



NACURH, Inc.

2026 Annual Business Meeting

Part I

Hosted on Zoom

April 25 2026

Part II

Hosted at Texas A&M University

May 18-20, 2026

2025-2026 NACURH Joint Board Roles

Presiding Officer:

Cade Perkins
NACURH Chairperson

Minutes Taken By:

Parrama Chouhan
2024-2026 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:

Damien Davis
Midwest Affiliate Coordinating Officer for NCCs and Assessment

Carson Markovic
NACURH Corporate Office Director



2025-2026 NACURH & NACURH NRHH Board of Directors

Central Atlantic Affiliate

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

South Atlantic Affiliate

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

Great Lakes Affiliate

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

Southwest Affiliate

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

Intermountain Affiliate

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

NACURH Corporate Office

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

Midwest Affiliate

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

Annual Conference Staff

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

Northeast Affiliate

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

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

Pacific Affiliate

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



Saturday April 25th, 2026

2026-2027 NACURH Executive Elections

1. General Election Guidelines:
 - a. Proponent speeches limited to 15 minutes.
 - b. Q&A limited to 40 minutes, no extensions necessary and exhaustion of the speakers list will not go past the time limit. If we reach 40 minutes, the question at hand will be allowed to be answered completely and then we will move promptly into discussion.
 - c. Discussion 10 minutes extendable twice, able to be exhausted.
 - d. Voting done by secret ballot.
2. NACURH Chairperson Election
 - a. [Minutes Document](#)
3. NACURH Associate for Operations Election
 - a. [Minutes Document](#)
4. NACURH Associate for NRHH Election
 - a. [Minutes Document](#)
5. NACURH Associate for Engagement Election
 - a. [Minutes Document](#)



Monday May 18th, 2026

1. Welcome (HIIII!!!)
2. Placards exist, will get them in boardroom tomorrow
3. Expectations
 - a. All
 - i. Check the lifeline! It has minutes, links, information, schedule, etc.
 - ii. Be on time! Your affiliates are paying for you to be here and represent them
 - iii. Be respectful of these spaces!
 - iv. Have fun and be respectful
 - v. Be empathetic
 - vi. Treat every moment as a learning opportunity
 - vii. Do not come with decisions being made, come with open mind
 - viii. Be curious, ask questions
 - ix. Slow down, allow for the space to happen even if discussion is going long and not rushing a vote
 - x. Be communicative (to your board, with execs etc.)
4. Parli Pro
 - a. In addition to the usual Parli Pro, the following are in effect for ABM:
 - i. Reading of the piece:
 1. The chair will ask for unanimous consent to waive the reading of the piece. If no one dissents, the reading is waived. No need for a motion.
 - ii. Discussion:
 1. Call previous question: 2nd, no dissent, $\frac{2}{3}$ placard vote. Immediately ends discussion and enters voting
 - iii. Voting:
 1. Bids - By secret ballot (Google Form)
 2. Confirmations - By secret ballot (Google Form)
 3. Legislation - By placard unless motioned to vote by general consent
 - a. Vote by general consent: When entering voting, anyone may motion to vote by general consent and if no dissent is made the piece will pass. This does not necessarily mean everyone supports the motion, but



that everyone believes the motion will pass.
 Discussion is the place to state opposition to a piece.
 If you believe your entity will be the only vote
 against, voting is not the time for symbolic
 opposition.

- b. Parliamentary Parli Pro Activity (With a prize) - Orin
- 5. Sniped Introduction - Keri and Justin
 - a. WILL be in the Discord
- 6. ADAF
 - a. Come by room 108 in the commons to confirm your inventory numbers and prices. Your merchandise is set aside in one (or two) crates and just needs to be counted.
- 7. NNBD Parliamentary & Recording Secretary - **HELP PLS!**
- 8. Recess until May 18 at 9:00 AM CST

Tuesday May 19th, 2026 NBD Boardroom

- 1. Roll Call - Called to order at 9:00 AM CST

Roll Call						
	Director	Finance Officer	ADNRHH	NACURH Exec		
CAACURH	x	-		Chairperson	x	
GLACURH	x	x		NAO	x	
IACURH	x	x		NAN	-	
MACURH	x	-		NAE	-	
NEACURH	x	-		Advisor	-	
PACURH	x	-		NRHH Advisor	-	
SAACURH	x	x		CRC	x	
SWACURH	x	-		ART	-	
NCO	x	x		ADC	-	
	Chair	NBD Liaison	Finance Chair			
AC	-	-	-	Quorum is present		



2. Who's Who
 - a. Minutes | Connor/Jason/Orin/Carson, Parrama
 - b. Speakers List | Parrama
 - c. Timer Keeper | Cade/Minute Keepers
 - d. Parliamentarian | Orin
3. Motion to approve 2026 Annual Business Meeting Agenda | MA
 - a. Second | GL
 - b. Dissent | None
4. RHA Building Block of the Year 2026 Selection
 - a. Motion to bring RHA Building Block of the Year 2026 to the floor | SA
 - i. Second | IA
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - b. Motion to open the floor for nominations | SA
 - i. Second | MA
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - c. Nominations
 - i. MA | Nominates Slippery Rock University
 1. Second | SW
 - ii. IA | Nominates Indiana University Bloomington
 1. Second | SA
 - iii. NE | Nominates Hofstra University
 1. Second | MA
 - iv. SA | Nominates Pennsylvania State University
 1. Second | IA
 - v. MA | Nominates University of California, San Diego
 1. Second | GL
 - vi. SW | Nominates Florida Gulf Coast University
 1. Second | MA
 - vii. SA | Nominates The University of Texas at Austin
 1. Second | CA
 - d. Motion to close the floor for nominations | MA
 - i. Second | SW
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - e. Discussion
 - i. SA | The South Atlantic believes that Slippery Rock University submitted one of the strongest bids in this category due to its clear alignment with the purpose of the Building Block award. The bid effectively demonstrated organizational rebuilding, increased member involvement, and intentional structural growth. The strongest aspect of the bid was its focus on sustainable



improvement and measurable development throughout the year. However, the bid was weaker in showcasing broader regional involvement and occasionally lacked depth when discussing initiative outcomes. Despite these weaknesses, the organization's growth story remained compelling and highly competitive. With this in mind, the South Atlantic fully supports Slippery Rock University for this award.

- ii. MA | The Midwest Appreciates ICRA at UC San Diego demonstrates a highly developed residential engagement model supported by its equipment lending program and diverse programming initiatives. The organization shows strong collaboration with campus departments and regional partners, contributing to both student leadership development and community building.
- iii. CA | The Central Atlantic believes that Slippery Rock University (SRU) showed great development and exemplifies the meaning of the Building Block Award. SRU showed regional involvement by hosting a regional conference and a regional board member
- iv. GL | While we believe that Indiana University Bloomington has shown great development and change. While there were changes made to their structure, and great development taking place, the things presented in their bid were not as impactful as expected for a recipient of the RHA Building Block award as an established, regionally engaged RHA already.
- v. SW | The Southwest Region appreciates that the bid from UCSD clearly outlines the purpose and goals of the initiative and provides well-structured descriptions of each program and its intended impact on residents. This level of clarity strengthens the chapter's narrative and demonstrates intentional planning. The bid would benefit from further elaboration on the challenges faced throughout the process to better understand the chapter's growth, adaptability, and areas for continued development.
- vi. IA | Indiana University, Bloomington is a very strong candidate for this award. They exceed in nearly every category of selection criteria, and the bid presents the content in a comprehensible and engaging manner. The extent of their impact on campus is clear via measurable qualitative and quantitative data. For example, they increased delegate awareness during their election process, and they expanded their residence communities, adding approximately 1,000 new residents. In addition, their RHA presents strong regional and national involvement, with accomplishments at multiple conferences.



- vii. MA | The Residence Hall Association at Hofstra University demonstrates strong organizational resilience through its successful rebuild from inactivity into a functioning and engaged student leadership body. It shows clear progress in student engagement, programming impact, and collaboration with campus partners, leading to increased visibility and regional success.
- viii. SA | The South Atlantic believes the University of Texas at Austin presented a highly successful and exceptionally developed organization with impressive infrastructure and broad-reaching initiatives. The strongest elements of the bid were its organizational systems, initiative expansion, and campus impact. However, the bid was weaker in demonstrating rebuilding, transformation, or development growth, which are central themes of the Building Block category. Compared to other bids, the organization appeared more established than developing, which slightly weakened its alignment with the intended award criteria. With this in mind, the South Atlantic does not support this bid.
- ix. RFI | Which bids do we still need to speak on?
 - 1. Chair | Florida Gulf Coast University and Penn State
- x. PA | The PA would like to echo the points made by the Midwest but we would also like to comment on the points made by the Great Lakes. We would like to point out that there is no award bid for established RHA chapters versus establishing chapters.
- xi. MA | The Midwest liked FGCU's measurable takeaways they got from regional and national conferences such as a recycling campaign, but we would have liked to see more direct connection between stated purpose, goals and outcomes.
- xii. SA | The South Atlantic believes Penn State University presented a very polished and successful organization with strong campus impact and comprehensive initiatives. The strongest portions of the bid centered around organizational excellence, visibility, and established programming efforts. However, the bid was weaker in demonstrating transformational growth or rebuilding, which are central components of the Building Block category. While Penn State clearly showcased success, the organization occasionally appeared too developed for the intended spirit of this award compared to other nominees. With this in mind, the South Atlantic does not support this bid.
- xiii. GL | Motion to narrow the field to 3
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None



- f. Narrowing - Form
 - i. University of California San Diego
 - ii. Slippery Rock University
 - iii. Indiana University, Bloomington
- g. GL | Motion to extend by 5 minutes
 - i. Second | MA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- h. Discussion Continued
 - i. MA | ARHS at Slippery Rock University demonstrates strong student leadership through well-structured roles, large-scale programming, and effective use of a strong budget. The organization actively increases student engagement through inclusive events, recruitment efforts, and hall-level involvement. Its consistent conference participation and regional hosting highlight strong collaboration, organization, and overall campus impact.
 - ii. SW | The SW appreciates the chapter's detailed, itemized budget layout, which demonstrates strong financial transparency and intentional resource allocation. The bid also provides extensive information about the chapter's regional involvement, highlighting a commitment to engaging beyond the campus level. The bid offers limited clarity regarding programming outcomes and does not fully articulate the goals or strategy behind resident involvement, making it difficult to assess the chapter's overall impact on its residential community.
 - iii. CA | Motions to end discussion
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
- i. Narrowing Form - 2
 - i. Slippery Rock University
 - ii. Indiana University Bloomington
- j. Discussion Continued ⌚ 0:00
 - i. SA | Motions to Caucus for 5 minutes
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - ii. GL | The Great Lakes recognizes that there is no other RHA recognition award that IUB could apply for beyond School of the Year. Despite this, we feel that our point still stands. Slippery Rock University's bid is remarkable and we feel that the changes that IUB has implemented to their structure and institutional engagement do not exceed the accomplishments presented by SRU.



- iii. SA | The South Atlantic believes Indiana University Bloomington submitted a very strong and balanced bid that closely reflected the intent of the Building Block award. The bid excelled in showcasing leadership development, intentional rebuilding efforts, and measurable organizational progress. The strongest aspects of the bid was its emphasis on sustainability and member growth through intentional programming and leadership cultivation. While we do support Slippery Rock University, we believe that the organization restructuring is more conducive to the building block award intentions. They showed tangible change and implementation that any organization could take and use to form their own chapters. Overall, the organization effectively demonstrated meaningful and sustainable development. With this in mind, the South Atlantic fully supports Indiana University, Bloomington, for this award.
 - iv. ~~MA | Motion to end discussion~~
 - 1. ~~Second | NE~~
 - 2. ~~Dissent | IA~~
 - a. Wanted to make a discussion point
 - i. NE and MA retract
 - v. IA | We do commend both bids and the work each school produced. The Intermountain is still in support of Indiana University, Bloomington. Within caucus, for the purposes of time, we re-reviewed the bids in their display of campus level selection criteria. It is clear that while both bids meet the selection criteria, Indiana University, Bloomington does so in a more thorough manner that displays measurable results. For example, both schools relay that they changed their constitution. Nevertheless, Indiana University, Bloomington lists specific changes from year to year, and they include the impact of those changes on the lower half of page 3.
 - vi. MA | Motion to end discussion
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - k. Voting Form
 - i. Conclusive majority reached
- 5. Student of the Year 2026 Selection
 - a. Motion to bring Student of the Year 2026 to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | SA
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - b. Motion to open the floor for nominations | SASA



- i. Second | IA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- c. Nominations
 - ☒ MA | Nominates Pennsylvania State University
 - ☒ IA | Nominates New York University
 - ☒ SW | Nominates Oakland University
 - ☒ PA | Nominates Northern Arizona University
 - ☒ NE | Nominates Eastern Kentucky University
 - ☒ SA | Nominates North Dakota State University
 - ☒ PA | Nominates Texas Tech University
- d. Motion to close the floor for nominations | MA
 - i. Second | IA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- e. Discussion
 - i. SA | The South Atlantic believes Penn State University submitted a strong Student of the Year bid that effectively highlighted the nominee's broad campus involvement, leadership contributions, and dedication to improving the residential student experience. The strongest aspects of the bid included the nominee's visible impact across multiple initiatives and their commitment to advocacy and organizational success. However, the bid became weaker when discussing the nominee's personal growth and reflective development throughout the year. Some accomplishments were presented broadly without fully demonstrating the direct influence the individual had on outcomes and long-term organizational change. While the nominee clearly made significant contributions, the bid occasionally focused more on organizational accomplishments than the unique impact of the student themselves. The South Atlantic fully supports this bid.
 - ii. MA | MACURH believes Texas Tech is a strong bid and that Roree is a clear leader on campus, but believes that this bid lacks a clear description of her impact on campus.
 - iii. IA | The Intermountain believes that Northern Arizona University, North Dakota State University, and New York University present the strongest candidates for this award. Each of their candidates meet all of the selection criteria, with each candidate excelling in at least one category.
 - iv. SA | The South Atlantic believes Eastern Kentucky University demonstrated a meaningful and student-centered leadership experience through the nominee's dedication to community-building and supporting peers within the residential



environment. The strongest aspects of the bid emphasized interpersonal impact, organizational passion, and intentional efforts to improve the student experience. However, the bid became weaker when compared to submissions that demonstrated broader institutional influence and more measurable outcomes. While the nominee clearly made positive contributions to their community, several examples lacked detailed evidence showing long-term organizational transformation or large-scale impact. Compared to the strongest bids, the nominee's sphere of influence appeared more limited in scope. With that being said, the South Atlantic does not support this bid.

- v. SW | The Southwest appreciates the bid from Oakland University but feels as though a Disproportionate metric was used rather than systemic inclusivity, seeing as some parts of the narrative looks at the award through a "checklist" of experiences rather than equitable growth and reflection upon the students' experiences.
- vi. MA | Motion to narrow the field to 3
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None

f. Narrowing Form

- ☒ New York University
- ☒ North Dakota State University
- ☒ Northern Arizona University
- ☒ Pennsylvania State University

g. Discussion Continues

- i. GL | New York University presented a well-organized, cohesively themed bid that gave a clear picture of the candidate and demonstrated a strong campus level involvement and impact, intentional regional and national engagement, and a deep engagement with campus community in a transformational way. We support NYU and Marry's bid fully to win this award.
- ii. MA | The Midwest was extremely impressed with Emilia's commitment to bringing partnerships between the food pantry and the School of Ed to CLSA for broader impact.
- iii. PA | Motion to extend time by 5 minutes
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- iv. NCO | The NCO believes that North Dakota State University provides a very strong bid for this category and believes that Kaitlyn presents strong leadership across the whole campus and



through the regional and NACURH levels. Kaitlyn has served in formal leadership positions in NRHH and has been involved in other aspects of involvement such as educational session presenting at the regional level. It is clear through Kaitlyn's bid that her impact is felt within residence life student leadership but also branches outwards to the other areas of leadership she touches.

- v. PA | The Pacific supports NYU's bid for student OTY because the bid had a strong combination of impact, leadership, and involvement covering all areas of the selection criteria.
- vi. IA | The Intermountain is in support of Marry Sung from New York University. Marry Sung meets all of the selection criteria and excels in her campus leadership and regional and NACURH involvement. In addition, she is one of the only candidates to explicitly express goals for her NACURH involvement. The Intermountain is in support of Marry Sung from New York University. Marry Sung meets all of the selection criteria and excels in her campus leadership and regional and NACURH involvement. In addition, she is one of the only candidates to explicitly express goals for her NACURH involvement.
- vii. SA | The South Atlantic believes North Dakota State University demonstrated a strong commitment to student advocacy and peer support through the nominee's leadership and involvement within the residential community. The strongest portions of the bid highlighted the nominee's ability to foster belonging and contribute positively to campus life. However, the bid became weaker when discussing measurable organizational transformation and broader institutional impact. While the nominee clearly supported students effectively, the examples provided did not consistently demonstrate large-scale influence or sustained organizational change compared to stronger submissions. Additionally, measurable outcomes and reflective growth analysis were limited throughout portions of the bid. With that being said, the South Atlantic does not support this bid. The South Atlantic believes New York University submitted a highly polished Student of the Year bid that effectively demonstrated the nominee's broad involvement, professionalism, and leadership within the campus community. The strongest portions of the bid highlighted the nominee's large-scale engagement efforts and ability to contribute meaningfully across multiple organizational areas. However, the bid became weaker in clearly distinguishing the nominee's personal contributions from broader organizational



accomplishments. At times, the narrative focused heavily on scale and achievements without fully reflecting on the nominee's individual developmental journey, challenges, or long-term impact. Compared to stronger bids, deeper reflective analysis and clearer attribution of accomplishments would have strengthened the submission further. The South Atlantic is not in favor of this bid and strongly supports Pennsylvania State University.

- viii. MA | Motion to end discussion
 - 1. Second | NE
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - h. Vote - Form
 - i. Conclusive majority reached
6. Moove to groove for 5 minutes | NE
- a. Second | PA
 - b. Dissent | None
7. School of the Year 2026 Selection
- a. Motion to bring School of the Year 2026 to the floor | SA
 - i. Second | MA
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - b. Motion to open the floor for nominations | NCO
 - i. Second | NE
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - c. Nominations
 - ☒ MA | Nominates Indiana University, Bloomington
 - ☒ GL | Nominates Northeastern University
 - ☒ SA | Nominates Rutgers University
 - ☒ GL | Nominates The University of Akron
 - ☒ PA | Nominates University of California, San Diego
 - ☒ CA | Nominates University of Georgia
 - ☒ IA | Nominates University of Nebraska - Lincoln
 - ☒ MA | Nominates University of South Carolina
 - d. Motion to close the floor for nominations | SA
 - i. Second | PA
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - e. Discussion
 - i. SA | The South Atlantic believes Rutgers University submitted a very strong School of the Year bid that effectively demonstrated campus impact, organizational excellence, and widespread student engagement. The bid's strongest qualities included its broad initiative scope, strong partnerships, and visible



institutional presence. However, the bid was weaker in reflecting on organizational challenges and lessons learned, which occasionally made portions feel more descriptive than analytical. Overall, Rutgers demonstrated the qualities of a highly impactful and successful institution. The South Atlantic fully supports this bid.

- ii. NE | The Northeast has found that Indiana University Bloomington presented a very complete and intentional bid that represented the School of the Year Award's purpose. This bid showed evidence of having made a large-scale resident impact by consistently providing programs, developing leaders, creating advocacy initiatives, and working together as a collaborative effort among various organizations on campus. The most effective aspect of this bid is that it developed long-term systems to achieve growth. Specifically, the rebuilding and growth of NRHH after the pandemic, increasing student involvement in OTM, and developing formal officer training initiatives.
- iii. MA | The Midwest appreciates USC's bid for SOTY, and thinks they have planned a multitude of intentional and well-attended programming; however some more depth on topics would have gone a long way.
- iv. IA | The Intermountain is in support of Northeastern University's bid, as the school demonstrates strong use of parliamentary procedure and inclusivity, along with focus on transition materials for the next board. Their emphasis on hosting a conference, contributing to boardroom, and completing spirit challenges reflects deep dedication to their region and NACURH initiatives. Additionally, IACURH commends this school for hosting a regional conference and successfully managing and saving costs; we also commemorate their use of parliamentary procedure and focus on inclusivity and communication. The Intermountain is in support of The University of South Carolina's bid, as the school shows intensive campus and community impact, as well as regional involvement and future realistic goals. They show great commitment to programming and overcoming challenges, particularly with their high number of students and emphasis on partnerships and collaborations. They also portray outstanding regional recognition and involvement, having won the "most spirited delegation" award and having presented 5 educational sessions.
- v. NCO | The NCO appreciated The University of Akron's bid for School of the Year. We felt like the bid was in-depth on most



things and there was a strong emphasis on programming efforts for the campus. We would have liked to see more discussion on regional and NACURH involvement.

- vi. MA | The Midwest echoes the points made by the IA on Northeastern University but also believes UNL has a strong case for School of the Year due to their exceptional regional engagement, measurable campus impact, and consistent commitment to both RHA and NRHH collaboration.
- vii. SA | The South Atlantic believes the University of Georgia submitted an exceptionally strong School OTY bid that effectively demonstrated campus impact, advocacy, leadership development, and organizational excellence. The strongest aspects of the bid included its comprehensive programming efforts, strong campus presence, and measurable engagement outcomes. The weaker portions of the bid primarily involved repetitive narrative sections and limited reflection on challenges encountered throughout the year. Overall, the organization presented one of the most complete and impactful bids in the category. The South Atlantic fully supports this bid.
- viii. SA | The South Atlantic believes the University of California San Diego submitted a strong and well-structured bid that showcased intentional planning, innovative initiatives, and meaningful campus engagement. The strongest portions of the bid emphasized organizational professionalism and strategic development. However, the bid was weaker in discussing organizational challenges, advocacy efforts, and reflective analysis of growth areas. With this in mind, the South Atlantic does not support this bid.
- ix. GL Motions to narrow the field to 3
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- f. Narrowing the field form
 - ☒ Indiana University Bloomington
 - ☒ Northeastern University
 - ☒ University of Akron
- g. Discussion Continues
 - i. MA | The Midwest likes Northeastern University bid for school of the year, their well detailed org chart, strongly explained events, and how they dealt with issues on campus, we currently support this bid for school of the year.
 - ii. SA | The South Atlantic believes Indiana University, Bloomington submitted one of the strongest bids in the category due to its



comprehensive demonstration of leadership, campus impact, organizational sustainability, and student engagement. The bid excelled in presenting measurable outcomes and intentional development across multiple focus areas. Its weaker aspects included occasional over-detailing and limited reflection on organizational obstacles. Nonetheless, the bid consistently aligned with the broad expectations of the School OTY category. The South Atlantic fully supports this bid.

