



NACURH, Inc.

2021 Corporate Business Meeting

Held Virtually
June 26-27, 2021

Presiding Officer:

Katie Westermeyer
NACURH Chairperson

Minutes Prepared By:

Jacob Durrance
NACURH Associate for Operations

Parliamentarian:

Daniel Rudy
Central Atlantic Affiliate Associate Director for Administration and Finance

Recording Secretaries:

Becca Franssen
Intermountain Affiliate Associate Director for Administration and Finance

Adam Coshal
Northeast Affiliate Regional Director

Corporate Information Session

- I. Call to order: Saturday, June 26, 2021 at 1:10 PM EDT
- II. Roll Call
 - A. Yield to Regional Directors
 - B. 143 institutions present
 - C. 143 NCCs, 83 NRHH Representatives present
 - D. Quorum is reached
- III. General Overview | NACURH Chairperson
- IV. Parliamentary Procedure Overview | Central Atlantic ADAF
 - A. Q&A
 1. Texas State University | What does the vote take for an amendment?
 - a) CA ADAF | Simple majority, regardless of the count of the original piece. For example, an original piece could require 2 / 3 vote, but the amendment proposed only needs a simple majority.
- V. Approval of the 2021 Corporate Business Meeting Agenda
 - A. Moved by Willamette University
 1. 2nd | Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts
 2. No dissent
- VI. Approval of the 2020 Corporate Business Meeting Minutes
 - A. Moved by University of Central Arkansas
 1. 2nd | University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point
 2. No dissent
- VII. Overview of the 2020-2021 NACURH Board of Directors Legislation | NACURH Associate for Operations (NAO) & NACURH Associate for Engagement (NAE)
 - A. Q&A
 1. Florida Gulf Coast University | One of the votes was by acclamation, and we're wondering if you can expand on that?
 - a) NAE | Through discussion, you can tell that there is a clear consensus in the room. During this piece's discussion, our Boards felt that there was a clear consensus in the room in favor of the piece. During that discussion, someone on Boards made the motion to vote by acclamation, which was not dissented to
 2. University of Delaware | As the former host of the NACURH Corporate Office, we wanted to know why the contract from ACUHO-I was dissolved and how the activities of the NCO are being redistributed?
 - a) NAO & NAE | Yield to Chairperson
 - b) Chairperson | When we entered the agreement with ACUHO-I, there were aspirations that they wouldn't just become the next NCO, but that they would take on responsibilities that are beyond



what we should expect student leaders to take on, such as accounting responsibilities and shipping products. This year, working with aCHO-I made us realize that what was written on paper didn't translate well to practice. This wasn't on ACUHO-I or us as NACURH; things just didn't shake out as we envisioned. In discussion with NACURH Leadership and with ACUHO-I, we came to the agreement that this contract was not in the best interest of NACURH at this moment. There is potential for the contract to be revisited in the future, but for now, we have transitioned some of those ACUHO-I responsibilities to the Executive Committee.

3. Virginia Tech | When do these policies go into place?
 - a) NAO & NAE | Yield to Chairperson
 - b) Chairperson | If it's not specified within the piece of legislation itself, then they take place at the end of the affiliation year. Some take place immediately, as written.

VIII. On Campus Marketing | Scott Singleton

A. Q&A

1. Kansas State University | We appreciate you, Scott!! We are just wondering what keeps you coming back to us as our OCM representative?
 - a) OCM | OCM has been a company where ym values and the company's values align very well. I have worked in other companies where that was not the case, and that wasn't good for me. I believe strongly in leadership development in others, and I think that NACURH is a very important tool for that. I do some work with younger people in high school to help with their leadership development. The people with whom I come in contact energize me and keep me coming back. I love following the student journeys, from undergraduate studies to graduate school to professional life. I hope this answers your question.

