and give an opportunity for others to get on the speaker's list during a period of additions. If you move to end without additions, then it would go straight to voting after the speaker's list is empty.
- C. Q | GL - Michigan State University | Will the Speaker's List be displayed?
1. A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | So when we are in full Q&A sessions we will have them, other than that we will also have the minutes or slides up.
- D. Q | IA - Utah State University | Where can we find the minutes?
1. A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Director | The minutes can be found on the corporate website, which also should have been emailed to all of the NCCs before the conference. Can also be found on the main website
- VII. Approval of the [2026 Corporate Business Meeting Agenda](#) | SW - Texas Women's University
- A. Second | GL - Eastern Michigan University
 - B. Dissent | None
- VIII. Approval of the [2025 NACURH Corporate Business Meeting Minutes](#) | NE - Stony Brook University
- A. Second | CA - Ohio University



B. Dissent | None

IX. [State of NACURH Presentation](#)

A. Legislation

1. Q | CA - Rutgers University New Brunswick | Is there a single place where all past legislation can be found?
 - a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | So NACURH legislation is not released outside of corporate business. Sometimes specific pieces are released for context but the rest will not be released since it is an internal document for the NACURH Board of Directors.
2. Q | SW - University of Texas at Dallas | How do the Joint Boards come to agreements with corporate sponsors?
 - a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | The process for that is that whenever we have a sponsor reach out to us or we reach out to them, usually I or another person on the committee talks about terms with the potential partner. After getting options we send it to the executive committee, then the NACURH Board of Directors, and then gets signed by the chair to go into effect after sending it to our lawyers.
3. Q | NE - Stony Brook University | Are we adding in back the graduation coords and tassels since we have a new sponsorship with CollegeWear?
 - a) A | Parrama Chouhan, NACURH Associate for Operations | Honor cords are still available to purchase via Chapter merchandise on the NACURH Store. They are just not available this week as we are doing other store operations. The agreement with CollegeWear includes graduation stoles and cords that institutions can purchase.
4. Q | CA - Miami University | How much the affiliation dues were increased by and where to find that information?



- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | That is included in the memo that was sent out on Thursday. It is also in the presentation later, so for now we are going to hold off until we get to affiliation updates later in the presentation, and if there are more questions they can be asked after the presentation concludes.
- 5. Q | GL - Eastern Michigan University | For future legislation being made, will there be an opportunity for us to review any updates or new things that may have been added?
 - a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | Whenever legislation is done on the NACURH-level and is internal to the NBD, those changes are reflected into the NACURH Policy Book. If there are significant updates, changes may be included in NACURH Newsletters or Regional Newsletters. Legislation is internal and is not sent out to institutions aside from Corporate Legislation. Bylaws pieces are sent forward because they are voted on by NCCs.

B. Finance Overview

- 1. Q | SA - Clemson University | You showed that there was a separate checking account for the NCO, but since it was dissolved, where do those funds go for the future?
 - a) A | Parrama Chouhan, NACURH Associate for Operations | The piece described what will happen with the checking account. The NCO is a part of NACURH, so the checking account balance will go back to the NACURH Budget. There was another piece that created activity budgets.

C. OTM Database Q&A

- 1. Q | SW - University of Texas at Austin | First off, snaps to this NRHH Team. How much is/does the contract cost/costing?
 - a) A | Justin Luster, NACURH Associate for NRHH | The full cost won't be released publicly, and development is finished. If we engage in the emergency maintenance contract, that



won't be at a charge to us. Those costs were quite minimal, and they were already allocated for in the NACURH budget

2. Q | CA - Pennsylvania State University | How does the investment of this OTM Database compare to the previous OTM Database?

- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | The previous OTM database was the ACUHO-I version, which basically was a partnership with them for a hefty fee (several thousand dollars). With COVID, that agreement was not viable for us anymore. Under that agreement we did not own the data base, we just had administrative access, but for this agreement we invested a certain amount of money which was approved by joint boards, and we now own that data base. This is something we can continue to have at no additional cost, and can make improvements at will.
- b) A | Justin Luster, NACURH Associate for NRHH | We used the Jotform and Google Drive system but it was difficult to use and did not fit our needs. It did not accommodate the large amounts of submissions and was a pain for institutions to navigate. This new database has a lot of functionality.
- c) CA - Pennsylvania State University | How long will the financial investment take to even out or become less than?
 - (1) Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | Around 3 to 4 years. After that, it continues to be a low cost.
 - (2) Parrama Chouhan, NACURH Associate for Operations | A working database means we also don't have to pay for maintenance. Since this works for us and if there isn't maintenance, we are not paying that and only the upkeep fee.
 - (3) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate for NRHH | The ACUHO-I one used to crash frequently. This one database has crashed once, during development and



we know exactly what caused it - it had to do with the large amount of submissions we were receiving.

3. Q | CA - Miami University | Since there is only one admin account, how will that work for transferring access?
 - a) A | Justin Luster, NACURH Associate for NRHH | We will cover this more later, but reach out to your NACURH leadership and we can help you do that. It is a super quick process.
4. POC - Parrama Chouhan, NACURH Associate for Operations | There was a question in regards to if NACURH will accept donations for the OTM database, and my answer to that is absolutely! Please email nao@nacurh.org for more information regarding that process.
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate for NRHH | When you submit the Database Improvement Form, there is a question that asks if you are willing to contribute financially for that improvement.

D. Additional

1. Q | CA - Rutgers University| You talked about institutions needing to be checked in by 8:38 am. Does that mean everyone needs to be present from that list?
 - a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | So you should have one NCC rep and NRHH rep here for today. Each boardroom will be looking at their respective boardroom, and as long as a proxy was here that is fine, please just communicate that with your region's board of directors
2. Q | CA - Miami University| We will be using a wall to separate the two boardroom sessions and that we can't hear the other session, correct?
 - a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | I can't speak to the volume so there might be some muffled sound but we'll make sure there's as little feedback as possible.



- X. Recess until Saturday for the Corporate Business Meeting | PA - University of California, Los Angeles
 - A. Second | IA - Colorado State University
 - B. Dissent | None



Saturday May 23rd, 2026

NACURH (NCC) Corporate Business Meeting

- I. Call to order: Saturday May 23, 2026 at 8:21 AM CST
- II. Welcome & Expectation Reminders
- III. Clarification Regarding OTM Database Cost
 - A. Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | The OTM database vendor contract was approved by the NACURH and NRHH Board of Directors during the 2025 Semi-Annual Business Meeting. The initial contract that we signed states that NACURH and/or our vendor may not release any confidential information, which includes the financial information for such a project, without the consent of either party and/or a legal order. In addition, due to the standards of the industry our vendor operates in, the rates and financials for custom projects like these are rarely publicly released for competitive reasons. As such, NACURH is not able to release the costs to NACURH at-large outside the joint boards.
- IV. Roll Call
 - A. Yield to Regional Directors
 1. 87 institutions present
 - a) CAACURH: 13
 - b) GLACURH: 20
 - c) IACURH: 12
 - d) MACURH: 10
 - e) NEACURH: 8
 - f) PACURH: 18
 - g) SAACURH: 18
 - h) SWACURH: 10
 2. NCC Quorum is established
- V.  CORP 26-01 Bylaws Optimization | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson



A. Motion to bring CORP 26-01 to the floor | IA - New Mexico State University

1. Second | CA - Rutgers University
2. Dissent | None

B. Reading of the Piece

1. Motion to waive reading of the piece | SW - University of Texas at Dallas
 - a) Second | GL - Ferris State University
 - b) Dissent | None

C. Proponent Speech

1. Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | The goal of this piece is both to get NACURH's Bylaws to better reflect what bylaws are supposed to be (a high-level overview of the governance structure, not the day to day and shifting duties of every individual) and to eliminate the need of some minor changes that pack all of you into corporate business every year. I included 4 pieces from the last couple of years that this would have made unnecessary and 26-02 this year will also be made irrelevant if this passes. Overall this change would open up much more time for NCCs and Advisors to be with their delegations and participate in conference activities and ed sessions rather than slogging through corporate legislation and also massively reduce the chances of redundancies and contradictions between the Bylaws and Policy Book. Functionally, this piece changes nothing. It just reformats the bylaws to save time in corporate every year at Annual Conference and by extension any money spent on large ballroom spaces by the conference team.

D. Q&A

1. Q | GL - Eastern Michigan University | Eastern Michigan University asks by how much does it reduce conference costs from how it is now to where it will be?



- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | It would be dependent on the year. Booking ballroom costs' varies from year to year. If we didn't have to meet to discuss minor pieces, then you all would be able to be outside of this space; you'd have your time back.
- 2. M | PA - University of California, San Diego | Motion to caucus for 3 minutes
 - a) Second | SA - University of North Carolina, Charlotte
 - b) Dissent | None
- 3. Q | MA - Iowa State University | Iowa State University would like to know from the author of how the policy book is updated and its process.
 - a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | Our policy book is updated by our Board of Directors of NACURH; some pieces are passed by majority, some are by 2/3s. It's the same process as a regular boardroom space.
- 4. Q | SA - Clemson University | Clemson University would like some clarification to know how passing this piece will reduce time in boardroom.
 - a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | If you look at the things being removed, there are simple duties. In our bylaws, we should only be seeing our highest ranking positions; we shouldn't be listing out the minor responsibilities that may change from year to year. Every time we change those, we have to present a piece to Corporate to change the minor items of business or responsibilities.
- 5. Q | CA - Towson University | Towson University would like to know what would be the effect of the direction of the piece with boardroom frequency be, how often would this reduce it by?



- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | It would depend on the year and how things are updated; at least once a year or every other year that we need to change minor things. I cannot give a specific number as I cannot predict what the next boards will do or pass, but it would lower the frequency of business.
6. Q | PA | YTR
7. Q | MA - Saint Louis University | St. Louis University would like to know if problems were to arise with policy changes further on, how would we go about reversing that if institutions believe policy change is affecting them in a negative way?
- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | Yes. Any NACURH affiliate institution can present legislation. If boards present more flexibility, they can include the specific positions into bylaws. We cannot change the duties in our policy book much as it would go against the positions in our bylaws.
8. Q | IA - New Mexico State University | How can we as the corporation hold the executive board accountable with the shift of positional responsibilities to an internal document?
- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | The same we currently do. All positions and responsibilities can be changed. Representatives should be able to view the bylaws and policy book. If this wasn't in the bylaws, you all could still view the policy book and go through accountability, or even a recall process.
9. M | SA - Eastern Kentucky University | Moves to exhaust the speakers list with additions
- a) Second | MA - University of Nebraska - Lincoln
 - b) Dissent | None
10. Q | SW - University of Houston | So just to clarify, our responsibilities will remain the same, even without boardroom?



- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | Yes. It doesn't change representatives' responsibilities. This piece makes it where there are smaller pieces updated into the policy book that need to go into the bylaws, this would allow us to optimize the changes without bringing it to the Corporate for minor changes.

11. Q | NE - Northeastern University | YTR

12. Q | GL | YTR

13. Q | CA - Towson University | If these duties were put into the policy book and changes were in the power of the NACURH board, what kind of updates can be expected to be shared with us besides going through 200 pages of the policy book?

- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | During the Corporate Information Session, we go through pieces that have passed in the year; this is a good time for you all to ask questions. We're trying to make the policy book more accessible, that's why we made the operations manual to decrease the size of the policy book. If major changes happen, we would communicate that in advance.

14. Q | IA - Colorado State University | CSU is wondering if the NACURH Policy book would be mentioned in the document so we know where to find the specifics on the executive positions?

- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | If you're talking about the bylaws, we don't link anything within our policy book. They are next to each other on our website under the "governing documents tab." You should be able to see the position responsibilities through the table of contents.

15. Q | SA - Georgia State University | Georgia State wants to know that with certain duties being removed, will this change make up for what is removed? How is this piece doing what it's supposed to do or is it just moving things?



- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | In terms of what's being removed, it's color coded. If it's red, it's verbatim in the policy book and is being removed. If it's green, it's something that is included in the bylaws. If it's yellow, it's something that's going to be updated. We wanted to make sure that everything was there from the bylaws and the policy book, so everything should be accounted for. By removing items from the bylaws, it decreases the amount of business as we'd have to remove wording from two different places. If you're wondering where these items exist, it's in the policy book.

16.Q | MA | YTR

17.Q | IA - New Mexico State University | Can this boardroom still happen because next year's budget isn't on the docket? According to Article 6 Section 4 Subsection 2, the presentation of next year's budget needs to be discussed during the corporate?

- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | This was discussed in Corporate Information yesterday; Parrama gave a finance presentation during this time. The NBD approves the NACURH Operations Budget. Per our bylaws, you all are updated on the passing of the budget.

18.Q | IA | YTR

E. Discussion

1. GL - Indiana University - Bloomington | Indiana University Bloomington believes this piece would increase efficiency and promote the optimization of time, allowing everyone to focus their energy towards more valuable items.
2. MA - University of Nebraska - Lincoln | Is in favor of pieces as it would reduce inefficiencies in practice, but we would like the NBD to be very transparent, we believe it is the responsibility of the board to keep up with education and consistency.



3. SA - Clemson University | Clemson University appreciates trying to reduce bloating and redundancy between the policy book and bylaws and believes that this piece, if passed, will help localize this information.
4. IA - Colorado State University | Motion to caucus for five minutes
 - a) Second | CA - The Ohio State University
 - b) Dissent | SW - University of Louisiana - Lafayette
 - (1) Chair | I will not entertain this dissent because of the notion of your dissent.
5. NE - Northeastern University | YTR
6. PA - University of California, Los Angeles | UCLA approves the legislation because there is no real change in documentation; rather, it is a reformatting of the rules into the policy book. We understand that both the NACURH Bylaws and the Policy Book, while they are two separate pieces, still coincide with one another. We also approve the piece for efficiency in boardrooms, and we agree with previous institutions that mention wanting at least some form of notification when something is changed or moved.
7. SW - University of Texas at Dallas | Believes that the bylaw changes are crucial for the progression of NACURHS governing documents, would like to point out difficulty in changing those bylaws during national meetings compared to policy book, integrating would make it easier for these changes.
8. CA - Miami University | Miami University appreciates the color coding to categorize what new additions, removals, and information are being explained further to minimize confusion
9. SA - Florida Gulf Coast University | Motion to extend discussion by 5 minutes
 - a) Second | NE - University of Connecticut
 - b) Dissent | None



10. SA - University of South Florida | University of South Florida believes that having reduced time in the boardroom will provide NCCs and conference reps with a more diverse and well rounded experience that will allow for more learning and networking of ideas that can be brought back to their institution for growth.
11. POC | PA - University of California, Los Angeles | Could we ask for an example of what a minor change could look like?
 - a) Chair | In the whereas clauses at the top, those points are redundant. Usually it's a couple words, maybe a sentence, etc. Those are examples of how we provide a service, not how we write the service.
12. PA - California State University - Sacramento | We agree with the University of Nebraska Lincoln. We would also like to add that we believe this may take away voting power for the NCCs because we already don't get to vote on NBD legislation. Not being able to vote on this legislation in corporate would take away the power of NCCs to directly disagree with the NBD.
13. CA - Towson University | Towson University finds it is significantly alarming that currently, the systems in place offer little information to be shared with institutions about changes that the NACURH executive board makes and finds that there is no guarantee for accountability if this piece passes for upholding any promises being made to better disclose vital information to all NACURH institutions.
14. NE - University of Connecticut | Similarly to what's been said, we disagree with this bill, we understand intention to increase efficiency, but with things discussed yesterday and things planned for today, we believe there is a push for power on the central board, the simplification of bylaws is crucial, but we are concerned about voting being taken out of hands of NCCs, additional concern of when information would be provided to NCCs and their institutions.
15. POC | Chair | Any updates to these documents are released 45 days before any changes are made.



16. POO | Parliamentarian | Points about other pieces shouldn't be made during this piece
17. MA - Saint Louis University | Motion to exhaust speakers list with additions
- a) Second | IA - Colorado School of Mines
 - b) Dissent | None
18. GL | YTR
19. IA - Colorado State University | CSU is in support of this piece as we believe that the removal of these procedural policies from the bylaws will be beneficial to the flow. However, we would like to emphasize the importance of referencing the policy book to reflect the policy removed from the bylaws.
20. SA - University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill | The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill believes that under the guise of simplifying corporate business, this legislation in effect makes it easier for duties to be changed by the NACURH Executive Committee and Regional Boards by only changing the policy book rather than the By-laws. This legislation in a way sidesteps the purpose of corporate boardroom, for voting representatives to vote on the details of NACURH legislation. What is the point of corporate business if we don't vote on changes to the by-laws? Shouldn't the Executive Committee be beholden to the NACURH By-laws, voted on by NCCs, rather than just the policy book, which is voted on by the RBD rather than the NCCs? UNC also wants to echo the dangers of the continued centralization of power brought up by previous universities.
21. CA | YTR
22. MA | YTR
23. SA - University of North Carolina - Charlotte | YTR



- 24. CA - Indiana University - Pennsylvania | Supports legislation as we believe it would help conferences be more efficient. We believe the legislation allows RBD and NBD to get things done and that don't need to be put past NCCs, we don't have to worry about power as we trust RBDs.
- 25. SA - University of Central Florida | UCF worries that these changes leave too much up to interpretation. We would like to propose an amendment/removal to allow NCCs to vote on these changes.
- 26. SA | YTR
- 27. SA | YTR

F. Vote

- 1. CAACURH: 10-3-0
- 2. GLACURH: 15-5-0
- 3. IACURH: 7-4-1
- 4. MACURH: 8-2-0
- 5. NEACURH: 7-1-0
- 6. PACURH: 5-3-0
- 7. SAACURH: 5-13-0
- 8. SWACURH: 7-3-0

G. Total: 64-34-1. Piece passes

~~VI. CORP 26-02 NAE Position Adjustments in Bylaws | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson~~

- A. SW - Centenary College of Louisiana | Motion to move to groove for 5 minutes
 - 1. Second | CA - Wright State University
 - 2. Dissent | None



VII. CORP 26-03 HR Policy Revision | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director and Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson

A. Motion to bring CORP 26-03 to the floor | PA - University of San Francisco

1. Second | MA - Minnesota State University - Mankato
2. Dissent | None

B. Reading of the Piece

1. Motion to waive reading of the piece | CA - George Washington University

- a) Second | GL - Ferris State University
- b) Dissent | NE - Northeastern University

(1) We would like to hear the piece.

C. Proponent Speech

1. Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | typed

D. Q&A

1. Q | MA - Missouri State University | When was the last time the HR policy in the bylaws was changed and how major of a change was it?

- a) A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | Those changes were made 2 years ago in NCC Corporate. Essentially, it rewrote our HR Policies to make it more in-depth. When we did that, it was added into the bylaws and policy book; we wanted to make sure we still had this policy. It requires us to still have a policy to address these things and still have consequences when not following these policies. It allows us to change the language more specifically.

2. Q | CA - University of Akron | The University of Akron would like to seek clarification on why definitions are being removed? Are these expected to be changed?