- iii. CA | The Central Atlantic fully supports the Indiana University at Bloomington's bid as it demonstrates large engagement with campus committees, large student engagement with turnout for events and OTMs. We appreciate their analytics towards OTM tracking and recognition for members through of the year awards. Though, we believe they could improve as they have a vague connection between their action modes and mission statements, and could improve on their programming efforts in uniqueness. Additionally, the University of Akron's bid showed a large growth in event attendance, philanthropic efforts in raising over \$4000, and high NACURH engagement. Many of their events also pull over 150 attendees, which shows their marketing and high engagement skills.

~~iv. MA | Motion to end discussion~~

~~1. Second | SA~~

2. Dissent | NE

a. NE would like to make a discussion point

b. SA and MA retracts

- v. NE | The Northeast appreciates Northeastern's bids to focus on regional impact and conference hosting. However the bid leaves much to be desired when it comes to on campus initiatives, impacts and how they enhance residential life on their campus. There is much data presented on regional impact and RSA growth but minimal data on community impact. The north east also believes that IUB demonstrates a large campus and regional impact. The northeast is fully in support of IUBs bid.

vi. SA | Motion to end discussion

1. Second | MA

2. Dissent | None

h. Narrowed Form

i. Indiana University Bloomington

ii. Northeastern University

i. Discussion Continues

i. IA | Motions to cause for 5 minutes



1. Second | GL
 2. Dissent | None
 - ii. GL | Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions
 1. Second | MA
 2. Dissent | None
 - iii. SA | The South Atlantic believes Northeastern University presented a polished and innovative bid that effectively highlighted strong programming, partnerships, and student engagement efforts. The strongest aspects of the bid were its professionalism, strategic initiatives, and broad campus reach. We appreciated the graphs and charts outlining clear and replicable structures. They also had strong programs, when it comes such as the dining hall takeover. We as an organization, tend not to focus on leadership development but rather on development through experiences. Northeastern clearly developed experience through programs such as Husky Hunt (to find areas on campus), Pumpkin Palooza, and the farmers market to encourage wellbeing. With this in mind, we support Northeastern as they are clearly growing student leaders and changing the on-campus culture.
 - iv. IA | The Intermountain is not in support of Indiana University, Bloomington's bid, as the bid relies heavily on itemizing facts without describing unique purposes or any "role," as mentioned in the selection criteria. Additionally, the bid includes extraneous details of facilities and departmental components, whereas Northeastern centers on its RSA and the organization itself, which the criteria delineates. The Intermountain is in support of Northeastern University as they continue to improve their regional and national initiatives through conference participation, focus on recruitment, and careful curation of educational sessions.
- j. Vote Form
- i. Conclusive majority reached
8. IA | Motion to move to groove for 5 minutes
- a. Second | MA
 - b. Dissent | None
9. First Year Experience 2026 Selection
- a. Motion to bring First Year Experience 2026 to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | SA
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - b. Motion to open the floor for nominations | MA



- i. Second | IA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- c. Nominations
 - ☒ MA | Nominates Temple University
 - ☒ SA | Nominates Indiana University, Bloomington
 - ☒ GL | Nominates University of Northern Colorado
 - ☒ SW | Nominates North Dakota State University
 - ☒ IA | Nominates University of South Carolina
 - ☒ NE | Nominates Centenary College of Louisiana
- d. Motion to close the floor for nominations | SA
 - i. Second | GL
 - ii. Dissent | None
- e. Discussion ⌕ 02:21
 - i. MA | The Midwest is in support of Maddison Luss from the University of South Carolina for FYE. Her strong campus involvement and clear goals we found met the award criteria the best. We also think she has good regional involvement.
 - ii. SA| The South Atlantic believes Indiana University Bloomington submitted one of the strongest bids in the category due to its comprehensive and intentional approach toward supporting first-year students. The bid excelled in showcasing measurable outcomes, leadership integration, and sustained engagement opportunities designed specifically for residential student success. The organization clearly demonstrated how its initiatives contributed to belonging, transition, and student development throughout the first-year experience. The bid was weaker primarily in its limited discussion of challenges or areas of future growth, as much of the narrative focused heavily on accomplishments. Despite this, the overall depth, intentionality, and measurable impact made this one of the most competitive bids submitted. The South Atlantic fully supports this bid.
 - iii. IA | The Intermountain believes that Amiyah Patterson is an exceptional candidate for this award. In nearly every category, she exceeds the selection criteria. For example, for community involvement, Amiyah demonstrates remarkable commitment to both Indiana University and Bloomington, participating in several RHA and club committees and volunteering at local service organizations. We also support Maddison Luss from the University of South Carolina, as she excels in many of the categories of the selection criteria. It is clear that Maddison has clear and detailed goals such as organizing the RHA Office and improving RHA's social media presence. Finally, we are also in support of Lucy



Alexander from North Dakota State University, as we believe she is a strong candidate for this award and excels in many of the categories of the selection criteria such as her academia and honors.

- iv. SW | SW commends Temple University for their bid but would have liked to see more of both quantitative and qualitative impact statements and measurements. While it has an enjoyable and engaging theme, the bid leaves much to be desired when it comes to how the student developed once they gained the different positions discussed within the bid.
- v. MA | The Midwest does appreciate the strong regional involvement of UNC, and the noticeable personal growth, however due to the few measurable leadership outcomes, we do not support this bid.
- vi. SA | The South Atlantic believes Centenary College of Louisiana presented a thoughtful and student-centered bid focused heavily on creating meaningful personal connections for first-year students. The strongest portions of the bid emphasized individualized support, close-knit community development, and intentional relationship-building within the residential environment. However, the bid was weaker in demonstrating large-scale institutional impact and measurable assessment outcomes. While the smaller institutional setting allowed for strong personal engagement, the organization did not consistently provide evidence showing how initiatives created sustained or measurable developmental outcomes for first-year students. Compared to stronger bids, the overall scope and documented impact appeared more limited. With this in mind, the South Atlantic does not support this bid.
- vii. GL | Motion to end discussion
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- f. Vote - Form
 - i. Conclusive majority not reached
 - 1. Indiana University Bloomington
 - 2. University of South Carolina
- g. Discussion Continues
 - i. MA | Motion to end discussion
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
- h. Voting - Form
 - i. Conclusive majority reached



10. Move to groove for 5 minutes | MA

- a. Second | SW
- b. Dissent | None

11. [NBD 26-44 HR Policy Revision in Bylaws](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-44 to the floor | IA
 - i. Second | SA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the piece
 - i. Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent
 - 1. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent Speech
 - i. Orin Artsmith, GLACURH Regional Director | We've seen a lot of changes to HR policy and every time we have to update the Bylaws because they're written verbatim. Policy should not be in bylaws so it just requires that we have HR policy in the policy book and allows us to update necessary aspects without going to NCCs.
- d. Q&A
 - i. SA | The South Atlantic was curious about the thought process of not including bias or risk management when rewriting the new HR policy. The South Atlantic was curious about the thought process of not including bias or risk management when rewriting the new HR policy.
 - 1. Orin Artsmith | The Policy Book has not been touched. It is the same and this makes it not be in the Bylaws.
 - 2. Chair | Everything stricken out is in the Policy Book.
 - ii. SA | Motion to exhaust with additions
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - iii. PA | Do institutions have access to the Policy Book
 - 1. Orin Artsmith | Affiliated institutions have access through the NACURH Website, it is password-protected.
- e. Discussion
 - i. IA | The intermountain is in support of this piece and its revised condensed wording. Our region agrees to condense and widen HR policy within the bylaws to allow for easier management of evolving changes, particularly regarding issues of harassment or discrimination, which are susceptible to change upon passing legislation via a simple majority.
 - ii. PA | We appreciate the consideration to have NCCs spend less time in corporate, especially related to topics that don't directly



- affect member institutions and for that reason we are in favor of this piece
- iii. MA | Motion to exhaust the speakers' list with additions
 - 1. Second | CA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- iv. RFI | Is general consent the same thing as voting by acclamation?
 - 1. Chair | No. Just an efficiency measure.
- v. PPP | Voting by general consent is the same as voting by acclamation. Here, motions on how we are voting should happen during voting.
- vi. SA | YTR
- vii. GL | The Great Lakes is in support of this piece and appreciates the intent of the author to clarify what should be in the Bylaws versus the policy book.
- viii. CA | YTR
- f. Voting
 - i. MA | Motion to vote by general consent
 - 1. Dissent | None
 - ii. Piece passes

12. [NBD 26-39 Moving POY to the Standard NACURH Award Bid Timeline](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-39 to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | SA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the piece
 - i. Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent
 - 1. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent Speech
 - i. Cade Perkins, Chair | I'm going to start off with a brief history of how POY came to be on its own timeline in the first place. When NACURH and ACUHO-I entered an agreement wherein ACUHO-I would invite the POY winner to their annual conference in late June-early July, the problem quickly became apparent that finding out you won POY in late May and having a month in the summer to try and organize travel and funds to get multiple students to ACUHO-I was not easy. NACURH initially made the change to select 2 finalists at semis and then select the winner at the Annual Conference, but then this was soon followed by just moving POY entirely to Semis. This arrangement made sense until 2 agreement renewals ago when the POY presentation was moved to a virtual format before Annual Conference, and then the presentation happened multiple times several months after



the Annual Conference and NACURH continued to provide a large grant to the winning school to attend NACURH but not ACUHO-I. Ultimately this webinar can happen at any time, especially since the winning students don't even need to be together to present it, so I believe it is prudent for us to return POY to the standard NACURH award bid timeline and remove the AC/ACUHO-I attendance grant thereby eliminating costs from a grant with a relatively low impact and removing the large additional workload to create an entire secondary bidding process in the middle of the year. The biggest issue I faced in arranging this new process is that schools who submit POY on the regional level often go on to submit to the NACURH level, but regional eligibility windows largely center around the fall conferences where POY is selected. Multiple options were considered to avoid forcing regions to move their POY processes to their spring conferences, and after meeting with several people with a range of opinions I settled on removing the eligibility window altogether. This is the only way I am aware of to maintain both the ability of all schools to submit a POY bid regardless of their submission or selection outcome on the regional level and of the regions to either maintain or shift their POY timelines as they wish. The obvious concern I expect is that an old program can be proposed on the NACURH level, but given that eligibility for the Program of the Year 2026 was from Oct 2024-Oct 2025, the nature of students graduating severely limits how far back even the oldest bids could reach, and the NACURH Boards' ability to disregard a program from 2023 for POY 2027 for example, I feel that this is a what if without much bite to it and the lack of a largely arbitrary timeline only helps to improve opportunities for great programs to be presented.

d. Q&A

- i. CA | Could you explain how this will trickle down to regions?
 - 1. Chair | By removing the NACURH eligibility window, this doesn't trickle down the regional level. Doesn't change regional bid timelines. Removes the eligibility window.
- ii. NCO | Motions to exhaust with additions
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- iii. RFI | Would POY still be decided at Semi's or ABM?
 - 1. Chair | Standard award bid timeline, which would be selected at ABM.
- iv. SA | How do you plan on making sure that POY winners are prepared to present at the Annual conference when we are



selecting the winner a few days before and Has there been any consideration to the fact that some delegates are not allowed to come to AC if they do not win a bid? If so, how do you plan to combat that?

1. Chair | Looking back at the history of submissions and attendance, these institutions are some of our most involved institutions. Schools who submit a bid in November are getting their registration covered and don't get to attend ACUHO-i. Those who are submitting are usually attending NACURH. We have looked at having POY submitters record a presentation so that all submissions can have the spotlight. We have also looked at selecting POY first so that we can communicate with institutions ASAP. We hold a spot regardless. We can also communicate with institutions that they may need to present if selected.

e. Discussion

- i. SA | Motions to caucus for 5 minutes
 1. Second | IA
 2. Dissent | None
- ii. IA | The Intermountain is in support of this piece, as we believe that creating consistency across all award bids will mitigate confusion among institutions. Moreover, this piece still allows for regions to hold POY at their desired time of the year. Additionally, since the winners present to ACUHO-I via a virtual webinar, there is really no need to maintain the current timeline.
- iii. SA | The South Atlantic is in support of this piece. Our biggest worry about this piece would be the impact on delegates, and the need to trickle down the piece to move POY from Fall to Spring Conferences. We agree that preparations for student presenters need to be better, and feel that this piece, and the work of other execs, would increase this. We do have a concern of the increased workload during ABM, but understand the need to shift timelines. We are in support.
- iv. SW | The Southwest is in support of the piece as it expands eligible bids for POY, making the process more equitable. While we do see potential issues with logistics of smaller schools going to annual conferences, we recognize the NACURH conference scholarships available to delegations and exploring virtual options.
- v. NE | Motions to exhaust the speakers' list with additions
 1. Second | MA
 2. Dissent | None



- vi. NCO | The NCO deeply appreciates the changes to the POY timeline and think that this change will be beneficial for the working role of the NAP with respect to award bids going forward. Placing award bids on a single timeline will also make communication with institutions streamlined and should reduce any confusion about these awards. As the group that has co-facilitated POY process this year with the Executive Committee, having a separate timeline creates additional strain on NACURH to do policy checks and bid reviews prior to Semi's in addition to institutions trying to submit award bids near the end of the academic semester. This piece gives flexibility in what is included in the Presenter Verification Form and the NCO does not see an issue with adding the expectation that all institutions that submit an award bid should be prepared to present, either in-person or pre-recorded. The form currently asks institutions to plan to attend the Annual Conference without knowing if they are the selected recipient. The NAP can work with institutions to prepare presentations prior to ABM throughout the spring semester.
- vii. CA | The Central Atlantic sees that POY is a large time commitment, both in preparation and in the boardroom. In addition to POY, Semis typically consist of preparing and hearing budgets, misc. presentations, and legislation. In contrast, ABM includes preparing and discussing legislation, around 13 bid categories, and finalizing annual conference prep. At Semis any legislation that does not get addressed at the conference has another 5 months to be addressed in joint boards or at ABM. Whereas at ABM, time is of the essence. Any legislation not heard will end with the close of the Annual conference. We see adding this large time commitment, of POY, to ABM as a hindrance to the amount of time needed for legislation and bids. We do not understand why this large time commitment would be better suited for a conference where we are crunching for time, rather than Semis, which in nature has more flexibility. Many regions hold POY in NRHH boardrooms, joint spaces, or have the RBD vote on this bid, making this a valuable award to not only the Directors and ADAFs but also the ADNRRHs. Finding that on the regional level, input from NRHH is seen as valuable, and necessary for three regions, we do not approve of moving this category to the NBD space. Although we understand that the POY timeline was put in place due to the ACUHO-I conference, which no longer affects the POY presentation, NACURH has built their schedules



and process around POY being at Semis. Therefore we see moving POY creates high risk and low benefit. The high risk of shortening the time for legislation to be heard, adding this large commitment on top of the already large commitment of reviewing 13 bid categories and legislation pieces of ABM, taking away the opportunities for NNBD to speak in the boardroom, and causing additional barriers/hurdles for regions and institutions. Do we really think these high costs outweigh the small benefit of having less work at Semis, while creating more at ABM, and moving this award just out of the cleanliness of doing all the awards at once, because the original reasoning for holding POY at semis is no longer pertinent?

viii. PA | The Pacific appreciates that this would give our institutions more time to submit bids for this category, which has historically been a barrier for quarter system schools who do not start their terms until late September. That said, we are worried about the institutions who may need to have a confirmed winning bid before attending the annual conference but overall we are in support.

f. Voting

i. 8-1-0, Outcome

13. [NBD 26-38 NACURH Subsidiary Budgets](#)

a. Motion to bring NBD 26-38 to the floor | GL

i. Second | PA

ii. Dissent | None

b. Reading of the piece

i. Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent

1. Dissent | None

c. Proponent Speech

i. Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | This was originally a NACURH/NCO Budget merger but that is no longer really needed. I was trying to rearrange some of our revenue-oriented practices to be more so. We have to change some of our practices because of how the NCO has had to balance their revenue with our expenditures and discourages revenue gathering. This allows a separate option of a budget for affiliation dues and merchandise to aim for a "net income" number more clearly.

d. Q&A

i. CA | you used the term activity budget in the piece but can you define it?

1. NACURH Chairperson | It is a budget for a specific activity. (e.g. merchandise selling) Rather than operating, it's for a



specific activity that falls into the overall operating budget. It's a smaller, more focused version – rather than scattering items throughout our budget. If we want to amend the operating budget, it's a process with the boards, that an activity budget would not have to undergo.

- ii. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering what reporting expectations would exist for changes made to the subsidiary budgets after the initial budget approval process?
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | There are no reporting requirements in the piece directly. The hope is that the activity budgets are linked so people can see them and view them. The activity budgets are not approved, just the NACURH Budget. There is no reporting but just the understanding and accountability of meeting the net income number.
- iii. SA | How can you ensure that those accountability standards are met and implemented?
 - 1. NAO | It wouldn't change how the budget is presented. It would still be presented the same at Semi's. Since it hasn't been implemented, we'd transition it with Nate in June to ensure proper implementation. Similar to the NACURH transaction log, it will be accessible to everyone to ask questions.
- iv. MA | Motions to end Q&A
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
- e. Discussion ⌚ 0:00
 - i. IA | The Intermountain is in support of this piece. We believe that creating separate activity budgets for merchandise and affiliation would be beneficial to the revenue growth of NACURH, as it would provide more business flexibility and cleaner budget documents. We also believe this policy continues to align with NACURH's original purpose of using this revenue to support operations, programs, and member services rather than aiming to generate private profit.
 - ii. NCO | The NCO believes that activity budgets are a great way to give flexibility to the NAA and NAO within the NACURH Budget. From a merchandise perspective, having a static number on a budget may not be beneficial if in a fiscal year there is additional revenue or unexpected expenses. This change also gives the NAA and NAO the ability to set year-to-year goals within these areas and can prioritize things differently to meet the net income



- number.
- iii. MA | Motion to end discussion
 - 1. Second| GL
 - 2. Dissent| SA
 - a. Retract| GL
 - b. Retract| MA
- iv. SA | The South Atlantic supports the concept of an activities budget and understands the intent behind allowing flexibility in how funds are used and generated. However, we still have some hesitation regarding accountability and the ability for the NAA and the NAO to make budget changes without clear NBD or JB approval, and we would want to ensure appropriate oversight is maintained. Despite these concerns, we support the piece in practice and the overall direction it provides.
- v. MA | Motion to end discussion
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
- f. Voting
 - i. GL | Motion to vote by acclamation
 - 1. Dissent | None
 - ii. Piece passes

14. Motion to move to groove for 10 minutes | PA

- a. Second | MA
- b. Dissent | None

15. NACURH Service Award

- a. Motion to bring NACURH Service Award to the floor | SW
 - i. Second | MA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Motion to open the floor for nominations | MA
 - i. Second | SW
 - ii. Dissent | None
- c. Nominations
 - i. MA | Nominates Cade Perkins
 - 1. Second | IA
- d. Motion to close the floor for nominations | GL
 - i. Second | SA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- e. Proponent | Nomination is read in full by the nominator.
- f. Discussion
 - i. SA | The South Atlantic cannot imagine a more deserving



candidate. Cade has done so much to restructure and improve financial processes on both the institutional, regional, and NACURH level. On the SWACURH level, under his guidance, the region successfully hosted two in-person conferences following the COVID-19 pandemic and secured future hosts for both RLC and RBC. He's also been a great chairperson this year. The South Atlantic also appreciates how Cade has approached accessibility in NACURH spaces and increasing meaningful dialogue in spaces. Through all of these years, he's maintained his dedication to furthering this organization. Overall, we're in full support and can't think of a better way to honor his achievements

- ii. SW | The southwest is in full support of Cade to receive the service award. While we are sad our Southwest ducky is leaving to Wisconsin for his new career in healthcare, this award will not only highlight his effort, but can elevate his work as a spotlight for effective NACURH leadership for new execs, showing how to balance effective leadership, personal growth, and leading a collaborative perspective first.