- a) A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | These are not expected to change. Per Robert's Rule of Order, bylaws are not placed for definitions to be heard - we won't know how language is to be changed. Bylaws aren't supposed to be changed, only rarely. If we remove something from the policy book, we can remove that definition at the same time. If not, we might have a redundant definition that we'd need to remove in NCC Corporate.
- 3. Q | NE - University of Connecticut | UConn wonders why the section about factors outside of the individual's control is removed?
 - a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | Martial Status is something we intended to include. There is an intended amendment that is hoping to be proposed in discussion.
- 4. Q | SA - University of Central Florida | Policy is not a substitute for responsibility, if we change these bylaws, would this not be in opposition of the policy book, and would these have to be changed as well?
 - a) A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | To clarify, when writing this piece, delegates are still responsible for their actions, not matters of policy. You can still be held accountable outside of regional policy books, but through the NACURH policy book vs bylaws. Our policy books are meant to expand on our bylaws. If we behold ourselves to our bylaws, we cannot hold ourselves accountable for what's in the policy book.
- 5. Q | PA - University of Oregon | One of the reasons for this policy is to "promote greater flexibility if laws and needs change." These rules are pretty important. Why would you want to change them?



- a) A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | With the changing federal language of laws, from the GL, we have a couple laws stating that institutions cannot participate with organizations with specific language. If we have language in our governing documents, we should be able to change that instead of waiting an entire year to change. These additions were approved by our lawyers. If we need to change or add anything into our policy book, we could add it without waiting until the next annual conference.
- 6. Q | SW - University of Texas at Dallas | Wanted to ask about violation specifically if harassment might not be a situation that a person is doing but accused of, how will these changes prevent when standardizations change, this scenario from happening to a person?
 - a) A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | When someone is accused of violating our HR policy, there are a number of checkpoints we have to go through. Our job is to represent you, and this is about our personal safety. To change our policy, it has to go through the individuals who are personally affected by it. This piece doesn't change the process or checkpoints when it comes to accountability. We do a lot to make sure all voices are heard; it's a restorative approach. We engage our advisors, directors, and others are neutral bodies in conversations.
- 7. M | GL - Saginaw Valley State University | Motion to exhaust speakers list with additions.
 - a) Second | CA - Penn State University
 - b) Dissent | None
- 8. Q | GL | YTR
- 9. Q | NE - Northeastern University | What happens after this piece is passed?



- a) A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | Should this be passed, changes would be voted upon by the NBD or the NNBD in a joint space. Pieces that affect both groups would hopefully be heard in a joint space. These are individuals of your DADs team who policies directly affect.

10. Q | PA - University of California, San Diego | UC San Diego is curious to know what methods are currently in place to prevent the introduction of bias in the defining of 'reasonable' consequences? In other words if the person providing the consequence is well acquainted with the individual, what stops them from going easier on them through the use of 'reasonable'?"

- a) A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | The reasonable consequences is saying that our policy book needs to have options for these consequences. The Chairperson in conjunction with the advisors and any others involved in the process will determine what is appropriate for the situation based on policy. Reasonability is determined by how we define violations and the severity as determined by those running the accountability procedures

11. Q | SA | YTR

12. Q | MA - Iowa State University | Wonders whether HR policy applies strictly to NACURH officers or will it also apply to regional officers?

- a) A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | NACURH Leadership is a term that applies to the NACURH Board of Directors, so that includes the NACURH Executives, NCO Members, Regional Board Members, Conference Chairs, Advisors, etc.

13. Q | CA - Towson University | Towson University would like to know, how will there be accountability for future generations of NACURH boards to uphold the core concepts of the said definitions, which are to protect individuals' human rights and freedoms from discrimination and harassment?



- a) A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | That is a big question with no specific answer. While we are tasked to set up policy for future generations to use as a starter, it is their right to determine what is appropriate and what their values and beliefs are. We can't define that for future boards. Boardroom spaces 5 years ago looked completely different from now and I can only assume that that will continue.

14. Q | GL | YTR

15. Q | SW - Texas Tech University | Texas Tech university would like to know what protections remain in place to ensure future boards cannot substantially weaken harassment, discrimination, or accountability procedures without NCC approval? Essentially, what are the check and balances procedures?

- a) A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | To be frank, the HR policy is our check and balance for one another. Our interpersonal interactions should not be beholden to what an NCC thinks our NCC looks like. NCCs don't see a lot of those spaces. So the check and balance is us holding each other accountable when voting. This is not the policy you all use to hold board members accountable. We are holding each other accountable during Semi Annual Business Meetings and other NACURH spaces.

16. Q | IA | YTR

17. Q | SA | YTR

18. Q | PA | YTR

19. Q | MA - Saint Louis University | Would like to know what motivated this piece, were there specific problems existing?



- a) A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | I am a member of the National Association of Parliamentarians and have done a lot of relevant research. I have worked to better align our practices with Robert's Rules to promote clarity and consistency and spoke with the Chairperson about redundancies between the policy book and Bylaws and we found that these two copies are exactly the same. In Robert's Rules, that is improper as rules should be written to ensure effective carrying out of business.

20. Q | CA - Miami University | Miami University wants to ask for a formal explanation as to why the factors beyond an individual's control are not listed or at least have an example of.

- a) A | Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | That was intended. We meant to add the protected classes. There are some institutions who are not allowing institutions to engage with NACURH because of specific DEI language that is flagged. The intent was to add the experiences without the exact language
- b) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | This was the exact language proposed by our lawyers.

21. Q | IA | YTR

22. Q | PA | YTR

23. Q | CA | YTR

24. Q | IA | YTR

25. Q | CA | YTR

E. Discussion

- 1. PA - University of California, Los Angeles | Motion to caucus for 10 minutes
 - a) Second | MA - Northwest Missouri State University
 - b) Dissent | CA - Miami University



(1) Proposed an amendment to caucus for 5 minutes

(2) Second | SW - Texas Women's University

(a) Dissent | None

(3) PA - University of California, Los Angeles | The amendment is not accepted as friendly.

(a) Discussion on amendment

- (i) PA - University of California, Los Angeles | UCLA needs the full 10 minutes to write an amendment.
- (ii) SW - Texas Women's University | We believe that 5 minutes is the most effective way for our time.
- (iii) SA - Eastern Kentucky University | EKU would like to acknowledge that an institution in our region has already written an amendment that may make the second amendment redundant
- (iv) CA - The Ohio State University | YTR
- (v) NE - University of Connecticut | We believe that it would be more conducive to have 10 minutes so the amendment could be written.
- (vi) IA - New Mexico State University | We're against changing it from 10 to 5 as the piecewriters are looking to add the change and adding ample time for piece writers to fully think out their amendment will avoid future amendments from being written to fix the initial amendment.



- (vii) MA - University of Nebraska - Lincoln |
Motion to exhaust the speakers list
with additions
 - (a) Second | GL - Butler University
 - (b) Dissent | NE - State University of
New York at Oneonta
 - (i) Would like to amend the
motion to exhaust
without additions
 - (ii) Second | GL - The
University of Wisconsin,
Whitewater
 - (iii) Dissent | None
- (viii) PA | YTR
- (ix) CA | YTR
- (x) SA - Georgia State University | YTR
- (xi) SW | YTR
 - (a) Vote on Motion
 - (i) CAACURH: 7-6-0
 - (ii) GLACURH: 15-5-0
 - (iii) IACURH: 7-5-0
 - (iv) MACURH: 5-5-0
 - (v) NEACURH: 7-2-0
 - (vi) PACURH: X-X-X
 - (vii) SAACURH: 15-3-0
 - (viii) SWACURH: 9-1-0



(ix) **Total: 72-30-0**

(x) Motion is amended to a
5-minute caucus

(b) Dissent | None

2. PPI | Chair | Should be an amendment to the motion, not dissent.
3. PPI | Parliamentarian, Orin Artsmith | Dissents are generally procedural, not because you dislike something and you can debate the motion. Since there is a second and the amendment was not accepted as friendly. The room will have to vote on the motion.
4. IA - University of Northern Colorado | The University of Northern Colorado appreciates the commitment to streamlining bylaws and will be voting yes.
5. CA - Towson University | It was mentioned that it is not necessary for NCCs to approve these internal NACURH board changes, it may be that NCC's are not aware of the inner workings of the NACURH boards, but we believe that more of that information should be shared instead of taking away NCC's ability to speak on how those spaces operate. Thus, specific definitions such as those listed in the bylaws mentioned in the piece are vital to protecting individuals' freedom from discrimination for the future of NACURH regardless of what may be happening in the current state and/or national governments because these are not simple administrative changes, they are core to basic human rights and believes that NACURH as a role model organization to hundreds of students should seek to uphold protective standards and empower students of NACURH to participate and have influence on major changes relating to human and protective rights. Which is why it is so important to keep these definitions in the bylaws where all institutions have a say to any changes or decisions that impact the organization.



6. MA - Missouri State University | Missouri State University understands the optimization, but believes that HR policy should be as visible as possible, in multiple places, to ensure that the exact definitions and processes for more sensitive topics such as harassment, discrimination, and sexual harassment have the maximum visibility for those who need to report HR violations and to hold violators of HR policy more accountable. While those versed in HR policy and legalities may be able to interpret the simplified policy, those who may need to report violations are typically not versed and are the ones who benefit from expanded definitions. Simplifying these with no redirection to the policy book for full definitions can leave incidents unreported. Having visibility of HR policies and definitions in both the bylaws and policy book can better ensure that incidents are more easily and properly reported. Visibility of such sensitive procedures and safety of those under the HR policy should be valued more than optimization.
7. POC | Parliamentarian, Orin Artsmith | This policy is solely for interactions between NACURH Leadership and NACURH Leadership. People like Parrama, our Advisors, etc. They are the people writing policy. This is not the process for institutions to utilize. If I felt I was being harassed by another member of NACURH Leadership, I can go to a NACURH Advisor. This does not impact how institutions interact or report members of NACURH Leadership.
8. POC | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | As the person who oversees these policies, when someone has a concern that falls within the HR policies, I redirect them to the Policy Book and we set up a meeting. We look at the accountability process and figure out the best way to address it.
9. RFI | Can you point us to a place for policies between institutions and NACURH interactions?
 - a) NAO | In the NACURH Policy Book, it is under Title 11, Human Resource Accountability.



- b) Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Director | Those processes [between institutions and regional leadership] are generally laid out in regional Policy Books.

10. SA - University of North Carolina, Wilmington | UNCW would like to propose an amendment.

- a) Second | MA - Washington University in Saint Louis

(1) Author finds the amendment friendly

11. SW - University of Texas at Dallas | The University of Texas at Dallas feels hesitant on this piece. Unfortunately, the removal of definitions in the bylaws prevents standardization, which complicates the initiation of the violations code per region. However, UTD also acknowledges the changing political landscape of regions on the usage of words such as Diversity can affect HR, so we ask institutions be mindful of these points when considering their vote

12. GL - Saginaw Valley State University | Saginaw Valley State University appreciates that, although it doesn't directly affect the NCCs, this piece would make the bylaws more concise and easier to understand while still leaving the specific details in the Policy Book.

13. IA - Colorado State University | CSU is in support of this bill because it's important to be inclusive in the way that everyone can be affiliated with NACURH. We aren't removing the values of the bylaws, just relocating them. We believe that it is important to refer to both the bylaws and the policy books equally. It's also important that we trust our Board of Directors to support our beliefs.



14. MA - Saint Louis University | SLU supports this piece as it doesn't remove or reduce protections of the practices involved, rather it only moves these practices to a more private location given exclusively only to participating institutions in order to allow institutions with stricter DEI regulations to still participate. Along with that, this change would only impact NACURH leadership and Regional Leadership and doesn't affect individual institutions and their policies. In conclusion, this change wouldn't alter policies, especially not negatively, and would only allow for more institutions to join the affiliate.
15. GL - Oakland University | Oakland University believes it is important to uphold the definitions and differences between bylaws and policy. For the inclusion of universities it is important to ensure that there are no language or legislation barriers to prevent them from participating nationally. As a university that has been cautious about such things it could provide many with peace of mind.
16. PA - University of California, Los Angeles University of California, Los Angeles | With an emphasis on the previous institution's points, we are not in favor of this piece as it blurs the lines for human resources terms. Institutions who are not familiar with such terms of discrimination and harassment will have an unclear understanding of the proper human resources guidelines. Unforeseen legal risks in summarizing the whole HR statement in how regions and institutions are liable and accountable for their own actions when such actions are not formally listed. While every individual is held accountable to these HR policies, we argue for fairness in which incoming members may not be knowledgeable for specific violations. Those who do violate these terms may not be aware of the specific guidelines and punishments in place.
17. CA - Pennsylvania State University | Motion to exhaust the speaker's list with additions
- a) Second | IA - University of Utah
 - b) Dissent | None



18. CA - Miami University | Miami University understands how policies such as SB1 can impact this, making this important to address, and we are in support of the shift.
19. SA - University of Georgia UGA believes that consolidating the HR policy and keeping the general laws in-tact makes the information digestible while both maintaining the overall importance of Article 9 and ensuring meticulous information doesn't disqualify other institutions from taking part in procedures.
20. GL - Michigan State University | Michigan State University is in support of this proposal. As previously stated, bylaws are not the appropriate place for extensive details as that should exist in the policy book (which we still have access to). Simply this proposal ensures documents are more consistent with robert rules. Furthermore to those with concerns over the HR policy itself I would like to highlight that this has already been reviewed by lawyers. The change would allow for more flexibility to ensure timely updates for legal compliance. Further, we endorse the proposed amendment to add "protected identities.
21. CA | YTR
22. IA - Colorado School of Mines | Colorado School of Mines would like to note that this piece was already approved by the NACURH leadership and the regional boards, which are the people that this is affecting. Thus, since they are already in support of this, Mines is as well.
23. MA | YTR
24. PA - University of California, San Diego | UC San Diego would like to raise a concern with a previous statement made by the author that the NCCs do not need to have a say in this matter. We are here to represent the goals and wants of our institutions, and UC San Diego definitely wants our regional board reps to be safe and protected in their interactions. While they are representing the region in these spaces, and this policy doesn't directly impact NCCs, they are still hosted at OUR institutions and we believe that it is important to ensure that we have a say as NCCs.



25.SA | YTR

26. GL - Loyola University - Chicago | Loyola University Chicago argues that with understanding of governing document precedence should come approval of this motion. The motion has nothing to do with an alteration of policy and is intended to streamline policy and governing documents. Disapproval of this document is more or less irrelevant to the institutions voting and further complicates the bylaws. It's important to understand the precedence of governing documents before voting on this motion in order to avoid redundant points being made in discussion. This policy will simplify written policy, not change it, which is why it should be supported by the general NACURH body.

27. POC | University of Central Florida | Nothing is being deleted. NACURH Leadership will still have consequences.

a) NAO | Institutions can access the policy book and can hold their regional leadership to the same standards.

28. PA - University of California, San Diego | UC San Diego would like to raise a concern with a previous statement made by the author that the NCCs do not need to have a say in this matter. We are here to represent the goals and wants of our institutions, and UC San Diego definitely Wants our regional board reps to be safe and protected in their interactions. While they are representing the region in these spaces, and this policy doesn't directly impact NCCs, they are still hosted at OUR institutions and we believe that it is important to ensure that we have a say as NCCs.

29.MA | YTR

30. CA - The Ohio State University |The Ohio State University acknowledges the hesitancy institutions have with removing the definitions however we ask that it is kept in mind that delays in changing of HR guidelines language has the potential to harm individual institutions who have no control over their state governments laws.



31. SA - University of Tennessee, Knoxville | UTK would like to note that this piece has an effect on NACURH Leadership. There is an expectation to sign legal documents as members of this group, and there is an expectation that they have a basic understanding of the policy and bylaws. Therefore, saying that they don't know this policy is directly against what is legally signed when becoming a part of NACURH leadership.

32. GL | YTR

33. GL - Western Illinois University| Western Illinois University approves of this piece of legislation (26-03) because it is very time efficient and allows the NACURH board to add to or change anything within the policy book without waiting until the next annual conference.

34. GL | YTR

F. Vote

1. CAACURH: 12-1-0
2. GLACURH: 17-3-0
3. IACURH: 12-0-0
4. MACURH: 9-1-0
5. NEACURH: 7-2-0
6. PACURH: 7-3-0
7. SAACURH: 18-0-0
8. SWACURH: 10-0-0

G. Total: 92-10-0. Piece passes

VIII. CORP 26-04 Discontinuation of the NACURH Corporate Office & Establish...
| Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson and Carson Markovic, NCO Director

A. CA - Wright State University | Motion to move to groove for 5 minutes



1. Second | SW - Texas State University
 2. Dissent | None
- B. Motion to bring CORP 26-04 to the floor | SW - Texas A&M University
1. Second | NE - Northeastern University
 2. Dissent | None
- C. Reading of the Piece
1. Motion to waive reading of the piece | GL - Ferris State University
 - a) Second | IA - Colorado School of Mines
 - b) Dissent | SW - Centenary College of Louisiana
- (1) We feel it would be useful for it to be read aloud.
- D. Proponent Speech



1. Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | The NACURH Corporate Office, aka the NCO, is the group of NACURH Leadership who handles the revenue generation for NACURH through affiliation and merchandise sales. The NCO has seen many iterations with the most recent iteration being brought back post COVID during NACURH's recovery efforts. This version mimicked the pre-COVID office but upon losing its in person host site and failing to secure a new one, the decision to not seek an in-person host site for the NCO was made. The NCO has been virtual since then and was restructured to more closely resemble a regional leadership team. Since then, multiple issues have been identified as severe roadblocks that challenged the long-term sustainability of the NCO and of NACURH. These issues have impacted the NACURH Boards in the form of the inability for the Executive Committee and NCO to effectively communicate and collaborate on projects that impact NACURH broadly, the NCO taking on a major financial responsibility for regional merchandise with little to no return on investment, and ineffective outcomes from previous NCO restructures and changes that have led to a lack of understanding of what the NCO is and its function within NACURH. These issues have also impacted affiliates in many visible ways. Poor communication about the affiliation process, conflicting guidance from different people, delays in merchandise shipping and processing, and more. While the NCO team and executives have made their best efforts to overcome these hurdles, some of these issues simply exist at a higher probability under the current split structure. Myself, the NCO Director, the NACURH Executive Committee, members of the NCO, and then the Joint Boards via NBD 26-42 came to the conclusion that the structure we have attempted to revive and adapt is simply not suited to the modern environment and needs of NACURH. The Joint Boards heard and passed NBD 26-42 in April, dissolving the NCO and distributing the core functions of the NCO to two new positions within the NACURH Executive Committee: the NACURH Associate for Administration (NAA) and the NACURH Associate for Programs (NAP). These two new positions aim to support NACURH administratively and in ways that NACURH has not been able to support in years past. Affiliation and merchandise have previously



been split between 3 positions within the NCO and have struggled to create consistent practices and expectations in these areas. Placing these responsibilities under one position will allow NACURH to fully support affiliation, including better defining the value of affiliating to institutions and creating an affiliation process that is easy to navigate for institutions and providing assessment information to inform NACURH's direction towards its Mission Statement. The NAP's main role is the facilitation of the NACURH Award Bidding process for the Annual Conference, which is a year-round process, providing education, guidance, and support to institutions who wish to engage with award bidding. The addition of these two new positions after the removal of seven positions will reduce annual operating expenses and reduce the burden of the Annual Conference Budget in regard to compensated NACURH Leadership members. These changes result in an exact change to the NACURH FY27 budget of a \$5,608.33 increase in net revenue and are projected to reduce annual expenses in following years by approximately \$7,500. While the budgetary impacts of this change will result in a direct benefit to affiliates and to conference attendees, these changes will otherwise impact only the corporate functions of NACURH and ease the implementation of top-level NACURH operations. To ensure that affiliation and chapter merchandise operations continue to function as normal for affiliates, the incoming NACURH Executive Committee and Joint Boards have identified and approved candidates for each of the two new positions to provide continuity for the corporation. Extensive planning has gone into the transition of the operations currently housed under the NACURH Corporate Office and I am happy to answer any questions you may have to assure you all that this is in fact the best and most efficient path forward for NACURH's future. All of the practices of the NCO are within the NACURH Corporate level sphere already so in terms of procedures and outcomes this piece maintains all responsibilities in the NACURH-level portion of NACURH Leadership. This folds the NCO team and Executive Committee into one body rather than two extremely entwined teams operating with greater barriers to communication.