- iii. IA | Motions to end discussion

- 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None

- g. Voting

- i. Decision reached

16. Motion to recess until May 19 at 1:30 PM CST | PA

- a. Second | SA
- b. Dissent | None



17. Roll Call - Called to order at 1:30 PM CST

Roll Call					
	Director	Finance Officer	ADNRHH	NACURH Exec	
CAACURH	x	-		Chairperson	x
GLACURH	x	x		NAO	x
IACURH	x	x		NAN	-
MACURH	x	x		NAE	-
NEACURH	x	-		Advisor	
PACURH	x	-		NRHH Advisor	
SAACURH	x	x		CRC	
SWACURH	x	-		ART	
NCO	x	x		ADC	
	Chair	NBD Liaison	Finance Chair		
AC	-	-	-	Quorum is/is not present	

18. Who's Who

- Minutes | Parrama
- Speakers List | Scott
- Timer Keeper | Minutes/other
- Parliamentarian | Orin

19. [NBD 26-43 Updating Annual Conference Financial Policies](#)

- Motion to bring NBD 26-43 to the floor | SA
 - Second | MA
 - Dissent | None
- Reading of the piece
 - Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent
 - Dissent | None
- Proponent Speech
 - NAO | Currently the policy book has annual conference information in different places. This piece merges them all into Conferences (Title 8) to help conference teams find all of the



information that is relevant to them and hosting conferences. This eliminates the now-duplicated processes from the Finances title and makes everything more streamlined.

d. Q&A

- i. IA | Under section 24 - Annual Conference Excess - it states that the conference excess shall be forwarded to the conference host in the currency they use. Will the NAO do that and do that math?
 1. NAO | That is based on what works for the school and the NAO will do the math. We haven't had that happen and we will navigate it the first time we need to do it.
- ii. SA | Historically, how often is there a conference excess that the RHA leadership scholarship fund would be given to the AC host institution?
 1. NAO | It totally depends on the amount of excess. The past few conferences, we have had an excess. Policy divides conference excess in a specific way, so it really depends, and we have in the last few years.
- iii. MA | Under article 5, where it talks about waiving conference fees, was there a discussion about including regional COs and paid-for conference chairs?
 1. NAO | This doesn't create any policy. If we need to add or delete folks, we can do that. That is how the AC schedule is structured. The AC budget covers costs for Execs but all other NACURH Leadership becomes paying delegates.
- iv. SA | The South Atlantic is wondering why the excess gift is given specifically to the host school's RHA by default and not split between RHA and NRHH, especially considering that many institutions do not have RHA or that many conferences, in our experiences, are lead by NRHH officers who put in just as much work?
 1. NAO | Great question! No idea! This has been in the policy book as long as I have known.
 2. (POC) NACURH Advisor | There is no particular reason other than the Policy Book being specific to RHA. It's likely we are not catching up with practices.
- v. IA | The Intermountain was wondering why the new legislation restricts the excess funds to a leadership scholarship rather than allowing the school to choose how to designate the funds based on its RHA needs for example?
 1. NAO | This has simply been moved over from existing policy. If we need to change it over to be more inclusive of options, we could do that.



- vi. SA | Motion to end Q/A
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
- e. Discussion
 - i. SA motions to amend the piece to read “student leadership” instead of “RHA” under Section 24, subsection 3.
 - 1. Chair | This motion was determined not to be germane.
 - ii. IA | Request for Information | Where are the yellow portions being pasted from?
 - 1. Chair | Title Ten
 - iii. SA | The South Atlantic supports this piece overall.
 - iv. MA | Motion to exhaust discussion with additions
 - 1. Second | CA
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - v. PA | YTR to MA
 - vi. SW | The Southwest is in support of this piece, conferences have so many pieces to them. Creating a more efficient process in any way can be helpful.
 - vii. IA | With consideration of the merge between NACURH and NCO budgets, the Intermountain would like to show support for this piece as we believe it’s beneficial to rewrite confusing wording, remove duplication, and reflect updated NACURH policy regarding changes in budget line items. We also appreciate the clarification of NBD voting rights of financial changes not included in the original budget by the NAO, and would like to show support for the NAA and NAO’s strategies to ensure NACURH’s net income is met or exceeded, with additional emphasis on the relocation of scholarship funds.
- f. Voting
 - i. NE | Motion to vote by general consensus
 - 1. Dissent | None
 - ii. Piece passes

20. [NBD 26-49 Compensated Delegate Attendance](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-49 to the floor | SA
 - i. Second | MA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the piece
 - i. Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent
 - 1. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent Speech
 - i. NAO | Currently we approve AC budgets at Semis, and do not



allow them to change the budgets outside of the delegate cap. Based upon policy, the conference team already needs to have fixed costs that make up 30-40% of their budget. The issue that we've seen is when we have board members who are not able to attend conferences, the funds allocated towards them go to waste. This piece states that if an individual cannot attend ABM or Semis, they will have a period of time to notify the execs or find a proxy, so that we are not wasting money for meals and housing that will not be used and are paid for by the delegates. In both the Semis section and the ABM section of the Annual Conference title, this change is reflected.

d. Q&A

- i. SA | The South Atlantic wonders what a potential plan is to support teams down a person at Semi's and ABM if they are not able to find a proxy?
 1. NAO | Like most situations, if you do not have enough board members, you just wouldn't have a third person. It's incorporated into the budget making process for the Annual Conference Budget to ensure that these changes are reflected. We are adding this to reflect our current practices in policy.
- ii. NCO | What steps will be taken if these deadlines are not followed and money does end up being wasted?
 1. NAO | Great question. Similar to this AC, if deadlines presented by the AC team and execs are not met, regions may have to bear that cost directly.
- iii. IA | IACURH is wondering if there would be financial implications for any partial attendance for members who voice their partial absence in advance?
 1. NAO | It is hard for us to work with hotels for Semi's or residence halls for ABM. For instances where an individual may attend for a partial amount of time, we are already losing that money. It would be better to find someone who could attend the whole time. We will work with people who may be presenting awards or legislation to potentially present virtually for example.
- iv. IA | Is there anywhere in policy that stipulates that regions would have to pay the cost directly?
 1. NAO | It will be a practice in the Operations Manual. This is not the process that the host will use, it is what NACURH uses. We will handle transfers internally. It would not be in policy since we would not charge an institution for one



- person.
- v. SA | The South Atlantic was curious what happens if a compensated delegate experiences an emergency, travel delay, illness, or unforeseen circumstance preventing full attendance; would the cost just be wasted?
 - 1. NAO | Yes. Things happen, we can't predict everything. We can't change the budget numbers once the costs have been paid up front. There's already a policy for this in place.
 - vi. IA | Motion to extend Q&A by 5 minutes.
 - 1. Second | SA
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - vii. NCO | Will the burden of paying back or upfront ever fall on individuals if maybe last minute someone didn't attend or didn't communicate in advance, or would it always fall on the region?
 - 1. NAO | Region. They can see if they want to charge the person. Would you pay? The regions have the budget and flexibility. To clarify, this only adds in instances where we know that a person may not be in attendance. We have things in place for emergencies or contingencies.
 - viii. NE | Motion to exhaust the speakers list without additions
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - e. Discussion
 - i. SA | Moves to amend sections 15 and 16 to state If an entity is unable to secure a proxy after exercising due diligence, the NACURH Chairperson and Conference Resource Consultant may determine whether an exception is warranted at their discretion.
 - 1. Second | GL
 - a. The NAO accepts the amendment as friendly.
 - ii. IA | The Intermountain Affiliate is in support of this piece as we believe it promotes stronger financial accountability and clearer expectations for compensated delegates whose attendance is funded through the Annual Conference Budget. We also appreciate that the piece reflects realistic operational timelines by allowing for a less stringent registration notice, aligning policy and the Operations Manual with current practice while helping conference staff better manage planning and costs.
 - iii. NCO | The NCO is in full support of this piece as it helps to ensure that the money being allotted to these conferences is always maximized. Regions and other NACURH stakeholders rely on the NBD and NNBD to be present and represent them to the best ability possible. Ensuring this guaranteed representation yields



the best practice and this piece allows for a smooth process to assist with that.

- iv. GL motions to exhaust the speakers list with additions.
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- v. NE | The Northeast is in full support of the piece as it promotes financial transparency.
- vi. NCO | YTR to GL
- f. Voting
 - i. SA | Motion to vote by general consensus
 - ii. Piece passes

21. IA | Motion to move to groove for 5 minutes

- a. Second | MA
- b. Dissent | None

22. [NBD 26-52 Resolution to Improve Educational Sessions](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-52 to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | NCO
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the piece
 - i. Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent
 - 1. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent Speech
 - i. Sydney Grom, IACURH Director | I want to preface by noting that this piece is not a reflection of any educational sessions chair or conference. Every conference in the past has produced some amazing educational sessions. Moreover, even the mere occurrence of educational sessions is tremendous. Rather, this piece is a criticism of a trend that I have observed throughout my time in NACURH, and this piece seeks to remedy this trend. At my first RLC, I fell in love with educational sessions. I saw how much potential they hold, and I appreciated how delegates could engage in knowledge sharing across institutions. The more conferences I attended, though, the more I realized that the majority of educational sessions either present similar content to previous ones and/or present content that is not applicable to higher education and campus communities. This trend is troubling, as:
 - 1. NACURH is a nonprofit organization, and in order for a nonprofit to remain viable, the majority of its efforts should assist the organization in fulfilling its mission



statement and advance the organization towards fulfilling its vision statement.

2. Delegates and institutions spend large amounts of their budgets to attend these conferences, and the goods and services these conferences provide maintain buy-in and can help sustain affiliation.
- ii. Now, of course, I have only observed so many conferences and educational sessions. It is possible that this trend is only applicable to IACURH regional conferences, in which case, I would still seek some remedy for the region. Nonetheless, I would like to treat this observable phenomenon as real and, at the same time, test the theory as with any other fallible social science theory. For these reasons, my piece presents a series of phases that allow for the collection of data and review of such data via an ad hoc Educational Session Committee. The hope is that with the devotion of short-term resources to this inquiry, we may remedy a long-term problem if necessary whilst preserving future time and resources if the problem does in fact not exist.
 - iii. Right now in Policy, there is nowhere that says what educational session chairs can or cannot do in sending out information to institutions. Once the committee reviews all of the data, the committee may propose a piece of legislation to standardize educational sessions. For example, 2 credible sources or the inclusion of a thesis statement so that the session is surrounding the NAUCRH Mission Statement. I want to note the importance of ed sessions. We spend a lot of time going through business, regional spaces, and corporate spaces. We hear a lot of different pieces. For a delegate who may be only attending one conference, they are seeing some of the same session being presented over and over again. Not necessarily content, but themes, so it is important to think about what a representative is learning.
- d. Q&A
- i. SW | The Southwest would like to ask if you seek this resolution with goals of NACURH standardizing what ed sessions may talk about, or allow annual conference teams still being allowed to have some wiggle room with fitting topics into their themes?
 1. IACURH Director | The ultimate goal is to standardize ed session to an extent: standardize it to fulfill NACURH's Mission statement. Civic engagement, residential engagement opportunities. Any standardization towards that goal is my goal. That is not to restrict what individuals



are able to present. If someone wants to present on board games and it relates to the Mission Statement, that is wonderful.

- ii. SA | Is the purpose of this piece to standardize NACURH educational sessions or regional educational sessions and then if this is a trickle-down piece, how do you foresee maintaining regional and conference autonomy?
 - 1. IACURH Director | That's a really great question. The ultimate goal would be for it to be a trickle-down change and apply to both national and regional conferences - because, in general, there are ed sessions presented at RLC. As far as implementation for regions, that would have to be a new section likely added to their policybooks newly. I believe that the NACURH execs would be able to help with this addition and implementation.
- iii. SA | The South Atlantic noticed that you state "the majority of educational sessions either present similar content to previous ones and/or present content that is not applicable to higher education and campus communities." Could you provide some examples of this with data that backs up your theories and ultimately, the piece?
 - 1. IACURH Director | Yes. In my freshman year, I attended RLC as well as NACURH, and attended a majority of ed sessions, and was also able to do so the following year. The majority of the ones I attended revolved around leadership style and preventing burnout. While those are very important, it was very repetitive in content being presented (e.g. Maslow's hierarchy of needs, leadership types). It's often similar content, rather than exactly duplicative. Our returning delegates get the same information again and again. As it comes to Higher Education, I think the external topic can distract from the intention of ed sessions. I attended one about movies, and it didn't connect well to student leadership or give the delegate much to take back to their campus community.
- iv. PA | Motion to extend by 5 minutes
 - 1. Second | SA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- v. PA | Many conferences have ed session tracks intended to guide and 'regulate' ed sessions, why those weren't taken into consideration as the focus of this piece rather than the ed sessions directly (i.e. why are we trying to impose policy on ed



sessions, rather than standardize ed session tracks to more closely encourage sessions to serve the mission statement).

1. IACURH Director | The ed session tracks are a good stepping stone and could be used by this committee. From what I have experienced, it is difficult to formulate an educational session track that does not repeat. I.e one about leadership or one about community impact. It is vague which allows a host of topics but not a lot of directions. It becomes more about what is experienced rather than doing research and presenting those findings.
- vi. CA | Can you clarify what you mean by "Higher Education-Focused?"
 1. IACURH Director | I am referring to residence life and the varieties of res life across campuses. What is the experience of students living on campus? Going back to the mission statement. With that, higher education as a field, promoting the advancement of students into higher ed, jobs, careers, higher education theories.
- vii. MA | Motion to exhaust with additions
 1. Second | GL
 2. Dissent | None
- viii. SA | What is the value of an NACURH level standard versus stronger regional standards?
 1. IACURH Director | To clarify, do you mean the standard of the ed session? I think it's important to address this on the NACURH level. The first phase is the Exec Buddies collecting information since they attend conferences. It allows that standardization and that standard is that it is good for all regions to implement. One region could propose their own legislation to standardize their own ed sessions. Hopefully it would be good to trickle down.
 - a. SA | Yes, what is the difference to you between addressing this regionally versus nationally identifying standards?
- ix. POC - IACURH Director | I noticed that in one of the SA's previous questions, you had wanted to know about conference autonomy and I wanted to clarify. I anticipated this. I know a lot of people admire the ability to be creative about hosting this conference. I think the conference teams could still be creative in many ways, this likely would create standards for the presenters themselves.
- e. Discussion
 - i. MA | The midwest is in full support of this piece, and appreciate



the author's thought and time put into this piece. Having better ed sessions we believe will only help improve NACURH and its entities on a whole.

- ii. GL | Moves to amend the piece to add "Let it further be resolved, the NACURH 2026-2027 Executive Committee shall convene an ad hoc Educational Sessions Evaluation Committee which shall be dissolved upon the completion of Phase III as outlined in the below clause." prior to the first "Let it be further resolved..." clause.
 - 1. Second | SA
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - a. Author has accepted as friendly
- iii. SA | The South Atlantic does not support this piece, as we have significant concerns that it over-standardizes NACURH programming in a way that limits regional and conference-level autonomy. We believe conference teams should retain the flexibility to design programming that best fits their attendees and regional needs, rather than being constrained by national standards that may not reflect the diversity of experiences across NACURH. We believe that the NAP would make programming across NACURH easier and more efficient, and believe standardizing educational sessions now would make their work limited. Additionally, we are concerned that the data used to justify these standards is limited and not broadly representative enough to support such a significant structural change. Furthermore, we believe that one exec member attending one educational session does not give the new adhoc committee much experience to learn or improve educational sessions overall. In the South Atlantic, we feel that our educational session topics are vastly different depending on the conference theme or conference track that is created. While the backbone of this piece is within higher education and some students go into higher education because of these experiences, we need to note that not all students are bound for higher education and we disagree that educational sessions need to be "only higher education focus." Because of these topics, the South Atlantic is not in support of this piece.
- iv. IA | The Intermountain region is in support of this piece, as we would like to highlight the importance of the delegate experience and any effort to improve their academic and professional development. With this legislation, we particularly foresee the creation of a larger span of meaningful and applicable content



within educational sessions that better aligns with NACURH's mission of leadership growth while providing delegates with more diverse development opportunities. Additionally, we believe this serves as a structured, low-cost trial run, and we would like to reinforce the creation of an Educational Session Committee to allow for active development of content management and stronger support for presenters and delegates, while providing an opportunity to collect data on student preferences and experiences.

- v. NCO | Motion to caucus to 5 minutes
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- vi. GL | The Great Lakes wants to emphasize that while we have not experienced the same concerns or struggles in educational sessions, we do think a review of our session practices and intentional improvements are good. While much of this piece is written based upon individual experiences, if delegates are having differing qualities of experiences and takeaways, improvements should be made and this piece can do so. At this time, we have no clue what changes the committee will recommend, what the executive committee will find, or what regions might contribute. Just because this convenes a committee to bring the board recommendations, that does not mean we need to accept them. If we find in a year, we dislike what they've found or don't feel that the research and data identified is sufficient, we can discuss this at that point. A standardization of the *quality* of experiences, not necessarily the experiences themselves, will only serve to strengthen community, commitment to our mission, and retention in NACURH.
- vii. MA | motion to exhaust with additions
 - 1. Second | CA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- viii. SW | The Southwest is in favor of this piece, recognizing that the experiences/ educational materials gained from affiliating with regional affiliates and NACURH is one of the things at the heart of what we do as a non-profit. While we do hold reservations about recognizing the different personality of each region, we hold ed sessions are a pivotal piece of affiliation, and any meaningful effort to improve them: and we believe this piece fits the bill.
- ix. NE | While NEACURH appreciates the goals of this piece and the effort to enhance ed sessions, NEACURH is concerned about this piece intimidating first time ed sessions hosts by having a



standard that could be too high, without a rubric being provided with the piece. There is also minimal supporting data to put the piece in practice as NEACURH feel education sessions vastly differ from region to region. We also believe regions should be able to establish their own standard for education sessions with potential guidance from the NACURH executive committee and advisors where needed. With there being a growing struggle to find host sites for conferences across many regions this could also be something that furthers that. With that being said we do not support the piece.

- x. PA | The Pacific would like to echo many of the concerns shared by the south atlantic and others. Additionally, we think that trying to introduce standards for all ed sessions, even at regional levels, would take away some of the value of regional conferences for affiliates. It is incredibly difficult to understand, cater to, and standardize ed sessions in a way that is equally beneficial to all regions, without consistently being present at all regional leadership conferences for an extended time. For this reason, the pacific is not currently in support of this piece, if the piece focused solely on ed sessions at annual conferences , or if the piece was intended to trickle down to create regional ed session review we would be more in support.
 - xi. NCO | The NCO is in support of the core function of this piece: addressing perceived issues with educational sessions within NACURH. We think it's important to state that the resolution does not guarantee that legislation would be proposed at the end of this resolution process. We think it would be beneficial for this ad-hoc committee to convene and hear the perspectives of multiple stakeholders under the guidance of the NAP. We understand the concerns brought forward by the South Atlantic. We see potential NACURH standardization to be loose guidance for institutions and presenters to follow, guiding back to NACURH's Mission Statement. Regions could implement their own additions to NACURH Policy as applicable. We also believe that centering sessions about issues that higher education is facing (i.e. governmental policy implications, financial implications). We don't think it would be wise to include the specific language of higher education, but think framing sessions within higher education is beneficial. With those thoughts in mind, the NCO is in support of passing this resolution.
 - xii. SA | YTR to the PA and NCO
- f. Voting



- i. 6-3-0, Piece passes.

Motion to mo(o)ve to groove for 10 minutes | GL

Second | SA

Dissent | None

23. [NBD 26-48 Repurposing of the Silver Globe Pins](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-48 to the floor | MA

- i. Second | SA

- ii. Dissent | None

- b. Reading of the piece

- i. Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent

- 1. Dissent | None

- c. Proponent Speech

- i. Carson Markovic, NCO Director | typed

- d. Q&A

- i. SA | The South Atlantic was curious what outcomes are expected from allowing NACURH Executive Committee members to distribute this pin at regional conferences?

- 1. NCO Director | Can you expand on outcomes?

- a. SA | The relationships that the NACURH exec buddy would like to create with the individual receiving a pin, creating a stronger connection, etc.

- i. NCO Director | Pulling from my experience, in my mind, I am thinking that an exec is present in boardroom and who is present and engaged. Paying attention to and being able to recognize who is engaged and doing work potentially in front of the scenes or behind the scenes.

- ii. POC | Cade | Some regions do have a similar thing. The SW and MA have a pin they give to an exec buddy so they can recognize someone at a conference. It's a way for individuals to feel recognized and with a pin provided by NACURH.

- ii. GL | Moves to end Q&A.

- 1. Second | MA

- 2. Dissent | None

- e. Discussion

- i. SA | We move to amend section 6 to include "The representative of the NACURH Executive Committee who is in attendance shall



consult the entity at each regional conference to verify the selection process and awarding of the Pin.”

1. Second | CA
 2. Dissent | None
 - a. Author accepts are friendly.
- ii. NE | NEACURH believes that this piece allows for a form of recognition that is missing in many cases. Many individuals contribute greatly at regional conferences that don't always get recognized in the ways they deserve, if at all. Repurposing the Silver globe pin like this is a wonderful idea and commemorates the NCO in a creative way. NEACURH is in full support of the piece. typedNEACURH believes that this piece allows for a form of recognition that is missing in many cases. Many individuals contribute greatly at regional conferences that don't always get recognized in the ways they deserve, if at all. Repurposing the Silver globe pin like this is a wonderful idea and commemorates the NCO in a creative way. NEACURH is in full support of the piece.
 - iii. IA | The Intermountain supports the notion that an increase in recognition efforts is vital to the engagement and participation initiatives promoted by NACURH executives. Additionally, we believe the excess of Silver Globe Pins should be utilized to motivate and encourage thoughtful dialogue, active participation efforts, and mentorship while allowing for an additional opportunity for general conference attendees to be recognized. We also believe that this pin will help bridge any perceived distance between the NACURH Executive Committee and stakeholders of NACURH who otherwise do not frequently interact with Executives.
 - iv. CA | YTR
 - v. MA | Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions.
 1. Second | GL
 2. Dissent | None
 - vi. SA | The South Atlantic is currently neutral on this piece and would prefer to see it further developed, as we have mixed feelings about the intent and implementation of a refurbished recognition pin. While we appreciate the goal for increasing engagement between NACURH Executive Committee members and delegates, we are concerned about potential oversaturation of recognition items and whether this would meaningfully differentiate from existing regional or NACURH awards. We also have reservations about maintaining the value and significance of



current recognition structures and avoiding perceptions of participation-based awards. Overall, we are open to revisiting the concept if it is further refined with clearer purpose, intentionality, and alignment with existing recognition systems. We're open to hearing what other regions have to say relating to this piece.

- f. Voting
 - i. GL | Motion to vote by general consensus.
 - 1. Dissent | None
 - ii. Piece passes.

24. [NBD 26-51 Update to the Past Executives Positions](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-51 to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | PA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the piece
 - i. Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent
 - 1. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent Speech
 - i. NAO | NACURH already benefits from a broad network of experienced past leaders Advisors, Consultants, former Executive Committee and NACURH Leadership members who continue to provide mentorship, institutional knowledge, and support without holding a formal role per policy. By eliminating individualized past executive positions, we move away from relying on singular roles and instead create a more accessible and flexible system of engagement. The creation of the "Past NACURH Executives" section ensures that current leaders can still connect with former counterparts when guidance is needed, while respecting the voluntary nature of alumni involvement.
- d. Q&A
 - i. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering if "Past Executives" include all professional staff, including the NACURH Advisors and Consultants?
 - 1. NAO | Yes. Executive Committee Members include all students, advisors, and consultants.
 - ii. IA | Would like to know more about the wrap up items, are transition items stipulated elsewhere in policy?
 - 1. NAO | Yes. Transition items are a separate section that are in policy already for each position.
 - iii. SA | YTR
 - iv. GL | Motion to end discussion
 - 1. Second | NE



2. Dissent | None

e. Discussion

- i. SA | The South Atlantic supports this piece as it provides necessary updates to better reflect current practice and removes outdated language that is no longer actively used. We appreciate that it maintains the option to engage past executives while improving clarity and alignment within policy.
- ii. NCO | The NCO is in strong support of this piece. The NCO wants to highlight the fact that this piece creates equal 'past' statuses for all NACURH Executive Committee members, including both newly created positions in addition to professional members.
- iii. GL | Motion to exhaust with additions
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- iv. IA | The Intermountain is in support of this piece, as the elimination of "past _____" positional roles lightens the weight of mentorship that outgoing Executives may have experienced in the past due to the lengthy positional duties.

v.

f. Voting

- i. NE | Motion to vote by general consensus.
 - 1. Dissent | None
- ii. Piece passes.

25. Motion to recess until May 20 at 9:00 AM CST | SW

- a. Second | NCO
- b. Dissent | None

Tuesday May 19th, 2026 NNBD Boardroom

1. Call to Order | 10:00 EST/9:00 CST/8:00 MST/7:00 PST/4:00 HST

a. Roll Call

- i. Central Atlantic | here
- ii. Great Lakes | here
- iii. Intermountain | here
- iv. Midwest | here
- v. Northeast | not here
- vi. Pacific | here
- vii. South Atlantic | here
- viii. Southwest | here
- ix. NACURH Corporate Office | not here
- x. NACURH Associate for NRHH | here
- xi. NACURH Associate for Engagement | here



- xii. NACURH NRHH Advisor | doing bank stuff
- xiii. Guests
 - 1. IA NRHH Advisor
 - 2. MA Advisor
 - 3. PA NRHH Advisor
 - 4. SA NRHH Advisor
 - 5. SW NRHH Advisor

2. Schedule Overview

3. Business

- a. Motion to confirm SW Advisor, Karina as NNBD Recording Secretary | CA
 - i. Second | GL
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Motion to confirm Lindsey as NNBD Parliamentarian | SW
 - i. Second | CA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- c. NRHH Building Block Chapter of the Year
 - i. Motion to bring NRHH Building Block Chapter of the Year to the Floor | SW
 - 1. Second | IA
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - ii. Motion to Open the floor for nominations | CA
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - iii. CA nominates East Carolina University
 - 1. Second | SA
 - iv. SW nominates Saint Louis University
 - 1. Second | CA
 - v. SA nominates The Ohio State University
 - 1. Second | MA
 - vi. CA nominates The Pennsylvania State University
 - 1. Second | SW
 - vii. SW nominates University of Idaho
 - 1. Second | GL
 - viii. PA nominates University of North Carolina Wilmington
 - 1. Second | IA
 - ix. Motion to close the floor for nominations | CA
 - 1. Second | SW



2. Dissent | None

x. Pro/Con - East Carolina University

Pro	Con
Increased membership	-
Clear outline of each goal	Limited involvement regionally & NACURH
Strong collaboration of RHA	Lack of membership growth/statistics beyond retention initiatives
Listed all membership types	-
Thoroughly documented measured growth	Lack of member responsibilities
Intentionally accomplished goals	No direct NACURH involvement
Strong recognition culture	-
Clear description of programs	-
-	-

xi. Pro/Con - Saint Louis University

Pro	Con
Detailed programming efforts	Vague details on logistics of chapter
Measurable accomplishment of goals	Lack of elaborations on mentioned initiatives
Strong regional and national visibility	Lacked recognition initiatives
-	Has no chapter size statistics
Details challenges faced by chapter	Lacked evaluation of program success



-	Lack of service partnership with alternative organizations
-	-
-	-

xii. Pro/Con - The Ohio State University

Pro	Con
Strengthened executive board	Surface level service and OTM information
Clear results on goals set	Lacked information on membership types
Significant chapter growth in OTMs and membership	Limited scope of recruitment processes
Strong external collaborations	-
Increased membership significantly	-
-	-

xiii. Pro/Con - The Pennsylvania State University

Pro	Con
Clear elaboration of goal outcomes	Lacked information on overcoming challenges
Specification on future initiatives and goals for the chapter	Limited mention on member specific goals
Strong regional and national involvement	-



Increased membership & OTM participation	-
Showed membership sizes and upheld goals	-

xiv. Pro/Con - University of Idaho

Pro	Con
Detailed growth of organization	Limited information on challenges
Creative member recognition initiatives	-
Strong testimonials	Lacked information on how members add to the vision
Collaboration with campus organizations	Limited information on leadership growth
Increased in OTMS, service, and membership	-
-	-
-	-

xv. Pro/Con - University of North Carolina Wilmington

Pro	Con
Implemented 3 year strategic plan	Limited mention of challenges faced
Good increase in membership	Heavy on emphasis on fall recognition over other recognition
Strong service and recognition initiatives	Limited regional and national involvement
Clear outline of member	No evaluation on program success



expectations	
Good balance between service and recognition initiatives	-
-	-
-	-

xvi. Motion to caucus for 5 minutes | SW

1. Second | SA
2. Dissent | None

xvii. Institutions

- ~~1. University of North Carolina Wilmington~~
- ~~2. University of Idaho~~
- ~~3. The Pennsylvania State University~~
- ~~4. The Ohio State University~~
- ~~5. Saint Louis University~~
- ~~6. East Carolina University~~

xviii. Discussion

1. SA | The SA supports Penn State's bid for NRHH BB due to their structured redefinition of chapter, clear goals, their intentional use of budget, innovative programming efforts, strong OTM growth, and their increased regional and national presence. Similar to their bid, the Nittany Chapter demonstrated extensive growth, and the South Atlantic wants to express their support for this bid.
2. SW | The SW commends The Pennsylvania State University for their clear elaboration of the outcome of their goals and details on future initiatives within their chapter, which demonstrates willingness to expand within the future years. Their regional involvement and emphasis on following through with goals provides additional support for their chapter and is seen with the growth of their membership size.
3. IA | YTR
4. MA | Appreciate PSU's OTM submission and chapter member growth. Also appreciate the clear communication of challenges faced by the chapter, as well as ones they are currently facing. Would have liked to see more regarding



programming, specifically the service projects, which were only touched on briefly and provided little context.

5. CA | The Central Atlantic gives their support to PSU, OSU, and ECU. We feel these chapters have shown significant growth in their chapters and thoroughly pursued their goals. PSU has significantly grown their membership in numbers and engagement, through their new recruitment strategies and new membership point system they were able to accomplish a high level of engagement. They have expanded their involvement in OTMs by implementing workshops and resources. As well as expanded their presence regionally and nationally by intentionally attending chats, meetings, and participating in programs. PSU also listed several initiatives, including hosting more service events, increasing involvement, displaying OTM awards in hallways, and collaborating with ResLife orgs. They also increased their connection with RHA and NRHH by programming and completing the build-a-bridge program. OSU has shown growth in reconnecting with recognition, service and OTMs, by implementing new programs that encourage their engagement in all three areas. They also expanded their membership extensively, by looking at new avenues to recruit, outside of RAs, bringing their membership from 18 to 78, showing the effectiveness of their strategies. East Carolina did a great job of implementing service and recognition programs, while also evaluating the success of these programs to provide sustainability. Their goals were specific and achievable for their chapter. We see in their bid how throughout the year they intentionally worked towards their goals. We appreciate their attention to detail with membership, programs, and overcoming their challenges.
6. PA | The Pacific appreciates the University of Idaho has shown how they have grown their chapter in multiple areas from regional and NACURH involvement to creating engaging programs and collaborations to how they have increased OTM submissions. However, we would of liked to see more information on how their recruitment efforts were to grow their chapter size. The Pacific additionally would also like to commend East Carolina University has a good balance between focusing on recognition and service, a balanced chapter in terms of having both recognition and



service initiatives. Showed measurable increase in OTM submissions and how they do it (writing socials, point system with RHA)

7. SA | The South Atlantic believes the bid from UNCW is a contender for this award due to their detailed executive structure growth, their extensive planning and preparations for their year, strong testimonials from members, and the utilization of their campus committees. As we believe this is a good bid, we do believe there might be others that stand out more for this award. The SA does not support the bids from OSU or Saint Louis University. The bid from OSU lacks extensive description of different aspects of the bid and the bid from Saint Louis has limited explanation of goals & objectives and vague connections of programming on chapter growth. Where the SA wants to thank both chapters for the work they put into their bids but we do believe there are other bids that stand out more for this award.
8. SA | Move to exhaust with additions
 - a. Second | CA
 - b. Dissent | None
9. IA | Motion to narrow the field to 4
 - a. ~~Second | GL~~
 - b. Dissent | SW
- ~~10. IA | Motion to narrow the field to 3~~
 - a. ~~Second | GL~~
 - b. Dissent | SA
11. SW | YTR

xix. Voting Form

- d. Pass the Diamond | Keri -- Cause we forgot at the beginning lol
 - i. Passed to Lindsey, Parliamentarian
- e. NRHH Outstanding Chapter of the Year
 - i. Motion to bring Outstanding Chapter of the Year to the Floor | CA
 1. Second | GL
 2. Dissent | None
 - ii. Motion to Open the floor for nominations | SW



1. Second | MA
2. Dissent | None
- iii. SW nominates Florida State University
 1. Second | PA
- iv. CA nominates Rutgers University - New Brunswick
 1. Second | PA
- v. SW nominates Stony Brook University
 1. Second | GL
- vi. PA nominates University of California - San Diego
 1. Second | IA
- vii. SW nominates University of Colorado - Boulder
 1. Second | CA
- viii. PA nominates University of Tennessee - Knoxville
 1. Second | MA
- ix. Motion to close the floor for nominations | CA
 1. Second | SW
 2. Dissent | None
- x. Pro/Con - Florida State University

Pro	Con
Proactive membership roles and responsibilities	Limited recognition initiatives
Detailed quantifiable measurements of improvement	Lack of programming information and their impact
Completed all stated goals	-
Lots of regional and NACURH level involvement	-
Incorporation of member feedback	-

- xi. Pro/Con - Rutgers University - New Brunswick

Pro	Con
Consistent programming efforts	No mention of what committees are



Transferred OTM data and strong membership	Limited assessment and feedback tools
Increased recognition efforts	Lack of membership growth statistics
Professional development opportunities	-
Clear layout of membership selection process	-
Intentionally achieved all their goals	-

xii. Pro/Con - Stony Brook University

Pro	Con
Emphasis on programming	Missing recognition initiatives
Clear collaboration with campus	Lacks details of how challenges were overcome
-	No leadership development initiatives
Strong regional involvement	-
-	-
-	-

xiii. Pro/Con - University of California - San Diego

Pro	Con
Strong regional and national involvement	Limited programming efforts mentioned
Clear emphasis on partnership	Limited goals listed
Lots of options for member	-



engagement	
Strong OTM and recognition initiatives	Limited information on committees
-	Limited membership recruitment strategies
-	Limited service initiatives
-	

xiv. Pro/Con - University of Colorado - Boulder

Pro	Con
Transformative chapter mission	Limited service impact
Detail analysis of their events and initiatives	-
Detailed collaborative model with RHA	Limited information on what challenges were
Strong executive structure	No chapter size statistics
Involved members in programming	Limited evaluation on evaluation and assessment methods
-	-
-	-
-	

xv. Pro/Con - University of Tennessee - Knoxville

Pro	Con
Innovative use of chapter committees	Lack of detail on recruitment
Quantifiable recruitment numbers	-



Very detailed OTM process	-
Clear chapter goals with measurable progress	-

xvi. Motion to caucus for 5 minutes | SA

1. Second | SW
2. Dissent | None

xvii. Institutions

- ~~1. University of Tennessee Knoxville~~
- ~~2. University of Colorado Boulder~~
- ~~3. University of California San Diego~~
- ~~4. Stony Brook University~~
- ~~5. Rutgers University~~
- ~~6. Florida State University~~

xviii. Discussion ⌚ 0:00

1. SW | The SW recognizes UCSD for their extensive regional involvement and well as providing a wide array of initiatives for recognition and leadership development, but would've liked to see more logistical details such as programming efforts, committee layout, and membership recruitment details.
2. SA | The South Atlantic wants to commend each of these chapters for their outstanding contributions to themselves and their communities. We believe there are two front runners for this award, the bids from Florida State and UTK. Florida State because of their innovative goals that were within organizational reach, their emphasis on strong chapter internal operations, their inclusion of proactive membership roles and responsibilities, the real time incorporation of member feedback, their strong programming and member assessments, and their strong regional and national involvement. UTK because of their strong and ever growing executive structure, their innovative use of chapter committees, the strong emphasis on member strategies and opportunities, their incentivized member participation, their focus on OTMs and programming initiatives, and their extensive involvement on the regional and national levels. We believe that either



of these bids are deserving of this award and would support either.

3. CA | The Central Atlantic supports Rutgers because that intentionally accomplished all of their goals and effectively overcame their challenges making their chapter strong. They carefully laid out their intentionality towards recruitment to identify members showing genuine interest in their chapter's purpose and created a detailed recruitment process. They also maintained membership engagement through the diamond dollar system which covered various areas of involvement and rewarded members for earning points. They have multiple service, recognition, and programming initiatives, alongside their various leadership/professional development programs. They consider all membership types and are largely regionally involved. They created multiple resources for their members and reviewed their constitution to better align with who they are. Colorado-Boulder does a great job of remaining member focused and strengthening their member engagement by having them involved in the programming process, providing professional development opportunities, and utilizing meetings to meet their needs. They outlined their membership requirements and recruitment sections well, proving intentionality. They have a mix of new and old programming showing sustainability. The Central Atlantic also supports UTK for sustaining a great membership structure and pursuing several programming initiatives. They demonstrate clear chapter goals and outline how they were intentional throughout the year in meeting these goals. The Central Atlantic thinks Rutgers, UC-B, and UTK stand above the rest for the reasons listed above.
4. MA | MACURH believes that FSU's chapter of NRHH is very meaningful in every goal they've set out to complete as a chapter, moving from traditions to evidence based programming shows intentional commitment to growth, and providing a great experience for their members, but would also like to commend UC Boulder's substantial recognition and recruitment efforts, making them a great contender for this award, but we would've like to see more information regarding service initiatives.



5. IA | The University of Tennessee, Knoxville demonstrated a strong balance of service, recognition, engagement, and regional involvement, supported by a cohesive “Top Dog” identity and an effective committee structure that encouraged broad member participation. Their transparency regarding membership growth and organizational challenges was particularly noteworthy, as were their efforts to create OTM learning opportunities and increase member development across the chapter. Rutgers University’s bid stood out for its comprehensive and detailed presentation of chapter growth, particularly the significant increase in recruitment and OTM submissions, which reflected intentional organizational development and increased campus visibility. The University of Colorado – Boulder distinguished itself through highly innovative programming and an exceptional recognition culture, particularly with 707 OTMs submitted and strong NACURH-level success, demonstrating significant national impact. Stony Brook University demonstrated a strong commitment to service and campus collaboration through impactful large-scale events and a clearly defined member development structure. The University of California San Diego presented a well-established chapter with strong traditions, impressive recruitment systems, and a highly successful campus-wide recognition initiative through the Rezzies Awards. Florida State University’s bid excelled in organizational structure, assessment practices, and intentional member engagement, particularly through its evidence-based planning and transparent reflection on internal challenges.
6. *Every institution has been talked about*
7. GL | The Great Lakes is happy to have reviewed all bids but is not in support of Rutgers University, as we believe the level of detail in the bid for chapter level processes divides attention and space to highlight measurable impacts and levels of membership engagement properly. The Great Lakes are, however, in support of the University of Tennessee Knoxville for their use of committee engagement and defined and measurable chapter goals. We would like to have seen further detail from said measurable progress and chapter growth but otherwise support this chapter.



- 8. SA | Motion to exhaust without additions
 - a. ~~Second~~ | SW
 - b. Dissent | PA
- 9. SA | Motion to exhaust with additions
 - a. Second | CA
 - b. Dissent | None
- 10. PA | UCSD has shown to be the most involved and engaged institution when it comes to OTMs throughout North America through their OTM traveling award and multiple regional/national winners and they have shown high regional and NACURH level involvement, showcasing this further through their major growth of their chapter by having multiple exec positions filled and understanding them acknowledging their challenges of the spread out communities they have to serve. Their diverse amount of communities they have to serve show how much work and commitment they put into outreach to the campus whilst being involved in NACURH. UTK has shown a very detailed OTM process and emphasis on both large and small scale programs, these programs showcase the wide variety of activities they chapter has been able to accomplish but we wish there was more NACURH involvement beyond Annual Conference and more descriptions on small scale programs the chapter has executed over the year.
- 11. CA | After hearing discussion the central Atlantic supports UTK for this award. We found their bid to outline impressive programming initiatives, several forms of communication with chapters members and residents, several committees, and great regional involvement. We hear the support for FSU, although they are great chapter, we are hesitant to support them due to their lack of recognition initiatives.

xix. Voting Form

- f. Motion to move to groove for 5 mins | CA
 - i. Second | SW
 - ii. Dissent | None
- g. NRHH Outstanding Member of the Year



- i. Motion to bring NRHH Outstanding Member of the Year to the Floor | IA
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- ii. Motion to Open the floor for nominations | SA
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- iii. IA nominates Eastern Kentucky University
 - 1. Second | SW
- iv. SA nominates Kent State University
 - 1. Second | PA
- v. CA nominates University of Nebraska - Lincoln
 - 1. Second | MA
- vi. Motion to close the floor for nominations | PA
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- vii. Pro/Con - Eastern Kentucky University

Pro	Con
Exceptional peer support	Smaller measurable impact
Contributed to recognition efforts in chapter	Limited NACURH level involvement
Personal mentorship opportunities	Lacks specifics for involvement within the honorary
Showed growth and development in each of their goals	-
Passionate service leadership	-
-	-

viii. Pro/Con - Kent State University

Pro	Con
Significant recognition efforts	Lacks information on full involvements within the chapter



Meaningful campus impact	Limited measurable outcomes
Strengthened chapter initiatives and embodies NRHH values	-
-	-
Stepped up to support chapter needs	-

ix. Pro/Con - University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Pro	Con
Strong testimonials	Lacks outcomes of goals
Intentional peer recognition	Limited regional involvement
Set clear goals and objectives	-
Strong progression in NRHH involvement	Accomplishments are not explained in detail
-	Limited service based accomplishments
-	-
-	

x. Institutions

- ~~1. University of Nebraska - Lincoln~~
- ~~2. Kent State University~~
- ~~3. Eastern Kentucky University~~

xi. Discussion ⌚ 0:00

1. SA | The South Atlantic believes Eastern Kentucky University submitted a strong and authentic NRHH Outstanding Member of the Year bid that clearly reflected the values of recognition and service central to NRHH. The strongest portions of the bid highlighted the nominee's interpersonal impact, commitment to supporting fellow students, and ability to foster a positive and encouraging



chapter culture. The nominee demonstrated genuine passion for recognition and made meaningful contributions to the residential community through consistent involvement and leadership. However, the bid became weaker in demonstrating broad NACURH-level involvement and measurable organizational transformation. While the nominee clearly impacted their immediate community positively, several initiatives lacked detailed assessment data or evidence showing sustained influence beyond the chapter level. Beyond this, compared to other bids, we believe this was one of the top bids. The South Atlantic supports Eastern Kentucky University's bid for NRHH Outstanding Member of the Year. .

2. CA | The CA would like to echo SA on supporting ECU. And would like to add that we do not support the other two bids as they are not as descriptive as ECU.
3. SW | YTR to SA and CA
4. PA | Through experience and roles, ECU shows depth about their accomplishments, whilst UNL and Kent State do not go into depth about their accomplishments
5. IA | Kent State University's nominee demonstrated sustained impact across the campus, regional, and NACURH levels through strong advocacy, leadership adaptability, and relationship-building. Their involvement extended well beyond the chapter itself, with meaningful contributions to accessibility advocacy, inter-chapter collaboration, and campus organizations that strongly aligned with NRHH values of service, inclusion, and recognition. Their ability to step into unexpected leadership responsibilities at NACURH 2025 and continue contributing despite academic disruption reflects resilience and reliability as a leader. While some initiatives are still developing and certain impacts could have been supported with more measurable outcomes, the breadth of involvement and consistent recognition from peers and advisors demonstrate a member whose influence meaningfully elevates both their chapter and the broader NRHH community. The University of Nebraska–Lincoln nominee demonstrated impressive leadership growth within a short time in NRHH, quickly taking on significant recognition-focused responsibilities and creating new structures such as the “Diamond of the Month” program. Their educational session presentation at



NACURH 2025 and active regional involvement highlighted strong initiative and commitment to recognition culture. Eastern Kentucky University's nominee demonstrated strong dedication, mentorship, and creativity through consistent involvement in chapter committees, campus leadership, and resident support roles. Their positive influence on chapter culture and commitment to mentoring newer members reflected meaningful alignment with NRHH values.