E. Q&A

1. Q | PA - California State University - Sacramento | If costs are projected to go down, how will that be reflected in conference registration rates since the budget has already been passed?
 - a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | Below is exactly what was passed in NBD 26-42. The Annual Conference budget is passed separately from the NACURH and NCO Budgets.
 - b) A | NAO | The Annual Conference Budget includes a section for compensated delegates and this would reduce the financial burden of the budget by 5 people.

Revenues Before NBD 26-42		Revenues After NBD 26-42	
Transfers In - NCO - Entity Dues	\$853.00	N/A	\$0.00
Transfers In - NCO - Membership Dues	\$25,145.00	Transfers In - Net Membership Dues	\$29,445.00
N/A	\$0.00	Transfers In - Net Merchandise	\$7,571.33
		Total Increase	\$11,018.33
Expenses Before NBD 26-42		Expenses After NBD 26-42	
Executive Retreat Accommodations	\$800.00	Executive Retreat Accommodations	\$1,000
Inventory - General	\$300.00	Inventory - General	\$400.00
M&E - Semis	\$270.00	M&E - Semis	\$330.00
M&E - Exec Retreat	\$1,000.00	M&E - Exec Retreat	\$1,200.00
Subscriptions - Wixsite	\$0.00	Subscriptions - Wixsite	\$2100.00
Subscriptions -	\$0.00	Subscriptions -	\$750.00



Airtables		Airtables	
Travel - Semis	\$5,000.00	Travel - Semis	\$6,000.00
Travel - Exec Retreat	\$3,000.00	Travel - Exec Retreat	\$4,000.00
		Total Increase	\$5,410

Net Change in Funds to NACURH FY27 Budget: \$5,608.33

2. Q | SW - Texas Women's University | TWU wants to know how this will increase support for the RBD's with the addition of these roles and what challenges may be predicted during this transition?
 - a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | It increases support for RBD/SECs by supporting regional coordinating officers. Currently, the NAE supports the COs, meaning she is dealing with more. Creating these positions will increase the support for those COs. We've already started working to ensure the incoming executive team is working with the individuals who will be coming into those roles if passed, as well as working with the NCO to make sure no services are affected if this is passed.
3. Q | CA - University of Akron | The University of Akron would like clarification on what directly causes the savings?
 - a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | Whenever we have our NCO, we bring the NCO Staff to conferences. We pay for them to travel to our Semi Annual Business Meeting, they have a retreat, they may purchase recognition materials. If we reduce the amount of NACURH Leadership members' expenses, that is where the savings are coming from.



4. Q | SA - University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill | Question: -The NCO has seven volunteer positions. The legislation proposes the consolidation of their responsibilities into two positions. How would these new Committee members fulfill the previous responsibilities of seven individuals?
- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | When the NCO was restructured, it was restructured to have similar DADs and COs. The 'COs' for the NCO are very similar, meaning that there is a lot of doing that everyone can do. When figuring out the main responsibilities, we were able to assign the duties to the roles to ensure they have enough support and guidance moving forward.
5. Q | GL - Saginaw Valley State University | If the workload does become too much, is there a plan for how to handle that?
- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | We left a little room for growth. We just passed our strategic plan making more opportunities for all delegates. In the plan, there is a goal to support the new positions within the plan to create more programming and other services for NACURH.
6. Q | IA - New Mexico State University | YTR
7. Q | PA - University of California, San Diego | Seeing as this will be passed effective immediately, what are plans to select people for the positions if they are approved?
- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | Once the piece was passed, we opened a process for a confirmation. The Executive Committee conducted interviews with candidates and the Joint Boards approved confirmations for both positions. If this piece would not pass, both candidates would not start their positions.
8. M | SA - Clemson University | Motion to exhaust the speaker's list with additions
- a) Second | GL - Indiana University, Indianapolis



~~b) Dissent | SW - University of Houston~~

~~(1) Motion to amend the motion to exhaust without additions~~

~~(a) Second | MA - South Dakota State University~~

~~(b) Dissent | SA - University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill~~

~~(i) — Want to keep it with additions, not without additions. We have more questions and we believe that other institutions may have questions.~~

c) Dissent | PA - University of California, Los Angeles

(1) With the current list of institutions, we would like to extend time instead

(2) GL - Indiana University, Indianapolis | We do not retract second.

d) Vote on Motion: for (exhaust with additions), against (go back into q/a, look for a different time-related motion), abstain

(1) CAACURH: 8-5-0

(2) GLACURH: 20-0-0

(3) IACURH: 11-0-1

(4) MACURH: 5-5-0

(5) NEACURH: 9-0-0

(6) PACURH: 5-5-0

(7) SAACURH: 15-3-0

(8) SWACURH: 1-9-0



(9) Total: 74-27-1. Motion passes, seeking additions to the speakers list

9. Q | SW - Centenary College of Louisiana | CCLA wants to know what the purpose of this piece is beyond easing the financial strain, if any?
- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | This piece is removing a lot of communication errors between the NCO and the NACURH Executive Committee that we necessarily cannot share with the region and their affiliate. Having multiple people who do the exact same job, creating a barrier in communication as no one is sure of clear responsibilities. With having one person over affiliation and another over programming, it centralizes communication and access.
10. Q | CA | YTR
11. Q | GL | YTR
12. Q | SA - University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill | The NCO has not yet been dissolved in our by-laws but the NACURH executive committee has already begun the work and planning of these positions. With the existing structure of NACURH, there exists checks and balances between the NCO and Executive Committee. Why has the NACURH executive committee already started doing the work and planning for these positions? Does this not overrule the purpose of NCC corporate boardroom and the by-laws?
- a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | The NCO primarily lives in the Policy Book. In the Bylaws, there are minimal mentions of the NCO. When the NCO came back from COVID, it was placed in Policy. There are operations efficiencies that exist out of policy such as merchandise operations where the NCO does shipping; we have planned for the regions to take their merchandise. There are no final decisions made where we can not go back.



13. Q | PA - University of Nevada, Reno | Currently in legislation, only one person per region/office may run for the same position, why is that line being mixed with legislation, and what does it have to do with the legislation?

a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | There have been several different attempts to get rid of this requirement. Each region can only send 1 person for each position; we also have bid down policies. Regions don't have policies to pick who that 1 person is. Instead of having 20+ people bid for a position, it creates a significant issue.

14. RFI | Parliamentary | For regions that don't have positional bidding processes, can you explain bidding down?

a) Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | If I wanted to run for a Regional Director position and also wanted to run for ADNRHH, I could submit a bid down to ADNRHH. At the executive level, if I was interested in the Chairperson and NAE, I could bid down. If that happens at the NACURH-level, that bid down process is a grey area in policy.

15. Q | SW | YTR

16. Q | CA - YTR

17. Q | SA - YTR

18. Q | PA - YTR

19. Q | PA - University of Oregon | Were there responsibilities from the old positions that weren't transferred to the old positions, how will they still be fulfilled?

a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | We went back through and took out some redundant responsibilities. For example, the NCO Advisor is being deleted, but the other responsibilities are being distributed between the two new positions.



20. Q | PA - Oregon State University | What training resources will be used for the NAA and NAP?

a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | Those individuals will be supported by the outcoming positions of similar NCO positions. The ADRE would be assisting the NAP, etc. It's very easy to match the two with a similar outcoming position.

21. Q | PA - University of Hawaii at Manoa - Would like to ask how an increase of efficiency would be gauged if this piece is approved?

a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | If you don't get conflicting information for affiliation, that can be an indicator. Increased revenue and lower expenses is a direct result.

22. Q | PA - University of California, San Diego | The piece crosses out the line that says the NCO can apply [for the NAE], we were wondering if this would be changed later on or if NCO members could still apply for this position? .

a) A | Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | To clarify, the NBD 26-42 included a clause that NCO members would be eligible for the new executive board members.

F. Discussion

1. PPP | IA - University of Northern Colorado | It's noon, could we recess until after two?

a) Chair | Unfortunately, we cannot. If we run over, we will have to continue.

2. GL - Butler University | Butler University believes that bringing functions such as affiliation with the proposed NACURH Associate for Administration fully under NACURH instead of split responsibility will make navigating NACURH much easier for new affiliates. As well as fixing operational miscommunications between committees.