6. MA | MAUCRH believes the candidate from ECU shows strong regional involvement and connection to NRHH's pillars, with a strong mentorship focus, Odilia is a clear leader within her NRHH, but would also like to commend the candidate from UNL, because MACURH believes the nominee is a great candidate for NRHH member OTY due to her dedication to her chapter's growth and development. We would've liked to see more information regarding her personal growth, but despite this she has clearly displayed strong goals, clear initiatives, and her bid details the meaningful impacts she had on her fellow NRHH members.

7. SA | Motions to exhaust without additions

- a. Second | CA
- b. Dissent | None

xii. Voting Form

h. NRHH Excellence in Service

- i. Motion to bring NRHH Excellence in Service to the Floor | SA
 1. Second | GL
 2. Dissent | None
- ii. Motion to Open the floor for nominations | SW
 1. Second | SA
 2. Dissent | None
- iii. GL nominates Missouri State University
 1. Second | PA
- iv. SW nominates University of Hawaii - Manoa
 1. Second | CA
- v. SA nominates University of North Carolina - Wilmington
 1. Second | IA



- vi. Motion to close the floor for nominations | PA
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None

vii. Pro/Con - Missouri State University

Pro	Con
Broad campus involvement	Initiatives lacked measurable outcome
Dedicated to traditions	Lack of challenges and improvement section
Variety of community services	Receding impact in the spring
Partnerships within the campus community	National involvement beyond day of service
Strong member notes and letters of support	-
-	-
-	-

viii. Pro/Con - University of Hawaii - Manoa

Pro	Con
Meaningful service initiatives	Limited measurable assessment
Diverse service projects	-
Strong quantitative impact	-
Detailed description of service events	-

ix. Pro/Con - University of North Carolina - Wilmington

Pro	Con
Monthly service programs	Lack of explained impact and initiatives



Measurable community impact	Limited discussion on challenges
Hosts long term and short term service opportunities	Lack of detail on structure of events
Explanation of plans for the future	-
Strong collaboration with campus partners	-
Tangible results with numbers	-

x. Institutions

- ~~1. University of North Carolina – Wilmington~~
- ~~2. University of Hawaii – Manoa~~
- ~~3. Missouri State University~~

xi. Discussion

1. SA | The South Atlantic believes the University of North Carolina Wilmington submitted one of the strongest bids in the category due to its comprehensive and measurable commitment to service throughout the award period. The strongest portions of the bid highlighted broad member participation, collaborative service initiatives, and clear evidence of community impact both on and off campus. The organization effectively demonstrated how service was intentionally integrated into organizational culture and member development. Additionally, the bid consistently connected service initiatives to student engagement and community betterment in a compelling way. However, the bid became weaker in areas where reflective analysis on challenges and organizational growth could have been expanded further. Some narrative sections also became descriptive rather than analytical when discussing accomplishments. Despite these weaknesses, the organization clearly demonstrated excellence in service that aligned strongly with the intent of the award category. The South Atlantic fully supports this bid.
2. MA | MACURH believes that the University of Hawaii at Manoa is a top contender for this award. We appreciate their dedication to serving the environment in their



initiatives. We also enjoyed how they showed the impact of these events on both their members and the community within the bid.

3. PA | Step by step guide wasn't provided that could hinder others from replicating the event. More specifics and processes could have been said about each section, lack of improvement section
4. SA | Motion to exhaust with additions
 - a. Second | SW
 - b. Dissent | None

xii. Voting Form

4. NRHH Lifelong Service

- a. Motion to bring NRHH Lifelong Service to the Floor | SW
 - i. Second | IA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Motion to Open the floor for nominations | CA
 - i. Second | PA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- c. CA nominates Towson University
 - i. Second | SW
- d. Motion to close the floor for nominations | SA
 - i. Second | PA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- e. Pro/Con - Towson University

Pro	Con
Exceptional long term dedication	-
Intensively supports other advisors at regional conferences	NACURH participation relies on networking and not on committees
Helped increase membership	-
Strong NRHH value alignment	-
-	-



f. Discussion

- i. SA | The South Atlantic believes Towson University submitted a strong and compelling NRHH Lifelong Service Award bid that effectively demonstrated the nominee's long-standing dedication to the values of recognition and service central to NRHH. The strongest aspects of the bid highlighted the nominee's sustained involvement, commitment to mentoring others, and continued impact on the residential community over an extended period of time. The nominee clearly embodied the principles of lifelong membership through consistent service, leadership, and support of NRHH initiatives. Additionally, the bid effectively conveyed the personal passion and commitment the nominee maintained toward improving the residential student experience and uplifting peers within the organization. However, the bid became weaker in sections where long-term measurable outcomes and organizational transformation were discussed more generally rather than through detailed assessment or specific examples. Some narrative sections also became repetitive and could have benefited from deeper reflective analysis regarding the nominee's evolving impact over time. Despite these weaknesses, the nominee clearly reflected the spirit and purpose of the NRHH Lifelong Service Award through sustained dedication and meaningful contributions to NRHH values.
- ii. SW | Call the question
 - 1. Second | PA
 - 2. Dissent | None

g. Voting Form

5. NRHH Member Scholarship

- a. Motion to bring NRHH Member Scholarship to the Floor | CA
 - i. Second | GL
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Motion to set the award allocation as three \$300 scholarships | SW
 - i. Second | MA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- c. Motion to Open the floor for nominations | IA
 - i. Second | SW
 - ii. Dissent | None
- d. PA nominates Aspen Delis
 - i. Second | SW



- e. IA nominates Camdyn Rolak
 - i. Second | CA
- f. SW nominates Cleo Hahn
 - i. Second | MA
- g. PA nominates Eshita Srivastava
 - i. Second | MA
- h. MA nominates Laura Grossheim
 - i. Second | IA
- i. SW nominates Lillian Faulkner
 - i. Second | CA
- j. IA nominates Madison Fillerup
 - i. Second | SA
- k. CA nominates Mercedes Vandenberg
 - i. Second | SW
- l. SW nominates Tanushree Dhage
 - i. Second | IA
- m. Motion to close the floor for nominations | SA
 - i. Second | SW
 - ii. Dissent | None
- n. Motion to caucus for 5 minutes | SA
 - i. Second | IA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- o. Applicants
 - i. ~~Tanushree~~
 - ii. ~~Mercedes~~
 - iii. ~~Madison~~
 - iv. ~~Lillian~~
 - v. Laura
 - vi. ~~Eshita~~
 - vii. ~~Cleo~~
 - viii. ~~Camdyn~~
 - ix. ~~Aspen~~
- p. Discussion
 - i. SA | The SA is in support of Lillian Faulkner, Tanushree Dhage, and Eshita Srivastava for the NRHH Scholarship. The SA believes each nominee showed extensive involvement with their NRHH Chapters, and to the regional and national levels. These three



individuals have been committed to fostering community and ensuring that individuals feel welcomed in NRHH spaces. These individuals focus on the small details and truly go above and beyond for their chapters and communities, further showcasing the SA's support for Lillian Faulkner, Tanushree Dhage, and Eshita Srivastava.

- ii. CA | The CA enjoys that Mercedes Vandenberg and Camdyn Rolak expressed their love for NRHH and demonstrated how they were impacted by their chapters and the NRHH mission when asked why they deserve this award. We also appreciate Aspen Delis's reasoning as they have truly been impacted by NRHH and embodies the values.
- iii. IA | YTR CA
- iv. CA | The CA appreciates Cleo Han however we feel that the other nominees included more meaningful information in their application.
- v. PA | Eshita is very involved in service activities on the campus and within NRHH that correlates to helping it grow and develop the overall organization.
- vi. MA | MACURH is in support of Madison for their demonstration of NRHH pillars, working to improve their chapter through redefining their NRHH chapter to better suit their members. She uses her experiences to shape her academics and support other students. She is very involved within their NRHH chapter and beyond with lots of time spent on service projects. Lastly, she demonstrates strong financial need.
- vii. SA | SA wants to showcase Laura's dedicated involvement in NRHH, showcasing that she should be a contender for this scholarship.
- viii. SA | Motion to end discussion
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- q. Voting Form

6. NNBD 26-15 | Public Access to NNBD Meetings

- a. Motion to bring NNBD 26-15 to the Floor | SA
 - i. Second | GL
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the Piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | SW



1. Second | SA
2. Dissent | None

c. Proponent

- i. Theo, SA CONBD | The NRHH Policy Committee developed this piece after reviewing the bylaws for potential incongruities with current policies and practices. We particularly reviewed the section of the bylaws that states that NNBD Meetings are open to any NRHH member, and upon review, we felt that this has not been applied much in practice despite the potential benefits. With this piece, we hope to not only clarify a process by which the NNBD can enter executive sessions for pertinent matters, but also to hopefully further integrate open NNBD meetings into practice. It's our hope that by having NNBD meetings open to the public, we can maintain alignment with the strategic plans by opening the pathways to leadership and increasing transparency with NRHH members, and we can provide more opportunities for NRHH reps to get involved with planning quarterly, creating resources and executing special activities such as service months.

d. Q&A

- i. SA | The South Atlantic was curious what the implementation for this piece would be to notify all NRHH Chapters?
 1. Theo, SA CONBD | Honestly, this would be up to how the NAN wants to interpret it. If we had a workgroup meeting, the NAN would probably send it out to let people know workgroups were happening. We could just keep the schedule open that meetings are every other week. And maybe not advertise if it is a legislation meeting and let people know they wouldn't have speaking rights, so they wouldn't have to attend.
- ii. PA | The Pacific was curious if there was any reason that this was not done before even though it was written in the bylaws (i.e. procedural etc.)
 1. Theo, SA CONBD | We were looking at the bylaws, it was added in 2022 or 2023. There was another document and there were the standing orders, and that the meetings were open and it was never in policy. It is something that we caught as a committee.
 2. Justin, NAN | It was added to the policy before we were having consistent NNBD meetings. In the past, NNBD only had quarterlies and something else. Being at semis was



already a closed meeting. Now we have more meetings to have discussions, and work on things.

- iii. IA | IACURH was wondering what agendas/minutes will look like in executive spaces vs. spaces all NRHH members are invited to?
 - 1. Theo, SA CONBD | I would figure that we would do similar to elections, separate documents for those there and where all the corporate minutes go public. Our Student Government uses this and they go into executive session and add to the public minutes later.
 - iv. SA | The South Atlantic is wondering about the legal consequences, if any, if boards are not allowed to share certain pieces of legislation due to levels of confidentiality. How are we going to make sure private conversations that require levels of confidentiality do not get spread outwards, and would this be the use of separate agendas?
 - 1. Theo, SA CONBD | Technically, the agenda would not have to be fully public, similar to a one sentence rundown, the piece doesn't need to be linked directly in the minutes. This will be more procedural on how to add the process with executive sessions. A separate minutes and agenda can be added in.
 - 2. NAN | NRHH a representative structure vs the non profit structure. The piece of the description of the piece after the meeting.
 - v. CA | Motion to extend by 5 mins
 - 1. Second | SA
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - vi. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering if the Author knew if this level of accessibility would be or is in consideration for NBD meetings?
 - 1. Theo, SA CONBD | Probably not. The general consensus is that NRHH is owned by NACURH whereas RHAs are not. In NBD spaces, things are being seen that cannot be public, like corporate agreements.
 - vii. PA | Motion to exhaust with additions
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - viii. SA | YTR
- e. Discussion ⌕ 5:00



- i. CA | The CA appreciates this piece of legislation as we have had members interested in attending NNBD meetings but without any formal guidelines they have been hesitant to do so. Rep involvement in NRHH has increased vastly over the past two years, we find this as a way to encourage and sustain this engagement.
 - ii. PA | The Pacific would like to thank the author for the piece, we believe this piece creates more transparency and accountability and understand the internal mechanisms of NACURH
 - iii. SA | Motions to exhaust without additions
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - iv. GL | The Great Lakes is in support of this piece as this allows NACURH to reap benefits of an open NNBD meeting and engagement to follow, as well as putting practice into official process with the strategic plan in mind. The Great Lakes specifically finds the clarification on opening accessibility to minutes and how to navigate voting and speaking rights to be clear and of an implementation style NACURH spaces tend to use already.
 - v. CA | YTR
 - f. Voting
 - i. 7-0-0
- 7. Lindsey | Pass the Diamond
 - a. Ofri | IA ADNRHH Proxy
- 8. Motion to recess to 1:30 PM | PA
 - a. Second | GL
 - b. Dissent | None
- 9. Call to Order at 1:30 PM
 - a. Roll Call
 - i. Central Atlantic | here
 - ii. Great Lakes | here
 - iii. Intermountain | here
 - iv. Midwest | here
 - v. Northeast | not here
 - vi. Pacific | here
 - vii. South Atlantic | here
 - viii. Southwest | here
 - ix. NACURH Corporate Office | not here
 - x. NACURH Associate for NRHH | here



- xi. NACURH Associate for Engagement | here
- xii. NACURH NRHH Advisor | here
- xiii. Guests
 - 1. IA NRHH Advisor
 - 2. MA Advisor
 - 3. PA NRHH Advisor
 - 4. SA NRHH Advisor
 - 5. SW NRHH Advisor

10. Business

- a. Service Themed Months Confirmation
 - i. Motion to bring Service Themed Months Confirmation to the Floor | CA
 - 1. Second | IA
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - ii. Proponent
 - 1. NAN | walk through of the guide
 - iii. Q&A
 - 1. IA | How did you plan to market it and communicate with institutions and what support looks like to chapters?
 - a. NAN | It is not required for them to participate, it will be shared in NRHH corporate. It can be shared in the Turtle Talk, and can also send it down the trickle down communication. There will be a new section on the website in regard to service. The color palettes will help with marketing these service theme months, the policy says it needs to be marketed 2 months in advance but if we approve it today we will have it all done and ready to start creating some of that marketing.
 - 2. SW | Motion to exhaust without additions
 - a. Second | SA
 - b. Dissent | None
 - iv. Discussion
 - 1. SA | SAACURH applauds the author for the work they did on this and is in support of passing this
 - 2. SW | SW appreciated the idea on adding the color palette and gives ideas on how chapters can use it on social media.
 - 3. IA | IA is excited to see the creativity from several regions and the cross-region collaborations that could occur
 - 4. SA | Motion to end discussion



- a. Second | GL
 - b. Dissent | None
 - v. Voting Form
 - 1. 7-0-0
- b.  [Closed] NNBD Awarded Gold Diamond Minutes
- c. NRHH Strategic Planning
 - i. Where would you like to see NRHH in 4 years at the end of the next strategic plan?
 - 1. IA | Would be super cool to see the OTM database be created and more streamlined processes for that. Help institutions with service opportunities and sponsorships
 - 2. CA | With the new database and having the campus administer role has been more important. Have a transition with those individuals and treating it as an actual role and help eliminate any confusion
 - a. NAN | There are a couple ways we can do this, we can specify on affiliation and in their constitution checks. And work with this through trickle down
 - 3. PA | Being able to support institutional chapters, and making sure they know they are getting support regionally and on the NACURH level
 - 4. NRHH Advisor | identify a number of chapters that are like 60% of affiliates have an NRHH Chapter
 - 5. MA Advisor | Comprehensive assessment of how AI effect polices, OTMs, other means
 - 6. SW | Looking how we can tie in NRHH Programming. Using programming as a tool to engage more people and more intentional
 - a. NAN | Establishing NRHH-U to be more than just in person. There are more affiliates that only have NRHH and still come to conference.
 - 7. CA | Better understanding, there are NRHH services, not just for NRHH chapters, making them feel like they are not just for NRHH and they can participate in OTMs, and NRHC for example.
 - 8. SA | Identifying more cost to value to NRHH, what incentives are there. They are getting x,y,z with affiliation but if you have an NRHH chapter you can get more



- 9. PA | We have sufficient positions, on the regional and on the NACURH level and not to strain those individuals on both levels.
- 10. IA | It would also be cool to see how we can better connect with residential departments on our campuses because sometimes when we are looking for support, administrators are asking “what do you do?” It would help to have more resources about how to have those conversations. It could help to increase the conversations between NRHH and the campuses to discuss the benefits and to receive the Turtle Talks.
- 11. NAN | Continual lead to make sure candidate member education and making sure all members are equitably getting the same information and bridging that gap
 - d. NRHH Corporate Briefing
 - e. Ofri | Pass the Diamond
 - i. Riddhi | SW
- 11. Motion to adjourn | SA
 - a. Second | SW
 - b. Dissent | None
- 12. Meeting Adjourned at **4:00pm CST**



Wednesday May 20th, 2026

1. Roll Call - Called to order at 9:00 AM CST

Roll Call					
	Director	Finance Officer	ADNRHH	NACURH Exec	
CAACURH	x	--	x	Chairperson	x
GLACURH	x	x	x	NAO	x
IACURH	x	x	x	NAN	x
MACURH	x	x	x	NAE	x
NEACURH	x	-	-	Advisor	x
PACURH	x	x	-	NRHH Advisor	x
SAACURH	x	x	x	CRC	x
SWACURH	x	x	-	ART	-
NCO	x	x	-	ADC	-
	Chair	NBD Liaison	Finance Chair		
AC	-	-	-	Quorum is present	

1. Who's Who

- Minutes | Parrama/Carson/Nate/Connor
- Speakers List | Scott
- Timer Keeper | Minute Keepers
- Parliamentarian | Orin

2. [NBD 26-53 Annual Conference Host School Guide](#)

- Motion to bring NBD 26-53 to the floor | MA
 - Second | SW
 - Dissent | None
- Reading of the piece
 - Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent
 - Dissent |
- Proponent Speech
 - AC Finance Advisor | I am the advisor, finance, and tech advisor for



AC 2026. This piece is really trying to get a host guide for the Annual Conference. Bethany (CRC) has been working on a website, but this is really to put some specifications in on what should be included – what institutions should be looking at when wanting to host an annual conference. Policies that are relevant to what the conference team needs to know, with some simple explanations of what the intent is. They will still work with the CRC to confirm things are done correctly, but this should make information sharing a little more efficient and easier.

d. Q&A

- i. PA | We would like to ask was this made in conjunction with the NAO and CRC for their long-term goals?
 1. AC Finance Advisor | It was not in collaboration with those individuals because I did not know about some parts of this piece until after it was submitted. In the piece it states that the actual guide would be created in conjunction with the NAO, CRC, and previous conference team members.
- ii. SA | The South Atlantic noticed that “An updated copy shall be distributed to the current and upcoming conference teams, and institutions intending to bid to host shall be informed when a new version of the guide is available.” Where would this guide be posted, and would institutions have access to it on the website if they were considering running or would it only be made accessible once they put in a formal intent?
 1. AC Finance Advisor | That is something left up to how the executives would want it to be. They could also use the website to help with the interpretation and support. If that’s through the website that’s fine. For how accessible it is, I want to leave that up to NACURH since I was originally in the organization and would be up to the execs and all of y’all.
- iii. MA | Did you consult with any former NACURH host sites to see if they had any feedback for a guide like this?
 1. AC Finance Advisor | We have not. I don’t have that contact for individuals unless they are in this space. It would be up to NACURH to determine who would be making the guide and that previous conference teams would be involved for communication.
- iv. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering if any considerations were given to how often this guide may need significant revisions if conference policies continue to evolve annually?
 1. AC Finance Advisor | Sadly, that was not taken into



consideration because that is case-by-case and year-by-year. I know the pace of change varies, and we don't know what the future will look like. Once the guide itself is created, unless there's a complete revision on AC Hosting, there shouldn't need to be a large update.

- v. PA | PA would like some clarification in one of the last whereas statements. Do you mean the entire guide or specific policy changes?
 - 1. AC Finance Advisor | Yield to the Chair.
 - 2. Chair | That was a request I made when Dakota originally submitted the piece. Dakota originally wanted the Policy Book, but the Operations Manual seemed to be a better fit.
- vi. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering what the implementation of this guide would look like, as it mimics the similar structure of a conference wrap-up report?
 - 1. AC Finance Advisor | While some of the things are the same or perceived as the same, policy interpretations aren't always in wrap up reports. So having content in the book that may need to be done by the certain positions outside of what's stated so they're aware of what needs to be done. They should be able to be handed this document so that we don't have to constantly bother the NAO or CRC for what certain things mean. I know there's some nuances where it's deeper, like fees and anthems, so help make it easier for institutions.
- vii. MA | Motion to extend by 5 minutes
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- viii. NE | Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions.
 - 1. Second | CA
 - 2. Dissent | GL
 - a. Redundant to the motion made
 - 3. Motion not entertained by the Chair.
- ix. MA | If this piece passes, what is the timeline for getting it created and published?
 - 1. AC Finance Advisor | I think that should be left up to NACURH Leadership. What I'd like it to look like, going into the next affiliation year, is a group of individuals who will work on this. I want to leave autonomy for this group. It will be dependent on needs, the individuals, and transitions. My goal would be to have it within a couple of months in an ideal world. In reality, the CRC has created a great



- foundation, but it may be longer.
- x. SA | The South Atlantic understands that “this guide would not take away from the CRC role nor the policy interpretation of the NAO.” Would the creation and maintenance of this guide increase the workload of the CRC or NAO in a way that may require additional support or restructuring?
 - 1. AC Finance Advisor | I don’t see this piece needing to do any of that. This is more of a support system since we have had to reach out to Bethany quite a bit to get interpretation from Parrama. This is a way to see the interpretation and not have to reach out as much except for certain specifications. When it comes to policy books, the NAO would have to update the guide when policy changes but it’s a 1:1 ratio. We wouldn’t have to ask as many questions.
 - xi. SA | Would this make us need to vote every time the guide is changed?
 - 1. Chair | If it is in the Operations Manual, then the Policies & Practices committee would approve any changes to the language in the Operations Manual. The actual guide would be external to both documents and wouldn’t need to be approved to make changes.
 - xii. SA | Motion to end Q&A
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- e. Discussion
- i. NE | NEACURH believes this piece helps AC Team work with NACURH and help better streamline information. However we would love to see this piece becoming more exhaustive, for example, explaining traditions, time lines and expectations of the boards, definitions of common roles, financial break downs and more. Overall NEACURH is in support of this piece.
 - ii. MA | Motions to caucus for 5 minutes
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - iii. SA | The South Atlantic wanted to express that we were originally hesitant to support this piece due to our interpretation that it would overlap with preexisting NACURH structures. Through the proponent speech and the Q+A period, our hesitancy has changed and we are now in full support of this piece. We believe that the additional support and clarification that this guide would provide is essential and we believe that this piece would add a level of accountability to ensure that the needed level of support for



hosting such a conference is present, further showcasing our full support for this piece.

- iv. IA | The Intermountain region is in support of this piece, as it promotes stronger organizational clarity, consistency, and accessibility for future Annual Conference host institutions. We believe the creation of a centralized hosting guide will effectively reduce confusion and fatigue while providing institutions with a better understanding of policy, procedures, and expectations throughout the conference planning process. Hosting a conference is a noble and challenging endeavor, and any resource that makes the process less stressful has the potential to be incredibly useful. Recognizing how beneficial conference wrap-up reports have become for our region, we think this guide will be a great addition to the resources already available to AC teams. In knowing that many resources exist within NACURH and that some are not utilized to their full potential, we are hoping this resource is especially streamlined for new AC teams.
- v. PA | There are a few specifics that we would like to be informed upon, but the pacific understands that this guide would be a WIP that will greatly benefit future conference teams and NACURH Execs. We especially appreciate the focus on the policy side that is more accessible and easier to read. That said, we would have liked to see the piece receive some additional support from both NACURH Execs and previous annual conference teams, especially because the author mentioned multiple times the various responsibilities of the NAO & CRC related to this guide. For those reasons, the Pacific is in support of this piece at this time.
- vi. SW | The Southwest echoes NEACURH's sentiment and believes that this may help encourage more institutions to feel more willing to host an Annual Conference. While we believe that there are small aspects of the piece has some room to be more fleshed out and centralized, we do ultimately believe that the core concept of the piece itself will greatly help in guiding people interested in hosting Annual Conference by laying out expectations and recommendations.
- vii. GL | The Great Lakes is in support of this piece and thinks that making a guide would be incredibly beneficial for future conference teams. We want to first note that a wrap-up report is what occurred at the conference and during the planning process, where this guide would give a process that an annual conference team would need to know to actually do the conference planning process, and give more context to policy. This guide will also save



the NAO and CRC time on interpreting policy and providing guidance on process so that they can focus, in conjunction with the Annual Conference Team, on making the conference experience as impactful as possible. Making conferences easier to host is going to encourage institutions to bid and host annual conferences, which will help secure the future of NACURH.

viii. MA | The Midwest is not in support of this piece in its current form. We believe a lack of communication between former conference hosts, no timeline implementation, and an increased workload on the NAO, CRC, and Policy and Practices Committee, would create more work, for already incredibly busy NACURH individuals. Furthermore, with our entire DADs team having worked on regional conferences before, having strong communication and asking questions to the CRC and NAO, adds more historical and context on how NACURH works, more than a guide could.

ix. GL | Motion to end discussion

1. Second | IA
2. Dissent | None

f. Voting

i. GL | Motion to vote by acclamation

1. Dissent | None

ii. Piece passes

3. 2026-2027 NACURH Associate for Programs Confirmation

a. Motion to bring NAP Confirmation to the floor | GL

i. Second | SW

ii. Dissent | PA

1. The Pacific has a multitude of concerns related to the procedural fairness of the NAA & NAP confirmation and legislation process specifically related to its alignment with NACURH policies. To recap, NBD 26-42, Discontinuation of the NACURH Corporate Office, was brought before the Joint Boards on April 12th. After a proponent speech, Q&A, & Discussion the piece passed. Within the original piece there was no inclusion of timelines, approval of the confirmation process, or information about the selection committee beyond a broad statement that the process would be developed with the incoming exec committee, and would not be in violation of NACURH policies. The incoming NACURH Exec Elections took place on April 25th, and then on April 27th the NAA & NAP vacancies were



announced. According to Title 4, Article 1, Section 4, "The application shall be released no later than two (2) weeks prior to the application closing date." This means that the application process was in violation of NACURH policy; as it was released on Monday April 27th, and closed on Sunday May 3rd, meaning that applications weren't open even for a full week. During Q&A a question was asked about a proposed plan to select candidates prior to ABM, and the process was presented at that time as a proper vacancy that would align with the aforementioned two week policy. Additionally, since the corporate bylaws pieces haven't been passed by the NCC's or NRHH representatives, this means that the positions don't even technically exist within the NACURH governing documents for the positions to be filled. It could be interpreted that the applications shouldn't even open until after these pieces are passed in corporate. Furthermore, upon the release of materials for the final candidates, the Pacific has some additional concerns regarding the adherence of the process to NACURH policy. The same aforementioned portion of the NACURH policy book states that "All application information shall be released to the NACURH Boards..." and policy also states that "The application shall include a letter of support from a full-time professional from the student's host institution affirming that the individual is in good standing" which was not released with the applications; nor were interview recordings, transcripts, or minutes released, and there was no supporting information released in advance regarding the actual process of the selection committee in selecting these final candidates. This leaves voting representatives with limited and incomplete information for us to make this decision, which has the potential to significantly impact the future of NACURH. Finally, there is no current plan for transparency to the institutional voting representatives with regards to the confirmation process, and the fact that the positions may have candidates already confirmed by the boards. As regional leadership, we are coached to consider the best interests for the organization. In alignment with this, we feel it necessary to raise the concern that many of our constituents are already on the fence about affiliation with NACURH. By proceeding with a process that isn't fully



transparent, and has the potential to be grossly misinterpreted as an installation of NACURH executives without the due diligence of communication with the institutions, we would be failing in our responsibility to advocate for the integrity of NACURH. For all these reasons, the Pacific dissents to the opening of the floor for this nomination.

- iii. Dissent was not entertained by the Chair
 - 1. PPP - Parliamentarian | The Chair has the right to entertain Dissent or not. Any decision of the Chair can be overturned.
- iv. No other dissent
- b. Presentation by Selection Committee & Candidate
 - i. Selection Committee Representative | This candidate was selected for her plans for creating novel programming opportunities within NACURH and detailed plans to bring back programming opportunities like LEAD, NRHH-Us, and programs within physical spaces.
 - ii. Kiara | Hi everyone! As you may already know, my name is Kiara Wisniewski and I am the Regional Director for NEACURH. I use she/her pronouns and am hosted at the University at Buffalo. Before being Regional Director, I was an ADNRRH, and before that I was an NRHH rep for my institution. Throughout each of these roles, I have had the privilege to learn and understand NACURH on deeper levels. How NACURH functions, what stakeholders are interested in, and most importantly how we can support our stakeholders. I originally applied for the NACURH Associate for Programs because I love people, and I love creating community. Within this position, I will be given the chance to work with MANY different groups of people; I'll work with the executive committee and advisors, work with every region, help support the CO team, support NACURH level bid teams, and work with NACURH at large. I do recognize that as this is a new position, there will be unique hurdles that I, and the executive committee will need to work through. I plan to communicate fully and transparently with the rest of the executive committee and advisors to fully outline what this position should look like, and how I can align this position to support the goals of my fellow executives. Some of my goals going into this position are: To work with the NAO to promote financial literacy both for people in financial officer positions, but for people to have general knowledge. This could include helping re-vamp regional budgets, learning about how finances work within a nonprofit,



how these financial skills can be leveraged or transferred outside of NACURH, and to promote financial transparency.

To work with the NAN to help promote NRHH + NNBD initiatives, such as service opportunities or OTM engagement. We could do virtual service programs (such as freerice) or virtual recognition programs (like making advisor appreciation cards to email out, or having an online whiteboard to recognize individuals). Another huge engagement opportunity that I would love to take advantage of is the National Residence Hall Celebration, where I could develop new engagement opportunities. I will also listen to any feedback or ideas from the NNBD to help individual regions or to help support new projects.

- iii. To learn and get to know COs, support their regional initiatives, and to get feedback for NACURH level programming
 - iv. To give each member more ownership in their NACURH experience by adapting NACURH-U and NRHH-U to accommodate both first time members and returners. That way new folks can learn the basics without being overwhelmed, but returners can learn a bit more so they get more out of their experience
 - v. Further develop the LEAD program and increase education surrounding the program
 - vi. Create asynchronous engagement for members that can't attend virtual programming, to make our information more accessible and prioritize having different types of engagement.
 - vii. I also have lots of other ideas as well, like having a resume workshop to help people learn how to talk about and market their experience within NACURH, because as we all know, it may be hard trying to explain what we do to people outside of housing or higher education.
 - viii. Within this position it is my goal to offer new initiatives outside of conferences that institutions can engage with year long, that help the growth and development of RHA and NRHH chapters, with the ultimate goal growing NACURH. I plan to work alongside the rest of the executive committee to help support each of their goals, and I plan to create intentional programming to give members more ownership of their experience, and to create a positive impact.
 - ix. Thank you all for your time and consideration and I hope to continue working with each of you.
- c. Q&A
- i. GL | What was your biggest motivation for returning to NACURH next year?



1. Kiara | My biggest motivation is that this is something new and to develop it. I want to work with how this could work with the executive committee and continue building what I've learned in NACURH. I have a lot of experience with networking and with my foundation I'll be able to continue learning about the organization and continuing to develop the organization.
- ii. SA | A major part of this role is running the bidding processes on the NACURH level. The South Atlantic is curious what are your experiences with bidding and recognition?
 1. Kiara | I have a lot of experience with bidding, mostly on the regional level. I was the ADNRRH in NEACURH. We didn't have our bidding CO, so I was responsible for that process: timelines, support, bidding guide, policy review, checklists. A lot of that will translate to the NACURH level. In my interview, I wanted to promote bidding information a lot sooner, and increase access. Bid teams start creating their bids early on, so stopping conflicting information. I ran a lot of different recognition initiatives in NEACURH: virtual sessions and parties. We haven't had a ton of participation, so that's why I wanted to try new things here. I am always open to feedback if people want different opportunities or have feedback for the bidding process.
- iii. PPI | Can you present this piece if you gave the proponent?
 1. Chair | I presented the proponent on behalf of the Selection Committee. I am not the candidate and all Executives were a part of the Selection Committee.
- iv. CA | Can you elaborate on any ideas you have for the bidding process on what you want to keep or add?
 1. Kiara | I'd love to promote timelines as soon as possible. I also want to increase engagement with bids, and I'm not sure what that would look like. I'd work with the NAE and the NAN to determine. With promoting sooner and doing Q&A sooner. I'd like to invite back past winning bid teams to present as well. It will allow bid teams to have someone to lean on and have advice. While the archives we have and we as board members can't help with bids beyond policy, they can talk to past teams about the process and recommendations. Connection is a big piece of this. Also, working with the NCO and their recommendations.
- v. SA | The South Atlantic noticed that you emphasized creativity and adaptability as strengths. As the NAP, you're wanting to bring



back many initiatives and programs that expect a high number of attendance. Can you give an example of a time you had to pivot a program or initiative when engagement or plans were not going as expected?

1. Kiara | When we have virtual business, we usually don't get a lot of people. Although it's not programming, it's something we expected attendance for and that didn't really happen. We tried advertising as much as we could but unfortunately had to reschedule it. We sent out information to all of the candidates when it didn't work out and used feedback to identify the best ways to pivot and make it successful. We also used marketing and experience with engagement rather than emails since people aren't looking at emails and information. We want to change our outreach and communication moving forward and use the information to help our future events. Something I also talked about is that we are expecting a high attendance at spaces that are asynchronous to engage more with our materials. We could do things like forms, puzzles, etc. Especially on the NACURH Level this would help with multiple time zones to help with engagement of both sides and I'm used to working with the team. If I can't find a solution I would consult the executive committee to see if we could find an alternative option.
- vi. SA | Motion to exhaust the speaker's list with additions.
 1. Second | SW
 2. Dissent | None
- vii. NCO | The NAP provides administrative support to the NRHH Executives and the NNBD, such as assisting in the NRHH Affiliation Process and assisting with the NRHH Membership Database. Can you provide some insight into how you work both individually and collaboratively, and how you stay organized and accountable?
 1. Kiara | Individually, my working style is a little chaotic. I adapt my style when working on a team. I have three different planners, it's not really that chaotic. I write everything down, prioritize, and keep track. I start with getting a base for my prioritization and create a todo list in order, then I communicate it with the team. I've never had an issue where I need to step away or push things off, so I don't see that being a problem, but if it is I would communicate. I am an overachiever and I have taken a lot



out of my workload going into next year because I'm going into grad school. Less jobs, less clubs. I don't anticipate needing to be held accountable on this. I have also learned as a student leader, you need to care for yourself. Overall, communication and transparency. I've never had an issue where I just didn't do anything – only when I maybe didn't complete something. I've adapted and made timelines for myself. I learned a lot about my working style this year, I did a Clifton's Strength Test. I learned not only about these, but what I want to do as a leader. I learned that I don't like taking the lead on decisions, but I like to work with others and bounce ideas off of others. This year as regional director, I did not enjoy being the final call for decisions. While I learned a lot, I'm excited to be in a team that will plan and sort things out as a team. I want to lean into that part of my leadership style and combat my weaknesses.

viii. MA | YTR

ix. SA | The South Atlantic asks what would success look like for you at the end of your term as NAP?

1. Kiara | I would like to say having a lot of attendees, programs, but personally that is not how I see it. Creating a foundation for the future of this position and making meaningful connections with the Executive Committee. Supporting the NNBD, NAN, NAO, making connections with COs. That is what success looks like for me. I have a lot of goals, but since this is a new position I am keeping my goals foundational based. I don't want to get discouraged if programs don't go as planned or if attendance is low. I would like to create an outline on what we would like to see in the future. I will have a successful year if I make a positive impact.

d. Discussion

i. RFI - IA | Is the result of this confirmation dependent on the corporate piece?

1. Chair | This is contingent on CORP 26-03. This is contingent on the creation of these positions to ensure continuity and that we don't have to do another vacancy position. If CORP 26-03 does not pass, the incoming Executive Committee will work on a plan going forward.

ii. GL | Motion to caucus for 5 minutes

1. Second | NCO
2. Dissent | None



- iii. Discussion Timer:
- iv. MA | The Midwest is in full support of Kiara for the position of NAP, we loved her goals on bettering engagement for students and advisors, as well as her clear dedication to the organization. We are really excited to see where Kiara can take this position.
- v. NE | NEACURH believes that with the NAP being a new position that needs a foundation the candidate going into the position needs to be prepared to set that at a high bar. Kiara has strong ideas and plans for a new and novel position that needs strong leadership. Her focus on the program will be incredibly beneficial to the entire NACURH community. From resume workshops to help explain our NACURH experiences on our resumes to the various plans she has stated it is clear she plans to make the most of the position. She is dedicated to NACURH and we believe she is an incredible fit for this position. NEACURH is in strong support of this candidate.
- vi. SW | It is not easy to run for a position that does not have any past experience or precedent to really go off of, and yet she has a clear plan to utilize this position to lead NACURH in the right direction of growth. We appreciated hearing her various ideas to make the position her own through different initiatives for bidding and recognition. Therefore, SWACURH would like to express their full support for Kiara for the NAP position and we are excited to see what she will accomplish within the role.
- vii. SA | motion to exhaust with additions
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- viii. CA | YTR
- ix. NCO | YTR
- x. PA | typed
- xi. POO/PPP - Parliamentarian | The parliamentary process is not to be used in this manner. Currently, what is on the floor is considering the candidate for NAP. We can no longer debate the topic of whether this item is reasonable to be on the floor, as the chair did not entertain the dissent raised, no further dissent was raised, and the decision of the Chair stood without being overturned. Furthermore, the reasoning for tabling should not be shared until after a motion has been made and a second has been obtained so that debate can proceed.
- xii. IA | The Intermountain region supports Kiara Wisniewski for the NACURH Associate for Programs position due to her strong emphasis on adaptability, flexibility, and open-mindedness in



shaping a newly created role. We appreciate her intentional focus on creative and inclusive programming, particularly within virtual spaces, to reduce repetition and encourage stronger engagement from NACURH stakeholders. We also appreciate the effort to improve financial literacy for delegates and financial officers. While she is still actively brainstorming the long-term direction of the position, we believe she has already established a strong foundation through concrete goals surrounding alumni collaboration, organization of data, support for RHA and NRHH chapters, and consistent virtual programming.

xiii. GL | YTR

xiv. PA | YTR

e. Voting Form

i. A conclusive majority has been reached

4. Move to groove for 10 minutes | NE

a. Second | NCO

b. Dissent | None

5. Roll Call

Roll Call						
	Director	Finance Officer	ADNRHH	NACURH Exec		
CAACURH	x	-	x	Chairperson	x	
GLACURH	x	x	x	NAO	x	
IACURH	x	x	x	NAN	x	
MACURH	x	x	x	NAE	x	
NEACURH	x	-	-	Advisor	x	
PACURH	x	x	-	NRHH Advisor	x	
SAACURH	x	x	x	CRC	x	
SWACURH	x	x	-	ART	-	
NCO	x	x	-	ADC	-	
	Chair	NBD Liaison	Finance Chair			
AC	-	-	-	Quorum is present		



6. Hangtight Contract Confirmation

a. Motion to bring Hangtight Contract Confirmation to the floor | MA

- i. Second | SA
- ii. Dissent | None

b. Discussion

- i. SW | For context, SW has used Hangtight for our RBC this year. Speaking on our experience, we genuinely loved using Hangtight. Their communication with implementing features was seamless, and we were able to get the app ready and function before the conference had started. It had taken a while for our region to be used to communicating on Hangtight instead of Discord, and we had to clarify a few times to use Hangtight at the primary source of communication, but our region used it often after some time. They connected with each other through the app, planning hangouts and events with each other, and the app play a crucial role in accelerating connections between delegates, as well as serving as a centralized location for conference logistics, such as schedules and locations. We believe that there are also a lot of features that are most likely available, but we did not utilize due to a short turn around on our end. One of the things that we recommend for future conferences is that the app is released earlier. We found that delegates used the app, but we initially got a lot of questions, engagement, etc. on Discord because the app had not been released yet. If the app comes out when we start announcing major updates to conferences, we can drive engagement with the conference to the app, thus making it more useful to delegates from the start. Overall, we believe that Hangtight is an app that can enhance the conference experience if used in an intentional manner.
- ii. PA | PA is in favor of this confirmation. We did have some challenges at RBC because some of our delegates didn't know how to use it. Some institutions weren't able to find the info they needed but the owners of hangtight were very receptive and helpful for what we needed changed and adjusted to support our reps at conference.
- iii. SA | The South Atlantic fully supports the Corporate Sponsorship Agreement between NACURH and Hangtight. While we didn't use Hangtight during the trial period, we have previously worked with the incorporation and have nothing but good things to say about their communication and work ethics. We adore the creators of the app and have noticed that they really care about the



collaborative nature between their company and regions. We fully support this agreement.