3. MA - University of Nebraska - Lincoln | University of Nebraska Lincoln is in favor of promoting efficiency within our governing bodies, so it makes sense to reduce it to one body with slightly more executive members. UNL appreciates the thoughtfulness that was put into the continuity and transition aspect of these positions. UNL thinks that direct mentorships are an important part of NACURH as a whole, and we support these efforts in ensuring a strong and positive leadership experience.
4. SW - Centenary College of Louisiana | CCLA is worried that delegating the workload and tasks of seven people to two people might overwhelm and overwork the NAA and NAP, but also acknowledges that this piece would centralize and streamline their communications and duties, and CCLA supports it.
5. PA - University of Nevada, Reno | The University of Nevada, Reno is generally neutral on this piece. There are a few lines that are included to be removed that feel like they could be separate pieces of legislation.
6. SA - University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill | The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill believes the NCO has historically been a separate entity outside of the NACURH Executive Committee. As seen on the NRHH history webpage, the NCO has been an integral part of NACURH since 1964 because of a requirement for grant funding. This legislation proposes to replace the entirety of its board with two new positions. This legislation fundamentally changes the way by which NACURH would operate by giving the NCO's existing responsibilities to the NACURH Executive Committee. UNC CH wants to state that we appreciate the effort to increase the efficiency of NACURH operations, however, we believe that there is a better way. We should instead consider previous NCO structures, thereby preserving the historical foundation of NACURH and its built-in 'checks and balances'.



7. IA - New Mexico State University | While we appreciate the attempt to decrease the cost distributed to the regions, we are hesitant as we agree with the University of Nevada, Reno and that some parts feel like they should have a separate discussion.
8. POC | Chair | We thought that this would be good to make elections easier. If you want to take it out, that could be done through an amendment.
9. CA - Miami University | Motions to exhaust the speakers list with additions
 - a) Second | GL - University of Wisconsin, Greenbay
 - b) Dissent | None
- ~~10. POO | PA - University of California, San Diego | Candidates were announced during NRHH Boardroom, while not here. We're worried about the order of transparency.~~
 - ~~a) Orin Artsmith, Parliamentary | If either of the two pieces fail, the positions are not filled. Also, both boardrooms are closed boardrooms so no information should be crossing between the two rooms and that consideration on this piece should not include outside information~~
11. GL - Indiana University Bloomington | Indiana University Bloomington believes that this piece is beneficial overall. Not only would it improve intercommunication between NACURH leadership members, and therefore their function, but this would also streamline understanding and accessibility of NACURH for us as CCs and/or institutions. We recognize that some institutions were a bit confused by the system of the NCO and the NBD, making it more difficult to do our jobs on campus and in our regions. So this item would help NACURH function to the best of its ability in the future.



12. MA - Saint Louis University | Saint Louis University supports this piece because it streamlines leadership, reduces redundancy, and creates cost savings while maintaining necessary responsibilities through NAA and NAP optimizing the workflow. We would like to emphasize our appreciation of the goals of efficiency and cost reduction.
13. SW - University of Texas at Dallas | UTD emphasizes that with the pass of the first bylaw, there is a lack of reason to not vote for this bylaw. This bylaw simply encourages a better management of resources such as increasing investment opportunities in regional merchandise. With a more centralized, smaller management, tasks can be completed quicker and more efficiently. As such, UTD supports this bylaw.
14. SA - University of South Carolina | The University of South Carolina appreciates the NACURH goal of optimization, however there are serious concerns about the centralization of power to the NACURH board, and urges a reconsideration of restructuring the NCO rather than disbanding it entirely and condensing it into two board positions
15. GL - Saginaw Valley State University | Saginaw Valley State University appreciates that this piece will create consistency and further optimize NACURH operations while also heavily reducing costs which will directly benefit the universities affiliated with NACURH. SVSU also appreciates the thoughtfulness put into supporting these individuals as they make the transition into their new roles
16. PA - University of Nevada, Reno | Motion to amend the piece to reinstated restriction of candidates per regions for the NAE to one per region
- a) Second | MA - Iowa State University
- (1) Authors accept the amendment as friendly
17. PPP | SW - University of Louisiana at Lafayette | Could you please zoom in on the screen, we cannot see.



18. MA | YTR

19. SA - Florida Gulf Coast University | FGCU appreciates this piece of legislation and believes that it will bring more functionality and benefits for NACURH, and other regions

20. GL - Oakland University | Oakland University believes it is important to highlight the support the coordinating officers of each of our regions will receive from the addition of these roles. Simplification and support are vital to a successful organization . We believe that it is necessary to ensure the incoming members would receive the support they need, but ultimately the approval of this piece is for the betterment of NACURH.

21. PA - University of Oregon | Typed

22. POC | NAO | No Executive Committee election is transparent to NCCs. The NBD votes on those elections.

23. GL - Eastern Illinois University | YTR

24. PA | YTR

25. GL | YTR

26. PA | YTR

27. PA | YTR

G. Vote

1. CAACURH: 13-0-0

2. GLACURH: 19-1-0

3. IACURH: 12-0-0

4. MACURH: 10-0-0

5. NEACURH: 9-0-0

6. PACURH: 0-10-0

7. SAACURH: 15-3-0



8. SWACURH: 10-0-0

H. Total: 88-14-0. Piece passes

IX. Announcements

X. Motion to recess until Closing Ceremonies | IA - University of Arizona

A. Second | SW - University of Texas at Austin

B. Dissent | None



Saturday May 23rd, 2026

NRHH Corporate Business Session

- I. Call to order: Saturday, May 23rd at 08:26 AM CDT
- II. Roll Call
 - A. Yield to Associate Directors for NRHH
 - 1. 78 chapters present
 - a) CAACURH: 14
 - b) GLACURH: 10
 - c) IACURH: 11
 - d) MACURH: 6
 - e) NEACURH: 5
 - f) PACURH: 9
 - g) SAACURH: 17
 - h) SWACURH: 6
 - 2. NRHH Quorum is **established**
- III. Welcome & Expectation Reminders
 - A. Please use the microphone
 - B. Yield questions to your Regional Board
 - C. Be patient
 - D. Refer to typed discussion
- IV. Statement of Fairness
 - A. NACURH is an international organization comprised of member schools that vary in demographic makeup, structure, size, abilities, characteristics, identities, beliefs, and affiliations. NACURH is committed to the full participation and involvement of its members in representation and decision-making in all practices and procedures including, but not limited to, conference hosting, awards and recognition, leadership development and officer roles, resources, communication, and provision of services.
 - B. To this aim, NACURH and its representatives will protect individuals and institutions from undue bias and influence stemming from circumstances that are removed from the direct control of our student members. This includes, but is not limited to, policies established by the students' institution and housing department, and laws established by governmental entities with relevant jurisdiction.



- C. While acknowledging and appreciating the differences of affiliated institutions, NACURH recognizes that there are relevant impacts on individual and institutional experiences in the organization that are of substantial and material significance. To this end, NACURH shall intentionally consider these impacts with integrity and with the best interests of affiliated member institutions in mind.
- V. Clarification Regarding OTM Database Cost
 - A. Justin Luster, NACURH Associate for NRHH | The OTM database vendor contract was approved by the NACURH and NRHH Board of Directors during the 2025 Semi-Annual Business Meeting. The initial contract that we signed states that NACURH and/or our vendor may not release any confidential information, which includes the financial information for such a project, without the consent of either party and/or a legal order. In addition, due to the standards of the industry our vendor operates in, the rates and financials for custom projects like these are rarely publicly released for competitive reasons. As such, NACURH is not able to release the costs to NACURH at-large outside the joint boards.
- VI.  NRHH Corporate 26-01 | Carson Markovic, NCO Director
 - A. Motion to bring NRHH CORP 26-01 to the floor | PA - California State University - Sacramento
 - 1. Second | CA - Miami University
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - B. Reading of the Piece
 - 1. Motion to waive reading of the piece | SA - University of Tennessee - Knoxville
 - a) Second | MA - Minnesota University, Mankato
 - b) Dissent | None
 - C. Proponent Speech
 - 1. Carson Markovic, NCO Director | The NACURH Corporate Office, aka the NCO, is the group of NACURH Leadership who handles the revenue generation for NACURH through affiliation and merchandise sales. The NCO has seen many iterations with the most recent iteration being brought back post COVID during NACURH's recovery efforts. This version mimicked the pre-COVID office but upon losing its in person host site and failing to secure a new one, the decision to not seek an in-person host site for the NCO was made. Since then, multiple issues have been identified as severe roadblocks that challenged the long-term sustainability of



the NCO and of NACURH. These issues have impacted the NACURH Boards in the form of the inability for the Executive Committee and NCO to effectively communicate and collaborate on projects that impact NACURH broadly, the NCO taking on a major financial responsibility for regional merchandise with little to no return on investment, and ineffective outcomes from previous NCO restructures and changes that have led to a lack of understanding of what the NCO is and its function within NACURH. These issues have also impacted affiliates in many visible ways. Poor communication about the affiliation process, conflicting guidance from different people, delays in merchandise shipping and processing, and more. While the NCO team and executives have made their best efforts to overcome these hurdles, some of these issues simply exist at a higher probability under the current split structure.