- iv. NE | NEACURH believes that this will help regions that don't have policy about conference apps and will help to standardize these policies. However we would have liked the piece to outline the bare minimum that the hangtight app would provide like channels how spirit can be used etc. Overall NEACURH is in support of this piece.
- v. CA | YTR to SA
- vi. GL | Motion to exhaust without additions
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- vii. IA | The Intermountain does have some concerns regarding buy-in of Hangtight, as a few of our regional conference chairs were apprehensive to use it during the trial period. Nonetheless, in hearing other regions' positive experiences with the partner, we are willing to confirm the contract but with some caution.
- viii. SA | YTR
- c. Voting
 - i. GL | Motion to vote by general consent
 - 1. Dissent | None
 - ii. Corporate Sponsorship is approved

7. SA | Motion to play IceJJFish for the Joint Boards

- a. Second | SW
- b. Dissent | GL
 - i. We have a lot of business to get through and think we can do that on our own time
 - ii. SW retracts
 - iii. SA retracts

8. [NBD 26-45 Bid Accessibility Clarifications and Award Bid Policy Updates](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-45 to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | SA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the piece
 - i. Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent
 - 1. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent Speech
 - i. Carson Markovic, NCO Director | This is the first piece of a few that aims to address issues that have come up with award bids at the NACURH level. These pieces are not contingent on one



another passing, but the history and reason for these pieces remain closely the same. The NCO ADRE handles the NACURH Annual Conference award bidding process and throughout this year, the NCO received many questions throughout both the Program of the Year process and the Annual Conference process relating to award bidding policy. This piece aims to clean up language and policy relating to accessibility policies on both award bids and bids for Executive Committee elections. Both types of bids currently follow closely related policy that is listed in two separate places in the NACURH Policy Book, adding a layer of redundancy to our policy. These bid types should follow exact policy, so Executive Committee bids are being treated as a type of award bid and follow the same accessibility policies. In addition, various changes are being proposed to clean up award bidding policy holistically. These changes do not make major swings to policies but better reflect practices and a general policy of having clean policies that institutions can understand. I am happy to answer any questions about these changes and yield the rest of my time.

d. Q&A

- i. NE | How do you know if copyright material is adapted 20%, and where did 20% come from?
 1. NCO Director | That was already in policy. It's highlighted yellow because it was moved, but it's been in policy for a few years. The 20% is on the region to determine. It's not something I'm proposing adding.
- ii. CA | Why did you decide to remove the statement "current student members of NACURH Leadership may not participate in the writing or presentation of NACURH Award Bids"?
 1. NCO Director | That was removed because the statement underneath it largely says the same thing. The statement below states that only current members can write awards and is open to multiple interpretations. That point (e) is basically saying the same as point d.
- iii. IA | YTR to NE
- iv. SA | The South Atlantic was curious if the author had intentions for this piece's language to be trickled down into regional policy books?
 1. NCO Director | Yes*. *I have a future piece that is not contingent on this piece passing, that would trickle down to the regional policy. We could add a clause that allows this to trickle down, in case the other were not to pass, we



- could.
- v. GL | Motion to exhaust the speaker's list with additions
 - 1. Second | SA
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - 3. NCO Director |
 - vi. NE | YTR to GL
 - e. Discussion
 - i. CA | Motion to caucus for 3 minutes
 - 1. Second | SA
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - ii. NE | NEACURH believes this piece is helpful for clearing up the policybook, and making language more clear. However we are concerned that requiring a regional letter of support for individual awards will limit the amount of award bids submitted. Overall NEACURH supports this piece.
 - ~~iii. SA | motion to exhaust the speakers list without additions~~
 - ~~1. Second | NE~~
 - 2. Dissent | CA
 - a. NE Retracts
 - b. SA Reclaims their time
 - iv. SA | The South Atlantic supports this piece as it provides necessary and straightforward updates that modernize and clarify existing language without introducing major structural changes.
 - v. IA | The Intermountain region is in support of this piece, as we believe it effectively aligns executive bid accessibility requirements with the same standards applied to other award bids. We also believe this piece is successful in removing duplicated language, clarifying policy check timelines, and establishing clearer procedures for the return and correction of bids following violations. We also appreciate the expansion of disqualification discretion from the Chairperson to the Executive Committee.
 - vi. CA | Motion to amend NACURH Leadership Nomination Eligibility section to remove point E and replace it with "Current members of NACURH Leadership may not participate in the creation and/or writing process of NACURH Award Bids. Exceptions to this include the following categories:":
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Accepted as friendly.
 - vii. SA | Motion to end Discussion
 - 1. Second | CA
 - 2. Dissent | None



- f. Voting
 - i. NCO moves to vote by acclamation.
 - 1. Dissent | None
 - ii. The piece passes
- 9. [NBD 26-46 Establishment of the NACURH Award Bid Guide](#)
 - a. Motion to bring NBD 26-46 to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | NE
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - b. Reading of the piece
 - i. Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent
 - 1. Dissent | None
 - c. Proponent Speech
 - i. Carson Markovic, NCO Director | As the whereas statements share, award bid policy is currently split between the NACURH and NRHH Policy Books. This split makes it difficult for NACURH to compile policy for resources and communication with institutions and for institutions to access these policies. This piece establishes the formal NACURH Award Bid Guide, a document that has largely been practiced in years past. This document acts similarly to the Operations Manual and undergoes a separate edit/amendment process to the NACURH Policy Book. The Award Bid Guide is approved by the NBD during the Annual Business Meeting to be released for the upcoming affiliation year. This approval process should act as a form of accountability for the new NACURH Associate for Programs, as the NAP has the discretion to make changes to award bid criteria and requirements aside from editing the purpose of an award bid - that still would require formal legislation approval. I do not foresee any edits to be major in scope, but that edits could or would reflect the interest or needs of NACURH in terms of information gleaned from award bids. An example may be a larger shift in OTM involvement for NRHH award categories or potential removal of regional hosting as being criteria for selection in some categories. These changes can also be made by members of NACURH Leadership and would be submitted to the NAP for consideration/inclusion in the version of the Award Bid Guide that the NBD would see. This new Award Bid Guide would be available for all institutions to view early on in the summer, and with work done by the NAE this Spring, would allow for greater visibility of our award policies. Lastly, having the Award Bid Guide approved as the start of the NAP's term would reduce workload for them and would allow them to start to plan



programming efforts and other bidding educational opportunities.

d. Q&A

- i. RFI - PA | Can an amendment of the NRHH Policybook happen in this boardroom?
 1. NCO Director | Earlier this year, there was legislation that created a process to amend both policy books in the same piece of legislation. It requires a simple majority vote to take place. NBD 26-02.
- ii. SA | The South Atlantic was curious if there has been any thought to making a bid guide resource based off policy as an additional resource document instead of completely removing policy and changing it every year?
 1. NCO Director | We worked to do that before and compile the bid information guide which is basically just copying and pasting all of the policy relating to the annual conference. I can pull the stats for how people have looked at the guide, but it could be helpful to send out early out in the newsletter as a smaller guide rather than sending out the entire policy book.
 2. NAO | The more places we have the same policy, once something is updated, the more places we have to update it. Sometimes, things are missed in those cases and our policy becomes conflicting.
- iii. IA | Would this preclude regions from publishing their own bid guides for national award bids? Or would regions be expected to just promote this one?
 1. NCO Director | The hope would be that there would just be one for consistency in communication. Regions are encouraged to say "check this resource" currently with the current bid guide. For consistency's sake, I would see it better to just have one that regions can send people to.
- iv. PA | Why is an additional guide being created, rather than the Operations Manual?
 1. NCO Director | Operations manual is internal for NACURH Leadership and isn't accessible for institutions. The point of this was to be able for the boards to talk about the guide rather than just the policy and practices committee. This would also be promotable and not password protected.
- v. CA | Would the guide be able to be amended throughout the year? Or is the idea just to have this presented at ABM, and then remain the same for the year?



1. NCO Director | The intent at this point is to have it approved for the upcoming year without any amendment process. It would be easier for a promotional sake so that they have the criteria and know what they're writing when it comes to the national award bids.
- vi. NE | Motion to exhaust the speakers list without additions
 1. Second | SA
 2. Dissent | None
- vii. IA | IA was curious as to why the Dr. Averill award was changed from NACURH Dr. Valerie Averill to Dr. Valerie Averill NACURH? Is there a specific reason for this clerical change?
 1. NCO Director | That was a creative take. The Dr. Jen O'brien NRHH Advisor is that way, so I wanted to make sure they had the same naming format.
- viii. PA | For the NRHH Policybook changes, the PA was wondering if you spoke with the NAN and NAE about these changes?
 1. NCO Director | There was not. The NAP would be an NRHH executive and when thinking about who would manage it would be in that realm but that was just so people weren't looking multiple places for policies.
- ix. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering if the guide is supposed to be the central hub for all award bid criteria, wouldn't that make regional policy books redundant and need major updates? Knowing this, what support would be in place to ensure bidding COs and boards know how to successfully implement the changes needed for this to be successful?
 1. NCO Director | The resolution after this would align NACURH and regional bidding policies. These are not contingent. Regions would be able to update as needed. In that piece, I mention that I would work with the NAP and RBDs/SEC to ensure that there is support and intentional communication about languages on a regional basis.
- x. SA | What metrics or feedback processes will determine whether this new guide structure is successful after implementation?
 1. NCO Director | It's listed as a draft as a google doc. It could be moved to another platform like Canva to be more creative. In Canva, you can track usage as a type of assessment. In a NACURH lens, if there are a lot of questions, we know changes need to be made. On a regional level, hurdles will be informal ways to identify success or failure. It could be a part of NSPA going forward, as well.



- xi. PA | We would like to ask for the guide since most institutions refer to policy for how to do things, how will you make sure that the guide is always updated to ensure it's accurate with policy?
 - 1. NCO Director | In writing this, there was not a section that established the formal guide as a document. If you open the piece, the section 2 almost didn't exist. In speaking with the NAO, we determined that including this to ensure regions know the expectation and they keep us accountable. If passed at ABM, it will be included in corporate updates. Execs can also hold one another accountable.
 - xii. IA | The Intermountain was wondering why the piece maintains the purpose statements within the policybook?
 - 1. NCO Director | The guide itself should hopefully not be majorly changed year to year, but will change. The purpose of award bids should remain the same, so that if the purpose would need to be changed for some reason, then formal legislation will still be heard and there is still an approval process. The hope is that any changes that are being proposed should still be in line with the purpose outlined in policy.
 - 2. NAO | The purpose of the award bids haven't changed for a long time. The things we change is the things in the award bid guide. It can still exist in the award bid guide but it would have to go through a process to make sure they're meeting accessibility and other guidelines so that everything is being met.
- e. Discussion
 - i. SA | The South Atlantic is strongly against this piece and implores the other entities present to see the value of keeping bidding information in policy for our delegates. Bidding information being removed from policy and being completely re-voted on every year will create undue strain on both delegates and regional bidding coordinators who rely on consistent bidding policy. Many of our delegates rely on our policy book as the end-all, be-all, expanded version of our regional bid guides and removing the bidding information from our policy book in the trickle-down from this and only keeping our regional level bids would lead to more confusion. This change would also make standardization of bidding policy more difficult if regions cannot easily keep bidding information in their policy books due to it being revoted on every year. Many bidding COs and regional boards work off of policy to



create and consistently update their processes and resources, and having to hold off on all changes until a new document is released each year puts more undue pressure on them. Furthermore, having to wait until ABM to make any alterations to bidding policy will create an omnibus where boards cannot look at each change with intentionality to decide if it works best for their region. Having checks in place to ensure that bidding policy can be changed year-round and that each change is voted on individually preserves the original intention of each bid and prevents drastic changes from altering the entire bidding process all at once. Having bid criteria completely revoted on every year and not living in policy can further detract from the value of bid awards, as nominees will be held to different standards based on the year they won. While we believe that a resource with just bidding policy could be helpful, ultimately, we do not have confidence that this document will be easy to find based on current practices around separating policy into guides/manuals (which has led to confusion and inability to locate/enforce/interpret important policies) and we believe that a guide should not replace the existing policy that preserves these awards and enables a seamless experience for delegates looking for bidding information.

- ii. IA | Motion to caucus for 5 minutes
 - 1. Second | CA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- iii. NCO | The NCO was initially in support of this piece, but is now indifferent after hearing the South Atlantic's point in discussion. We do believe that having annual approvals will not dramatically effect needed changes as these award purposes don't typically have variations and past patterns have shown minor changes overall. The NCO would like to hear from more entities before making a formal decision.
- iv. CA | The Central Atlantic is hesitant about this piece due to the guide needing to be reviewed and updated by the NACURH execs before ABM. We would like to hear from other regions if they have hesitations about the sustainability of the guide and if this is the right direction to go for bidding policies. However, we do appreciate putting the existence of the guide into policy, but we think this should serve as an additional resource to policy, not the policy itself. We could be swayed either way right now, but we remain hesitant to pass this because of our fears of future boards not being able to review and update the guide before ABM so



that the guide can be released in a timely manner and fulfill the intentions of the guide.

- v. PA | The Pacific agrees with SA as this piece of legislation only brings about problems that will separate the guide from actual rules, a.k.a the policy books. Furthermore, institutions in our region have expressed they do not like bid guides as many times bid guides are out of alignment with policy. While we see some value in a separate guide, ultimately creating more guides and manuals will only seek to confuse the process, not clarify it. For that reason the pacific is against this piece as it stands.
- vi. NE | Motion to exhaust the speaker's list with additions
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- vii. GL | YTR
- viii. IA | The Intermountain region is in support of this piece, as we believe it better centralizes award bidding policies and criteria through the formal establishment of the NACURH Award Bid Guide. We appreciate the removal of duplicated award language between the NACURH and NRHH Policy Books as well as the creation of an annual approval process for the Guide through the NBD. Additionally, we believe moving detailed criteria and required elements outside of formal policy will allow for more intentional and efficient updates to award resources while maintaining clear organizational oversight.
- ix. SA | The South Atlantic wanted to express our further concern of this piece as this piece is contingent on the NCC approval of the NAP during Corporate as the author mentioned multiple times during Q/A that the NAP would assist/support in the implementation and execution of this guide. It's difficult to put into policy something that's based off a position that doesn't exist *yet*. We're also concerned that the incoming NAP isn't able to advocate for their position responsibilities and time constraints, even though this position is new to all of NACURH. Again, we're strongly against this piece.
- x. POC | NCO Director | This isn't contingent on the NAP position being passed, it would be supported by whomever supports the award bidding process this year, regardless of who.
- xi. IA | Moves to amend sections 7 and 9 to read "NACURH Dr. Valerie Averill" and "NACURH Dr. Jen O'Brien".
 - 1. Second | NE
 - 2. Dissent | CA
 - a. There's a bit of inconsistency with the purpose (7.i),



- the NACURH would need to be in the front.
- b. Retracted, due to clerical.
- c. Discussion
 - i. IA | The whole point of this amendment is to help streamline the process and ensure there is consistency in title across different areas of
 - ii. NE | Motion to end discussion
 - 1. Second | CA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- d. Voting
 - i. 7-2-0, Outcome
- f. Voting
 - i. 2-7-0, the piece fails.

10. NE | Motion to move to groove for 5 minutes

- a. Second | PA
- b. Dissent | None

11. Motion to recess until May 20 at 1:30 PM CST | SA

- a. Second | NE
- b. Dissent | None

12. Roll Call - Called to order at 1:40 PM CST

Roll Call					
	Director	Finance Officer	ADNRHH	NACURH Exec	
CAACURH	x	-	x	Chairperson	x
GLACURH	x	x	x	NAO	x
IACURH	x	x	x	NAN	x
MACURH	x	x	x	NAE	x
NEACURH	x	-	-	Advisor	x
PACURH	x	x	-	NRHH Advisor	x
SAACURH	x	x	x	CRC	-
SWACURH	x	x	x	ART	-
NCO	x	x	x	ADC	-



	Chair	NBD Liaison	Finance Chair
AC	-	-	-

Quorum is present

13. Who's Who | ABM 2026 Lifeline

- a. Minutes | Parrama/Carson/Orin/Nate
- b. Speakers List | Jamie
- c. Timer Keeper | Cade/Minute Keepers
- d. Parliamentarian | Orin

14. Gold Pin - Cade

15. [NACURH 2026-2029 Strategic Plan](#)

- a. Motion to bring NACURH 2026-2029 Strategic Plan to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | NE
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the piece
 - i. Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent
 1. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent Speech
 - i. Morgan Lakey, Nate Lilla, Carson Markovic, Isha Khirwadkar | As many of you know, the 24-27 strategic plan was voted to be disassembled this year, and a committee was formed to write the 2026-2029 Strategic plan. It was formed of 19 individuals over a month-long period. This plan was intentionally designed to be flexible and able to grow alongside the evolving needs of our organization. Rather than serving as a set of strict directives, it provides overarching goals and guiding initiatives, allowing each year's leadership to determine the specific steps needed to move the organization forward. Each year, the Executive Team and Boards will develop annual priorities aligned with the plan, outlining what they hope to accomplish during their term. While some goals within the document are more concrete than others, the overall purpose of this strategic plan is to provide a broad, adaptable vision for NACURH, one that can respond to changing circumstances while maintaining organizational direction. Most importantly, this is intended to be a living vision that leaders at every level of NACURH can contribute to and shape over time. I'll now pass it to Nate to discuss the structure of the plan.
 - ii. The NACURH 2026-2029 Strategic plan is structured as a layered planning document that begins with the purpose and context of



the plan, then moves into broad organizational focus areas, followed by more strategic priorities and implementation ideas. Each major section uses consistent headings and subheadings to guide readers from high-level goals into supporting concepts and recommendations. The document relies on narrative explanation paired with bullet points to balance vision-setting with practical direction over topics deemed important by the committee and NACURH Leadership at large. It is also designed to be cyclical, encouraging annual review and adaptation rather than serving as a fixed operational manual. Overall, the structure creates a framework that is organized, flexible, and easy for future leadership teams to build on for the next three years, and now Carson and Isha are going to explain how it's broken up.

- iii. This new Strategic Plan includes a rough action plan that was left flexible so that each year's Executive Committee and NACURH Leadership at-large can implement this Strategic Plan as they see fit. This Action Plan includes the recommendation of creating a year-to-year plan that guides the vision for NACURH Leadership. The Committee found that a year-to-year evaluation was the best decision for this Strategic Plan instead of a rigid "here is what NACURH should focus on this year" approach. This Action Plan also includes three primary initiatives that guide implementation and completion of the four (4) Focus Areas: NACURH Leadership, Affiliation Value, Communication & Branding, and Corporate Sustainability.
- iv. Resource Creation & Simplification is a general initiative for all resources created/generated by the regions and NACURH such that all resources are available and accessible. This initiative is also wrapped in with affiliation value meaning that resources should provide an inherent value to institutions affiliated with NACURH. Branding Guidance & Structure is meant to provide consistent branding expectations and guidance for NACURH and the regions. Communication and Engagement ensures that institutions are receiving consistent, thorough, and thoughtful communications about the corporation. This mainly falls to the NAE as the Chief Marketing Officer, but is the responsibility of all of the NACURH Executive Committee and NACURH Leadership to be a part of that process.
- v. The NACURH Leadership focus area of this Strategic Plan emphasizes the importance of supporting members of NACURH Leadership. Processes & Procedures covers consistent recruitment of NACURH Leadership members, thinking about the perceived



pipeline of campus involvement to regional leadership and potentially up to NACURH-level leadership. Other areas of this sub-topic include making sure that role expectations and commitments are transparent for those who wish to get involved, establishing a healthy leadership culture, and making processes across the board more efficient and user friendly. The Educating & Transition sub-topic focuses heavily on what education are we providing to NACURH Leadership members throughout their transition into their roles and what continuing education looks like based on position. Some topics proposed for education include legal and financial concepts so that Leadership members can better answer questions, provide guidance, or divert questions to an appropriate source. The last sub-topic in this Focus Area is about creating inter-regional unity and unity between the affiliates and the Executive Committee. This sub-topic also ensures that advisors are trained and onboarded so that there is support given to advisors, formally through ART tracks and informally through resources or conversations.

- vi. The first section of this plan emphasizes Affiliation Value. With regards to Clarifying The Value Of Affiliation, the committee highlighted the importance of institutions understanding the benefits that they receive from affiliation and the importance of promoting those benefits through programming. Another key focus within the clarification of value was the Value Ratio, and more specifically an evaluation of the trade off between affiliation cost and benefits. We recommend that NACURH prioritize high-impact relationships while re-evaluating those which do not meet expectations. In terms of increasing affiliation value, we recommend the future boards to invest in a program expansion, especially outside of conference. We identified that one consistent area of feedback is a lack of leadership development outside of conferences so we recommend that the boards develop a structured, year-round leadership development series. Further, we recommend reinvesting in NACURH alumni and keeping them engaged via in person and virtual volunteer opportunities. In the Resource Generation as well as Accessibility & Exclusivity we propose that Leadership collaborate across all levels of NACURH to create resources that provide development, striking a balance between resources that are accessible and easy to navigate, but still exclusive to our membership. Finally, we recommend an expansion of the ART program, to continue and support our advisors.



- vii. The next section focuses on communication, outreach, and branding. One of the committee's primary priorities was strengthening direct-to-delegate communication. We aimed to reduce barriers and create clearer, more accessible channels that allow information to flow directly to the people we serve. Another key focus was establishing communication structures that align messaging across all levels of the organization and promote consistent information sharing. Strong record-keeping also plays a critical role in these outreach efforts, ensuring that institutional knowledge and relationships are maintained from year to year. In terms of resources, the plan emphasizes expanding partnerships and collaboration with professional organizations. Strengthening these relationships allows NACURH to build meaningful connections with unaffiliated institutions through in-person, virtual, and asynchronous engagement opportunities. Providing leaders with shared talking points and resources will help ensure institutions receive clear, accurate, and consistent information about involvement in NACURH. From a marketing perspective, NACURH will work toward establishing shared baseline expectations for marketing and communication practices across both corporate and regional levels, creating a more unified organizational identity.
 - viii. The corporate sustainability section focuses on ensuring NACURH can continue to grow and adapt while remaining financially stable, collaborative and accessible for future generations of student leaders. This section emphasizes defining clear organizational values, expanding revenue opportunities beyond traditional funding sources, and strengthening partnerships that support NACURH's missions and long-term impact. It also highlights the importance of stronger collaboration between regions, encouraging shared resources, communication, and consistency while still preserving each region's individual identity. In addition the section recognized the need for NACURH to remain flexible in response to changes within higher education and organizational leadership through ongoing assessment and adaptation. Finally, it focuses on making conferences more sustainable and accessible by reducing burdens on host institutions, improving support systems, and prioritizing accessibility and compliance for all attendees. We are happy to answer any questions you all have!
- d. Q&A
 - i. RFI | IA | Does this apply to what was discussed in NRHH Corporate yesterday?



1. NAN | No.
- ii. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering how the implementation of a standardized NACURH brand would affect regional brands and what that would look like?
 1. SA Director | If this passes Corporate, with the distribution of COs between the NAE, NAP, and NAA, there will be more opportunities for communication and allow for more collaboration.
- iii. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering, in your opinion, what is the “ideal state” of NACURH in 2029 if this strategic plan is fully successful?
 1. PA Director | When we developed this plan, there was some consideration about what influenced the original plan we had. Something that consistently came up was the topic of engagement and ensuring people know what NACURH is and does. The ideal state is ensuring we are connecting to our affiliates.
- iv. PA | How will you ensure that institutions are aware of the value of NACURH and how would you go about measuring that?
 1. PA Director | The evaluation: the focus is about serving institutions and trying to understand what they think about NACURH and what we provide. For communication, we would ensure that the benefits of NACURH are promoted in a consistent way.
- v. NE | Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions
 1. Second | CA
 2. Dissent | None
- vi. SA | The South Atlantic has noticed the declining in affiliation numbers over the years, raising the question of “why affiliate?” How will NACURH ensure that increased programming does not unintentionally raise barriers to participation, especially when regional board members are implementing the programming region wide?
 1. SA Director | So, for clarification, when you say barriers to participation, can you expand?
 - a. SA | Within your proponent speech, you mentioned that you wanted to raise programming efforts, as students there are often barriers that arise (e.g. lack of ability to attend, feel engaged, feeling excluded).
 - i. SA Director | Part of what we discussed was that there are sometimes barriers due to timezones and other things. We determined



that increasing programming makes more options and is therefore more accessible. We also talked about asynchronous programming and direct-to-delegate communication and communicating more with regions and fostering collaboration on all sides.

- ii. PA Director | Part of the vision for increasing programming was also to increase the buy-in from students who are attending the programs so they are more inclined to attend or engage.

e. Discussion

- i. MA | The Midwest region fully supports the 2026–2029 Strategic Plan. We believe the four core focus areas provide meaningful direction as NACURH continues to evaluate and shape its future. Prioritizing the organization's value is especially important, as many institutions in our region are navigating decreasing levels of institutional support. As such, we are particularly invested in the continued exploration and development of the value ratio. Additionally, fostering stronger alumni engagement and creating more opportunities for collaboration beyond conference settings will be critical in supporting NACURH's continued growth and impact. Overall, we sincerely appreciate the committee's dedication and hard work in developing this strategic plan.
- ii. IA | The Intermountain Region is in favor of this strategic plan, as we believe the development of NACURH resources, such as procedural guides, alongside improvements in communication, transparency, and organizational expectations, will better support student leader success and foster long-term organizational growth. Additionally, we believe that clarifying affiliation expectations and NACURH's core values will demonstrate a stronger and more intentional value to member institutions.
- iii. GL | Moves to exhaust the speakers list with additions
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- iv. SA | YTR

f. Voting

- i. GL moves to vote by acclamation
 - 1. No dissent
- ii. The Strategic Plan passes!

16. [2026-2027 NACURH Associate for Administration Confirmation](#)



- a. Motion to bring NAA Confirmation to the floor | NE
 - i. Second | MA
 - ii. ~~Dissent | PA~~
 - 1. ~~Same dissent as the NAP Confirmation~~
 - 2. Dissent is not entertained by the Chair
- b. Presentation by Selection Committee & Candidate
 - i. Selection Committee Representative | Carson was chosen by the selection committee because of his strong ideas for merchandising and affiliation. His strong ideas for the affiliation database and establishing effective inventory processes for merchandise will be helpful in establishing this new exec role. Carson also exhibited strong leadership ideas for engaging with CO's and other members of the exec committee.
 - ii. Carson | I want to keep this brief and really focus on things that may not come through throughout my application. I applied for this role because I see the need to continue to evolve and expand on the two main roles of the NAA: affiliation and merchandising. My role, NCO Director, is the primary position that oversees the affiliation process. Stepping into this role in November, I started to notice areas of the affiliation process that needed fixing. I have been able to make some changes to the affiliation process that hopefully will create a smooth experience for institutions and for the Executive Committee in managing the backend of the process. There is still work to be done with affiliation, indicated in my application, the 26-29 Strategic Plan, and various conversations I have had with NACURH Leadership. I stated this in my application and interview, but want to reaffirm my want to pursue an agreement to establish an Affiliation Database. This Database would help with many aspects of NACURH and institutional affiliation including a location for institutional NRHH Membership Lists to exist and potential personalized login information for NACURH Governing Documents. In my application you can see some goals with merchandise, but I will leave any clarifications to Q&A.
- c. Q&A
 - i. NE | Could you briefly elaborate on the affiliation database?
 - 1. Carson | It would hopefully be a hub for affiliation information for institutions, so that they can hopefully not have to go through the entire process to reaffiliate. It could host payment. It would all be in one place. Hopefully if it was in an agreement with the current people making the OTM Database, we could create agreements to



- cross-information. Contact information, resources, etc.
- ii. SA | The South Atlantic noticed that you've served in many leadership roles very quickly over the last few years. How have those transitions shaped your leadership style, and how would you ensure sustainability and delegation in this role, especially during high-demand times like affiliation and conference season?
 - 1. Carson | The transitions have been a little difficult, to be truthful. But it has helped me figure out how to transition effectively and know what information is going to be needed depending on the responsibilities. I think the information I have from the NCO will help in that transition. And I know that through any transition, I have a team behind me giving me support and guidance. Affiliation is really an all-year thing. Thankfully, going into this year, it's consistent management. With merchandise, it will be more collaborative with the regions now, so communication will be important. Knowing where that support is needed, will need me to rely on regions.
 - iii. MA | How are you planning on working with the newly established ORC on affiliation?
 - 1. Carson | I think since that process hasn't happened yet, this is hypothetical. The way I see it currently, is the ORC does the initial outreach, and the NAA will work with them once they've indicated interest. It's largely a hand-off, but there will be collaboration surrounding benefits, timelines, and policies. The ORC is about the relationship side and the NAA is about the management of policies.
 - iv. NE | Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - v. RFI | PA | Are we allowed to direct questions to the selection committee?
 - 1. Chair | About the process, yes. If you're concerned about how the candidate was selected, then you can.
 - vi. PA | Since there were no interview materials released, could the selections committee share the questions they asked?
 - 1. Cade | With every selection we do, we don't send out the interview information. We allow the candidate to cater their application to go out for business. We won't be sharing any more information than that, because the interviews don't allow the candidates to present themselves as intentionally.



- vii. NCO | How are you wanting to shape the role over this next year, and how do you foresee it looking after your term is over?
1. Carson | This next year would really be about discovery and exploration mostly on the merchandise side. Affiliation, if we got the database, would be a separate thing. Affiliation is really in a good place. There are a lot of changes happening with regions handling merchandise, fulfillment, and inventory – I'd like to help shape that. We should evaluate if there's a way for NACURH to support regional merchandise in place of the NCO allocation. We also want to focus on what the NACURH Store will look like. After the first year, I want to leave with a strong, multi-year, foundation. There will be inadvertent things that come up, especially in the first year.
- viii. SA | The South Atlantic noticed that you discussed creating an Affiliation Database potentially through RoomPact. What would be your first step in evaluating whether that partnership is feasible, and how would you ensure regions and institutions use this database effectively?
1. Carson | The first step is definitely racing out to see if that's something they can provide and if it works for us. I would be leaning on others, as I don't have a lot of experience in working with external companies. I would want to see what would benefit us in the development and maintenance of that. We also want to ask what we're offering to the regions and institutions to ensure this is effective.
 - a. SA | Is there consideration to go through Azumo?
 - i. Carson | I named RoomPact because I've had conversations with a few of the current execs and that's something they've considered. I'm leaving all options open, but this is something that's been mentioned as an option.
- ix. PA | Since the new roles, the NAA and NAP, is essentially converging the NCO roles into two, and especially as the NAA, the system of merchandise and affiliation systems can become unstable very quickly (i.e. online store disorganization, customer service for institutions), so the question is how would you go about establishing systems that are long-term sustainable in a singular role.
1. Carson | On the affiliation front, the NAA is the main person doing that work. On the back end, this includes the NAO, the Advisor, the NAN, and now the NAP. If there's



something that's disorganized, there are multiple people supporting the process so it's easier to catch. On the merchandising front, because it's more on the regional autonomy; but with shipping and pending host sites, there may be disorganization. We don't know what that will look like, so I don't have a clear answer, but there is support from the execs and the regions.

a. PA | To clarify, this question was about the current systems that are in place. Such as: the airtable, current merchandise processes, etc. How wouldn't you go about converging all of those tasks to one person.

i. Carson | It's multiple people currently, and it still will be regardless of the NCO or exec committee.

ii. NAO | The system will still be in the same place. Right now that's one person who manages that. Most other tasks are overseen by both the NCO and execs for different parts of the tasks. That will still continue.

x. NE | YTR

xi. SA | YTR

xii. PA | YTR

d. Discussion

i. SW | The Southwest would like to voice their support for Carson coming into the new NAA position. We appreciated hearing not only his new ideas on continuing past efforts, but willingness to learn the parts of the position that are new to him. We also believe that having an affiliation database will make the process easier and more streamlined, encouraging more institutions to affiliate. It also makes the buy-in for NACURH more apparent and clear with the affiliation database, which aligns with NACURH's overall goals. Overall, we believe that Carson is a strong candidate for NAA and are excited to see how he will refine the merchandise and affiliation process to benefit NACURH as a whole.

ii. NCO | Carson stands as a phenomenal candidate for the NAA role. His improvements throughout the year with affiliation through his role as the NCO director and his ideas for the affiliation database are both amazing and will continue to lead to very beneficial improvements. Echoing Carson's points within his proponent speech, the NCO has ran into a multitude of hurdles and obstacles that Carson has strong solutions for such as a new inventory



management system. Carson's goals throughout this next year also align perfectly with what the NCO believes should be focused on and improved on in this role, which is based on our entity. Carson has also heavily enhanced his knowledge within his time in NACURH through his positions and has worked to make intentional efforts throughout his experience as a whole. Additionally, Carson is ambitious to make meaningful progress in this new role and we believe he will make tremendous impacts to the entirety of NACURH. The NCO could not think of a more qualified candidate for this position.

- iii. MA | YTR
 - iv. SA | Motion to exhaust the speakers list without additions.
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - v. IA | The Intermountain region supports Carson Markovic for the NAA position due to his extensive experience across the institutional, regional, and NACURH levels, particularly his direct involvement with affiliation processes through his service as NCO Director and ADRE. We appreciate his clear vision for improving affiliation accessibility through the development of an Affiliation Database and stronger institutional resource connections. Additionally, his focus on organizational systems, communication, and long-term operational sustainability demonstrates a strong understanding of the evolving needs of NACURH and its affiliates.
 - vi. NE | YTR
 - vii. GL | YTR
 - viii. PA | Although the PA continues to hold great reservations about the process, we still think Carson is a great candidate for this position.
- e. [Voting](#)
- i. A conclusive majority has been reached

17. [NBD 26-50 Membership Dues in Policy](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-50 to the floor | PA
 - i. Second | SA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the piece
 - i. Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent
 - 1. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent Speech
 - i. NAO | This piece moves membership dues from the NACURH Policy Book to the Operations Manual. When affiliation prices



increase in three days, we can note changes. We can include membership dues on the NACURH Website. This would put these dues in two places but allows us to update them as it is relevant and recent.

d. Q&A

- i. CA | Why do we need to move the membership policies out of the policy book to be able to inform institutions that it is changing in the next year?
 1. NAO | It does not change the policies. The only thing we are moving is the specific costs of affiliation. It is already reflected on the NACURH Website. It creates inconsistency if the NAO forgets to update the costs in the Policy Book.
 - a. CA | Are you saying that if we update it on the website before in policy, that would create inconsistency?
 - i. NAO | A piece would have to be heard to update costs in the policy book, which could create confusion since that piece may not be heard until summer and prices would be updated on the website when affiliation opens.
- ii. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering with membership dues being moved out of policy, could you clarify what the revision process would look like moving forward; specifically, would changes to dues still require an NBD vote, or could rates be adjusted administratively without board approval and only the Policy and Practices Committee?
 1. NAO | Affiliation will be required to approve by the joint boards. After 3 years, they will need to be approved by the boards, it will live in the operations manual but will still need boards approval.
- iii. GL | Moves to exhaust with additions
 - ~~1. Second | NE~~
 2. Dissent | CA
 - a. We would like the opportunity to ask more questions.
 - b. NE retracts
 3. Second | SW
 4. Dissent | None
- iv. IA | Motion to caucus for 5 mins
 1. Second | CA
 - ~~2. Dissent | NE~~



- ~~a. Believes we could caucus after Q&A and before discussion.~~
 - i. Dissent is not entertained by the chair.
 - b. Dissent | None
 - v. RFI | MA | In the piece it says that \$20 goes to the NCO budget as we approved, but there is no NCO. How will this be split up?
 - 1. That wasn't reflected in this, but there was a piece that determined that already.
 - vi. CA | YTR
 - vii. IA | YTR
 - viii. SA | YTR
- e. Discussion
 - i. NCO | The NCO supports the passing of this piece. It will allow for less confusion on how affiliation prices change and are reflected as there will be less barriers in communicating to institutions. Additionally, in NACURH bylaws, a vote by the NBD as well two financial memos from the NAO and three financial officers are both required, ensuring the integrity and communication of the current increase process.
 - ii. IA | The Intermountain is in support of this piece because it improves efficiency and flexibility by moving frequently updated operational information, such as membership dues and payment procedures, out of policy and into more easily maintainable resources like the Operations Manual and NACURH website. We believe this will reduce confusion, allow institutions to access more accurate and timely information, and keep the Policy Book focused on broader legislation rather than administrative procedure. We also want to note that the Policies and Practices Committee, which maintains the Operations Manual, is open to all of NACURH Leadership. We are excited to see how this transparency excites more institutions to affiliate.
 - iii. PA | YTR
 - iv. CA | The Central Atlantic was originally against moving membership dues to the operations manual. But after understanding that bylaws state membership dues must be updated every three years and approved by the NBD, we are more in favor of moving the membership dues to the operations manual knowing that the policy and practices committee and nacurh exec committee will not be able to adjust these prices without the NBD approval.
 - v. NE | Motion to exhaust the speakers list without additions



1. Second | SW
2. Dissent | None
- vi. SA | Before walking into this space, similar to the Central Atlantic, the South Atlantic was against the piece because of the notion that changes to membership dues should be approved by the NBD instead of the Policies and Practices Committee within the Operations Manual. Because of this foundation, we support this piece.
- vii. GL | YTR
- viii. PA | YTR
- f. Voting
 - i. GL | Motion to vote by acclamation.
 1. Dissent | None
 - ii. RFI - IA | Would this need a $\frac{2}{3}$ approval?
 1. Parliamentarian | No, that is for budgets or other major financial policies.
 - iii. Piece passes

18. [NBD 26-47 Aligning Regional and NACURH Award Bidding Practices](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-47 to the floor | NE
 - i. Second | NCO
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the piece
 - i. Chair | Waive the reading of the piece by unanimous consent
 1. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent Speech
 - i. Carson Markovic, NCO Director | As stated earlier, the NCO received many questions throughout the award bidding process. While not all questions were due to inconsistencies or conflicts between regional and NACURH award bidding policies, it is clear that there is tension between the two. This piece is a formal resolution in that regions must follow NACURH-level award bidding requirements as a base requirement and that regions may elect to set stricter policy as needed/wanted. As the resolution reads, if regions have any award categories that are region-specific, regions should still follow NACURH-level accessibility guidelines but can adopt their own criteria and requirements. I know this may limit the ability for regions to have direct autonomy over differences in policy, but these differences are actively creating barriers for institutions who want to participate in award bids. I included in this piece that I myself and the incoming NAP would work with regions on the



implementation of this resolution so that regions do not feel like they are navigating this change alone and for the NAP to have the context of the NACURH policies and how they can support NACURH Leadership members who oversee award bidding. I still chose to present this piece, even after questions and discussion on NBD 26-46. If this piece does not pass, it still is a form of feedback for the NAP to use.

d. Q&A

- i. NE | With NBD 26-46 failing to pass, how would that affect this piece?
 1. NCO Director | It doesn't necessarily majorly affect this piece. As it stands right now, regions would adopt what is currently in the NACURH Policybook, rather than the language in 26-46. It doesn't necessarily say anything about the future. That would be up to the author to determine trickle down.
- ii. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering if this piece would be expected to be maintained for every bidding detail, NACURH changes in the future, and how these trickle downs would be communicated out for years to come if so?
 1. NCO Director | I think I kind of just answered that, but this piece doesn't address the future and is more focused on coming into the next affiliation year. The hope is that it will continue to be trickled down.
- iii. PA | Can you give examples without naming the regions of what is the purpose of this piece, for example it was said there was tension between the regions and NACURH, but the Pacific is asking for clarification what actions led to this piece.
 1. NCO Director | In the last few weeks we had long discussions with multiple institutions about letters of support requirements differing. We had at least one institution that ended up not resubmitting based upon differences between policy checks. The differences between requirements and smaller details add up.
- iv. IA | How will NACURH support regions in the implementation of the trickle down?
 1. NCO Director | My vision for that is first working with the NAP and thinking about how to support them. And then sitting with each region and seeing what implementation is needed with the NACURH level. It will be largely case-by-case through a Zoom meeting or two.
- v. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering if this limitation of regional



flexibility reduces the ability of regions to innovate or tailor award processes to their affiliates?

1. NCO Director | Can you explain award processes more?
 - a. SA | More like the process of bidding, period. Requirements, LoS, years, things you need in bids to make them successful or increase impact?
 - i. NCO Director | I would say that much of the bidding process to the NACURH level would be standardized in requirements, but when the bid could be selected and things like that would be up to the region.
- vi. PA | In terms of the NAP role, what is the expectation of how they do this process especially considering that the NAP role is new and will be establishing itself and in addition is there a reason why this wouldn't be a part of the NAO role especially as the policy interceptor?
 1. NCO Director | They could still be involved because it's policy based. The reasoning for the NAP specifically is that they will have all of the context of award bidding and their responsibilities. Since it's not directly impacting NACURH policy, I didn't see the need to have the NAO directly involved.
- vii. PA | Motion to ~~extend by 5 minutes~~ exhaust the speakers list with additions
 - ~~1. Second | CA~~
 - ~~2. Dissent | NE~~
 - ~~a. Could we instead exhaust the speakers list with additions?~~
 3. Second | SW
 4. Dissent | None
- viii. NE | YTR
- ix. SA | The South Atlantic was curious if any feedback mechanisms were used to ask regional opinions on these policies or if there was a way to update these policies from bottom to top?
 1. NCO Director | From a bottom to top perspective, trying to create enough flexibility in the NACURH policy to adapt to regional policy can be difficult. I did not get any opinions from the regions on this, but this is part three of this process of trying to remove barriers of the submission of bids from the regional level to the NACURH level.
- x. PA | Do you foresee trickledown as a problem as many regions have different ways to amend the policy books to align with



NACURH, and some regions may not go along with NACURH's standards, for example some regions just put it in the their policy books while others go through a legislation process?

1. NCO Director | I can foresee that there might be some issues from region to region, but that is why this is written this way and it is intentionally region-by-region support while providing the same language to everyone.

xi. PA | YTR

e. Discussion

i. SA | Motion to caucus for 5 minutes

1. Second | NE
2. Dissent | None

ii. NE | NEACURH appreciates that this piece attempts to promote better consistency and standardization across NACURH and the regions. However we are concerned that this will limit regional independence when it comes to award bid processes, as many regions have practices that differ slightly from NACURH policy that are unique to their regional identity. This is particularly present with how some award winners who win on the regional level do not choose to raise their award to the NACURH level, and while very few, some never intend to raise their award to the NACURH level. NEACURH is strongly against this piece.

iii. IA | Motion to amend the piece to add a "Let it be further resolved statement" that states "the support referenced in the previous resolution be enacted by the author and the incoming NAP no later than August 1st, 2026 to ensure that this piece is executed in a timely manner and that regions have ample time to update their bidding timelines and guides before bid information is released to their stakeholders."

1. Second | GL
2. Author accepts as friendly
3.  NBD 26-47 Aligning Regional and NACURH Award Bid...
(this is included in the original piece)

iv. MA | The Midwest is in full support of this legislation. We appreciate the streamlining of this process, and making it easier for bidding CO's and institutions to bid on the National Level.

v. SW | The Southwest Region fully supports this piece as it makes the regional bidding policy more streamlined and aligned with NACURH policy. The SW is one of the regions that currently has outdated bidding policy that does not align with modern practices, and we've had institutions who have been impacted by this. While our region is continually working to align our bidding



- policies with NACURH policy, having a process set in place will help further guide this process in a more efficient manner.
- vi. GL | The Great Lakes fully supports this piece and thinks that standardizing the NACURH award process with their Regional equivalents will not only make the process of national-level bidding easier, but also make the process more fair and equitable for those bidding. This piece does not touch unique, individual regional awards, but rather ones that have a direct NACURH equivalent. If this piece is not to pass, we think that it will only kick the stone down the path further along to other boards.
 - vii. SA | The South Atlantic is not in favor of this piece as it imposes on regional autonomy to develop their own bidding policy, and the authors did not provide sufficient justification for why regional bids should be standardized in this way. For example, the South Atlantic has a variety of accessibility standards, such as requiring dyslexia-friendly fonts, that we have not seen enforced in practice on the NACURH level, which has made bid reviews difficult for SEC members who rely on dyslexia-friendly fonts. We see value in standardizing bids from the regional level to the national level in hopes that hiccups do not come up, but we believe that this piece isn't a concrete plan, but more of a band-aid. The South Atlantic wonders if all regions are facing these issues, or if singular regions face the problem of resubmitting bids to the national level, knowing that their policies don't fully align with NACURH. Further data would show the trend in hopes that if this does pass, that the NAP and NAA works with those specific regions to fix these issues. We have concerns that if this piece is passed, we would have to dial back our accessibility standards as a region, which would create difficulties for schools that use past bids as a resource. Because of these reasons, we are against this piece.
 - viii. NE | Motion to exhaust the speaker's list with additions
 1. Second | SW
 2. Dissent | None
 - ix. RFI | CA | Does the piece state that you can't have additional requirements, or that you can?
 1. NCO Director | These would be baseline requirements for regions. Regions could have stricter requirements if they wanted to.
 - x. PA | The Pacific believes that this piece is good on concept however its enforceability and implementation are questionable with timelines and steps not seemed to be to indepth. This piece does provide value, but we believe that the piece at its current



standing is not developed enough and will only provide confusion for the new NAP individual who's stepping into the role. We are looking to see what other regions might say.

- xi. IA | The Intermountain region is in support of this piece, as we believe it creates a smoother and more consistent transition for institutions submitting bids from the regional level to NACURH by aligning core award eligibility expectations and providing an opportunity to additionally incorporate original regional guidelines. We appreciate that the legislation still preserves regional flexibility by allowing regions to maintain original award categories and adopt additional guidelines beyond NACURH minimum standards. Alongside, we value the commitment to collaboration and implementation support between NACURH and regional leadership to assist regions in updating governing documents in a timely manner ahead of the upcoming affiliation year. In response to SAACURH, we do want to acknowledge that our region has actually had a separate set of issues regarding representative confusion surrounding the differences between regional and national bids. We believe this piece will help to clarify that confusion. Nevertheless, we do understand SAACURH's concerns and believe that trends surrounding bidding should be addressed

- xii. GL | YTR

- xiii. MA | YTR

- xiv. PA | YTR

- f. Voting

- i. 6-3-0, NBD 26-47 Passes

19. Motion to recess until Semi-Annual Business Meeting 2027 | SW

- a. Second | SA
- b. Dissent | None

20. NACURH Leadership Corporate Info and Business Prep

21. Award Bid Committee Selections

- a. [Award Selections Committee A](#)
- b. [Award Selections Committee B](#)