2. Myself, the NACURH Chairperson, the NACURH Executive Committee, members of the NCO, and then the Joint Boards via NBD 26-42 came to the conclusion that the structure we have attempted to revive and adapt is simply not suited to the modern environment and needs of NACURH. The Joint Boards heard and passed NBD 26-42 in April, dissolving the NCO and distributing the core functions of the NCO to two new positions within the NACURH Executive Committee: the NACURH Associate for Administration (NAA) and the NACURH Associate for Programs (NAP). While this piece only formally adds the NAP to the NRHH Bylaws, I want to provide a little background on both positions. These two new positions aim to support NACURH administratively and in ways that NACURH has not been able to support in years past. Affiliation and merchandise have previously been split between 3 positions within the NCO and have struggled to create consistent practices and expectations in these areas. Placing these responsibilities under one position will allow NACURH to fully support affiliation, including better defining the value of affiliating to institutions and creating an affiliation process that is easy to navigate for institutions and providing assessment information to inform NACURH's direction towards its Mission Statement. The NAP's main role is the facilitation of the NACURH Award Bidding process for the Annual Conference, which is a



year-round process, providing education, guidance, and support to institutions who wish to engage with award bidding.

3. The addition of these two new positions after the removal of seven positions will reduce annual operating expenses and reduce the burden of the Annual Conference Budget in regard to compensated NACURH Leadership members. These changes result in an exact change to the NACURH FY27 budget of a \$5,608.33 increase in net revenue and are projected to reduce annual expenses in following years by approximately \$7,500.
4. While the budgetary impacts of this change will result in a direct benefit to affiliates and to conference attendees, these changes will otherwise impact only the corporate functions of NACURH and ease the implementation of top-level NACURH operations. To ensure that affiliation and chapter merchandise operations continue to function as normal for affiliates, the incoming NACURH Executive Committee and Joint Boards have identified and approved candidates for each of the two new positions to provide continuity for the corporation. Extensive planning has gone into the transition of the operations currently housed under the NACURH Corporate Office and I am happy to answer any questions you may have to assure you all that this is in fact the best and most efficient path forward for NACURH's future.

D. Q&A | 5 Mins extendable up to 2 times

1. NE - University of Connecticut | The University of Connecticut seeks clarification on the distinction between the responsibilities of the NACURH Associate for Engagement and the NACURH Associate for Programs, specifically regarding programming initiatives and member involvement.
 - a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | We struggled with where that line is and we did our best to distinguish what is engagement and what is programming. The description is a lot longer in the policy book than the bylaws, but basically the NAP will oversee NRHH-Us, NACURH-Us, and other NACURH sponsored programs.
2. CA - Miami University | If you could go into more detail on what programming the NAP would be doing for NACURH & NRHH?
 - a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | I listed a few previously, but it would be a lot of asynchronous programming like the



- CME program, Pen Pals, NRHH-U's, award bid programming, etc. We will also allow the NAP to assess what programming is wanted by NRHH members
3. Point of Personal Privilege| Georgia Technology University
 - a) Can you get the captions back up
 4. PA - University of Oregon |What the timeline for filling these roles are
 - a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | We have done a process to conditionally confirm people in these positions, so if the piece passes they will be confirmed tonight with the rest of the exec committee. The process was accelerated but still complied with NACURH policy.
 5. GL - Saginaw Valley State University | How does adding another position lower the annual budget?
 - a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | Each member of NACURH Leadership are a part of a compensated position to attend ABM and Semis, so by removing 7 positions we are saving a significant amount of money
 6. NE - University at Buffalo | Out of the inefficiencies and hurdles mentioned earlier that were seen by NCO, which of them does the new position seem to address and could you explain how?
 - a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | From a top level, that is where the most impact is. While the NCO has voting rights, we can collaborate effectively with the exec committee. We also have shared organization systems which are inaccessible to the NCO if I need something from them. It also does a lot of extra support for COs at the regional level, as the NAE oversees the entirety of CO support, and the idea of this support is that it will trickle down all the way to the institutional level. The programs offered by the NAP should also serve as similar support.
 7. MA - Minnesota State University - Mankato | Motion to extend by 5 mins
 - a) Second | NE - Stony Brook University
 - b) Dissent | None
 8. PA - University of Hawaii, Manoa | Has there been a plan for the allocated position in the future?



- a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | Some of that would go to additional travel funds to the exec committee since we have two new positions, but other than that most of it would be absorbed by the NACURH budget with the merging of the two bank accounts. The budget for this upcoming year has already been approved, and it would be up to the NAO to delegate that as they see fit.
 - b) POC | There is a NCO budget that was approved and that money is already allocated.
9. SW - Centenary College of Louisiana | About the positions, there are 5-7 positions that are dissolved to make the new positions, why are y'all putting the responsibilities from those positions made for more people only to 2 people?
- a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | There are a lot of overlapping responsibilities between the NCO and the exec committee. For example, the NAE and ADMT in the NCO have similar responsibilities in terms of marketing. We did a lot of review for the core functions of the NCO, and determined that affiliation, award bidding, and marketing were the core functions of it. A lot of responsibilities can be given back the exec committee, and these two positions have a lot of room to grow, so we saw no reason to keep these positions around
10. CA - Miami University | Motion to exhaust with additions
- a) Second | SA - Appalachian State University
 - b) Dissent | None
11. NE - University at Buffalo | UB understands that you answered the reason behind it, but could you also explain how exactly does NACURH aim to support and make sure that 2 new positions will fix situations and challenges that previously required 7 members to run the logistics?
- a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | The way we have structured this is there are support systems on both the student and advisor size. Reducing the burden of overseeing a team. The NAP is more collaborative with the NAN and NAE, and those projects are not falling on one person. There are systems in place to support the new roles.



12. PA - California State University - Sacramento | What happens if this piece does not get passed in terms of delegating the tasks of the NAP?
- a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | If this piece does not pass. I am not sure how that works on the governing documents side but will have to consult with the Chairperson and the incoming Executive Committee.
 - b) PO | If we pass it, it is still contingent on the NCC. If the NCC's pass it will be added to the NACURH Bylaws but we do not pass it in NRHH, then it will not get added to the NRHH Bylaws.
13. NE - University of Connecticut | The University of Connecticut asks what transition mechanisms or documentation practices are being implemented to ensure continuity as responsibilities shift from the Corporate Office into the Executive Committee structure.
- a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | I would transition the NAA, and the current ADRE and myself will transition the NAP. There will be multiple meetings that will be set up to get that transition started, and using the responses that we have in the google drive and using previous Execs and NCO members for context
14. PA - University of Oregon | Why is the information of removing the NCO budget not public?
- a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | NACURH does not publish the budget to NACURH at large. In the NBD piece, the budgetary changes are listed there but are not publicly available for institutions
15. Point of Information
- a) UB | We did not feel as though our last question was answered, is there a way to clarify
16. Request for Information | NE - University at Buffalo
- a) Can you clarify on Question 11 beyond what the support systems are?
 - b) Internal support will be through transition and from the executive committee
17. NE - University of Connecticut | The University of Connecticut asks whether the incoming structure provides clearer accountability pathways for affiliates seeking support from NACURH leadership



- a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | There is nothing specific, there is a recall method for all of execs and then we have an accountability process for all of NACURH Leadership.
 - b) NAN | You need to work with Regional Board of Directors and Advisors to do that accountability process
- 18. NE - University of Buffalo | UB is unclear whether this is considered outside information, but, hypothetically, if the piece fails to go through, what are the alternatives and future paths that NACURH is considering moving forward with regards to the future of NCO, their discontinuation, and the other upcoming relevant changes that they expect?
 - a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | The NCO was dissolved previously this year, so it would take new legislation to reinstate these positions. If the bylaws fails these positions won't be created, so the incoming exec committee would work amongst themselves to delegate the old task from the NCO / NAA and NAP
- 19. NE - University of Connecticut | What responsibilities specifically fall under 'administrative functions' for the NACURH Associate for Programs?
 - a) Carson Markovic, NCO Director | The big two that I will highlight is the NACURH level award bidding process which consists of policy checks and other heavy administrative tasks. Also, the NRHH affiliation process in conjunction with the NAN, as well as working on the back end of our OTM database.
- E. Discussion | 5 Mins extendable up to 2 times
 - 1. IA - Colorado State University | Colorado State University is in agreement with this piece. CSU believes that this piece will be fundamental in helping to distribute the work amongst the team. CSU believes that this will help to prevent burnout and help to keep retention amongst the board members. CSU believes that this role with helping to improve the budget will positively impact the NACURH space. CSU is excited to see what will happen with this new role on the contingency that it is passed.
 - 2. SA - Georgia Technology University | Georgia Tech appreciates that the piece focuses on streamlining positional responsibilities on the national level, and likes the further clarity to the structure



of NACURH that this brings. Tech's only concerns and hopeful focus points for the Executive Committee would lie with making sure there is smooth transition with the two positions that do not currently exist and the potential for inconsistencies between the bylaws and operations if either additions do not pass.

3. Request for Information | What is the NCC Piece? And the implementation of the pieces passing or failing.
 - a) Y'all have access to both pieces on the corporate website.
4. CA - Towson University | This is in the best interest of NACURH and is in support of this piece of legislation.
5. NE - Stoney Brook University | Appreciated that you are trying to reduce the budget. We are worried about the burnout of the positions consolidating from 5-7 roles to 2 roles.
6. MA - University of Nebraska - Lincoln | UNL is in favor of this piece. The current format is inefficient as positions were not being filled, so this provides a more efficient framework with more support from the board.
7. PA - University of Hawaii Manoa | The University of Hawaii at Manoa is appreciative of this bill and would like to recognize that the passing of this bill is overall beneficial to NRHH and NACURH as a whole. UH Manoa would like to see the possible implementation or proposal of an amendment that aims to quantize and/or evaluate if the elimination of this position has actually decreased overall communication delays within NRHH
8. NE - University of Connecticut | The University of Connecticut believes the consolidation of responsibilities will improve operational consistency and programming coordination across NACURH and NRHH with a more structure designed for more direct collaboration and oversight.
9. IA - Colorado State University | Motion to extend by 5 mins
 - a) Second | CA - IUP
 - b) Dissent | None
10. GL - Saginaw Valley State University | Saginaw Valley State University motion to caucus for 5 mins
 - a) Second | NE - Stony Brook University
 - b) Dissent | None
11. IA - New Mexico State University | New Mexico State University shares similar points that Stony Brook University, Colorado State



University and GA Tech made. We do want to state that, in the future, more consideration should be given to how appointments are being made.

12. CA - The Ohio State University | The Ohio State University appreciates the commitment to consolidation and liquidation of overlapping positions to create a more streamlined NACURH. We would also like to emphasize the importance of decreasing expenses, trickling down savings to smaller institutions.
13. MA - Minnesota State University, Mankato | Motion to exhaust without additions
 - a) ~~Second | PA - Oregon State University~~
 - b) Dissent | NE - University at Buffalo
 - (1) Institutions may want to be added to the speakers list after the caucus
 - (2) Amended to Motion to exhaust with additions
 - (a) Second | SA - University of Southern Mississippi
 - (b) Dissent | None
14. SW - University of Texas Austin | YTR
 - a) Chair will not accept that motion due to the speakers list but would accept it later
15. GL - University of Wisconsin - Green Bay | University of Wisconsin-Green Bay supports this legislation and recognizes that the NNBD might be stretched thin, but can make updates if necessary next year.
16. SA - University of South Carolina | The University of South Carolina believes that more communication regarding this amendment and other recent changes on the NACURH level would have been beneficial, and currently our institution does not feel we have been provided enough information. We would like more communication moving forward, and more clear information.
17. PA - California State University - Sacramento | California State University believes that during the Q&A period, we received vague information from the responses. We would have appreciated more clarity from the author. Sacramento State is not here for the piece.



18. Point of Clarification | The confidence of the speakers should not be taken into consideration, only what is written in the piece and what was said in the proponent and within Q&A session.
19. Request of Information | The rationale states that these structural changes result in an exact \$5,608.33 increase in net revenue for the FY27 budget. As mentioned by the FCO, the FY27 budget has already been approved but this enabling legislation has not yet passed. Could the authorship clarify the current state of these funds? Specifically, does the approved FY27 budget already conditionally rely on this new structure, or does the passage of this bill create an unallocated surplus of \$5,608.33 that will require a subsequent budget amendment to formalize?
- a) POC - Budgetary matters, the budgets were combined but there will not be funds unaccounted for.
20. CA - Miami University | Miami University believes the proposal offers great reform that helps situate a national and regional connection that allows for engagement and renewal that all regions have mentioned as goals for their institutions, and although there is only two people for the positions, believes that change is necessary in order to work with the modern day NACURH Values.
21. PPP - Can we zoom in on the speakers list?
22. NE - University of Buffalo | UB agrees with all the points mentioned by its colleagues that brought up concerns with this piece, UB wants to acknowledge the genuinity of the concept and the potential good that can be brought up with this piece but we do want to highlight the multiple potential discrepancies in this piece and the potential lack of detailing in the planning process for this alternative that is being put forth and want to express our concerns on the said matter and urge all our colleagues to take all the discussion points into consideration as we approach the time of voting. To reiterate, we appreciate and acknowledge the good that can come off of this, but we would have appreciated it more if this solution had a more detailed logistical plan from NACURH to begin with.
23. GL - Western Illinois University | Western Illinois University believes that the increased efficiency this legislation offers is a significant step forwards for NACURH.



24. PA - University of Hawaii Manoa | YTR
25. CA - Wright State University | Wright State University is in full support of this piece as the NCO is already dissolved and we believe this a great way to keep the basis of the positions within the NACURH structure
26. GL - Saginaw Valley State University | Think that it is important for NRHH to have input on this piece on the bylaws
27. NE - University of Connecticut | The University of Connecticut believes this restructuring demonstrates adaptability from NACURH leadership in responding to the evolving operational needs of NRHH and NACURH. While UConn supports the overall direction of this piece, we encourage clear communication to affiliates as these changes are implemented so institutions understand the intent of the proposal and the responsibilities of the new structure.
28. CA - University of Akron | In full support of this piece
29. NE - Stony Brook University | SBU would like to thank our ADNRRH for clarification during the caucus. The NCO is dissolved and incorporated into the executive office adding 2 positions to the executive, which one would be in charge of the award and program, then the other in charge of affiliation. The merch would be handled by the regional conference. We agree that this would be more efficient in having one power handle everything instead of having 2 conflicted. However, our initial concern still stands that the position in charge of the award bid and the program may be handling too much. We agree with the other institution that we need more information on this matter.

F. Vote

1. CAACURH: 14-0-0
2. GLACURH: 10-0-0
3. IACURH: 11-0-0
4. MACURH: 6-0-0
5. NEACURH: 0-5-0
6. PACURH: 1-8-0
7. SAACURH: 15-2-0
8. SWACURH: 6-0-0
- 9. Total: 63-15-0. Piece passes**

VII. NRHH Year In Review | NACURH NRHH Board of Directors



VIII. State of NRHH | Incoming NACURH Associate for NRHH

A. Legislation Q&A

1. SA - University of North Carolina at Charlotte | Can you clarify service themed months?
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | Service theme months were reestablished, a calendar of themes that NRHH will focus on throughout the year. There is a guide with marketing guidance and program ideas to engage in.
2. SA - Florida Gulf Coast University | Will the minutes to NNBD be public?
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | The minutes will not be published per our policy if we go into an Executive Session. The other minutes like if we go into a round table or something similar, those will be published.
3. IA - University of Idaho | If able, clarify on 26-12, why OTYs were removed
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | I wrote this piece, so the OTY process focused on a singular months accomplishments for the entire year, and oftentimes you were comparing things of different magnitudes, and this process caused extreme strain on the OTM selection committee. Overall, it created a lot more business for joint boards to do in a very short period of time. Additionally, it doesn't work with our new OTM data base, and if we were to try to make it work we would have to allocate a lot more funds to the data base to add in those features
4. CA - Towson University | Elaborate for 26-03, and what that entails
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | The finance pieces that existed were in relation to our merch that we had, and exists in our policy book, just not the NRHH book. Finances are handled by our NAO, whom



of which is not a member of NRHH. Our policy around finances was moved to the operations manual, as it is not important to reps how NACURH manages its funds internally.

5. NE - University at Buffalo | Would NNBD 26-08 put any strain on the NRHH leadership?
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | This piece was a resolution, meaning it is a one time piece. The policy book was formed in a way that was really bad, so we made it screen reader accessible, as well as in accessible fonts, and will provide ease of access in terms of writing legislation
6. SA - University of North Carolina - Charlotte | 26-07, Is there a plan to have more/less OTM categories and their effectiveness
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | I think there are initiatives that institutions can do, but also initiatives that NACURH can do. With our new OTM database it will provide more clarification on what can be applicable to certain categories. The only category that was changed was the empowerment program and that was at the advice of our legal council, and to provide more support for our institutions so they can continue to affiliate with us.

B. Affiliation Q&A

1. IA - Utah State University | Are the forms available on the website? When you are trying to remove someone, what is needed to remove them and the criteria?
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | They are all on the website, specifically there is a page called membership types and policies, and then there is a form for you to complete to change membership types. For many of those things it requires approval from an advisor, and for some processes it courts ADNRRH approval. Please use the forms on the



website, otherwise it won't be considered accurate. The specifics of the removal are decided by your institution, so some examples are not meeting membership requirements, not attending meetings, but overall it is decided at the institutional level, and the process is facilitated through the form.

2. IA - University of Northern Colorado | When is the constitution due?
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | It is part of the affiliation process. It will automatically send the feedback to you, and it can be changed within the year.
3. CA - The Ohio State University | Are there an active list of our current members so we can submit those membership forms.
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | We are working on that structure. What you submitted last year is what we currently have to reference. Your regional leadership does have access to that and can get you that info. For the future, we are hoping to add that into our OTM Database.
4. SA - Florida International University | Can you tell us where the constitution checklist?
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | If you go to the NRHH website, there is a resources tab, and on the top row on the right side. That is the constitution checklist and templates
5. IA - Utah State University | If we inducted members, are they still considered for 3-4 year service pins if they are not
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | Yes, the three and four year membership process is not reliant on that list, it is based on the info presented and interactions with your regional leadership
6. CA - The Ohio State University | What is the policy if NRHH policy goes against institutional policy?
 - a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | Please consult the exec team so we can discuss that, We have



tried to have our policy as general as possible but we recognize there will be conflictions still

b) Patrick Rosengrant, NACURH NRHH Advisor | We will always want you to default to what your institution is saying and their policies.

7. NE - University of Connecticut | Is there a link to affiliation? Does affiliation cost one for RHA & NRHH?

a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | There will be a link on the website for that. It will be the same space right now, and that process should be announced at the closing ceremony. We recommend completing the affiliation process with your advisors and NCCs to complete the process as smoothly as possible

8. SA - University of South Carolina | Is there a process of feedback on chapter NRHH bylaws?

a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | Currently, there is no process for bylaws, but part of the affiliation process is asking what you are comfortable with sharing with other institutions. If enough institutions are comfortable, we can make resources for that based on chapter constitutions

9. SA - University of North Carolina - Charlotte | Is there a progress tracker, to make sure we are meeting the deadline?

a) Justin Luster, NACURH Associate NRHH | For the processes of memberships and constitutions, they won't be held against the institution on the constitution side. For the membership side, just complete the membership census list to the best of your ability

IX. Motion to recess until Closing Ceremonies | NE - University of Connecticut

A. Second | GL - Saginaw Valley State University

B. Dissent | None :)