IX. 4-Year Service Pin Recipients | NACURH Chairperson

X. Regional Board of Directors Vacancy Advertisement | NACURH Chairperson

XI. NACURH OTM Selection Committee Advertisement | NACURH Associate for NRHH

XII. NACURH Store Advertisement | NACURH Advisor

XIII. Preparation for the Corporate Business Meeting | NACURH Chairperson

A. Q&A

1. Virginia Tech | Are there going to be separate links for NCCs, RHA Presidents, and NRHH Reps?



- a) Chairperson | Tomorrow, NRHH Reprs will meet on Annemarie's code, and NCC's and RHA Presidents will be on this code. Both are on the Corporate Website for your reference.
- 2. Florida Atlantic University - Boca Raton | Do you want us to read over the legislation today so we can vote tomorrow?
 - a) Chairperson | Yes. We'll have a roadmap for business tomorrow too.
- 3. Mississippi State University | Just for clarification, where can we go to read up on the legislation?
 - a) Chairperson | It's on the Corporate Website, which has been linked in the Discord for Joint, and it was emailed out, too.
- 4. University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill | Can we receive the legislation that was reviewed at the start of this meeting? I missed some of it, and I want to make sure that I have that all down and prepared.
 - a) Chairperson | We will put that up on the Corporate Website.
 - b) NAN | This will also be available within 45 days after the close of the Annual Conference because it will be released via a NACURH publication.
- 5. University of Central Arkansas | Are there minutes for this meeting?
 - a) Chairperson | We don't do live minutes for these sessions, but we will post these after the close of this conference on the NACURH website.
- 6. Kansas State University | For tomorrow, will NCCs be in a separate space from NRHH?
 - a) Chairperson | NCC's and RHA Presidents can stay together. NRHH Reprs go to a different code.
- 7. Louisiana State University | What happens next for the rest of the day?
 - a) Chairperson | After this, if you look at the schedule, there are other activities going on. Not relevant to Corporate, but we have two Program of the Year presentations, and there are plenty of educational sessions available, too!
 - b) LSU | I've just been lost in joining codes and such because none of the links on the schedule haven't been working for me.
 - c) Chairperson | Okay! After this, try logging onto the Discord server for this conference and go to the Help channel to see if they can support you! You can also check in with your RBD for further assistance, too!

XIV. Recess until Sunday for the Corporate Business Meeting



Corporate Business Meeting

- XV. Call to order: Sunday, June 27, 2021 at 1:10 PM EDT
- XVI. Roll Call
 - A. Yield to Regional Directors
 - B. [#] institutions present
 - C. Quorum is reached
- XVII. Expectations
- XVIII. CORP 21-01 | Gender Neutral Pronouns
 - A. Pittsburg State University | Moves to bring to the floor
 - 1. Eastern Kentucky University | 2nd
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - B. Reading of the Piece | Chairperson
 - 1. Kansas State University | Moves to waive the reading for all pieces in Corporate Business
 - a) Virginia Tech | POI | What is a reading of the piece?
 - (1) Chairperson | We just literally read through every line of the piece
 - b) University of Texas - Austin | 2nd
 - c) Dissent | Virginia Tech | We would like to hear the piece.
 - (1) University of Texas - Austin | Retracts 2nd
 - (2) Kansas State University | Retracts original motion
 - C. Proponent Speech | NAO
 - 1. The background of this piece came from a few years of the past. This has been in the works for a while. We have already replaced many instances of gendered pronouns across many of our documents and resources, but recently, we received feedback from an affiliate in the Intermountain about gendered pronoun usage in the NACURH By-Laws. This piece seeks to make a blanket change in the editing and auditing process. This also allows for future pieces of legislation that use gendered pronouns to be edited to gender-neutral pronouns or to a position, if referenced.
 - D. Q&A
 - 1. Ohio State University | Do RHA Presidents have speaking rights here?
 - a) Chairperson | I am fine with RHA Presidents to have speaking rights here, but you should be working with your NCC to strike a balance. NCC's do hold the vote here.
 - 2. GL Director | POC | GLACURH does not recognize RHA Presidents in business spaces, so that does not apply to you all.



3. University of Colorado - Boulder | If I'm a proxy for the NCC, do I have speaking and voting rights?
 - a) Chairperson | Yes just make sure your director is aware of that.
4. San Jose State University | For the use of gender neutral pronouns, is it just replacing she/he usage in general policy? In what circumstances will gender neutral pronouns be used?
 - a) NAO | There are currently only around 5 specific instances of gendered pronouns in use in our governing documents right now, and they are usually specifically in use in reference to Executive Committee positions. Long story short, you are correct.
5. University of Maryland | When you were explaining the legislation, you talked about using positions in place of gendered pronouns, and I was wondering - since the legislation talked about just solely using gender neutral pronouns and not positional titles - was that part of the legislation or was that something you've done before?
 - a) NAO | I feel like, as someone who interprets policy, it's more of a syntax thing. If you are describing the NACURH Chairperson position, you would use the Chairperson positional title as the reference, not gender-neutral pronouns in this case.
6. Bowling Green State University | Believes that gender neutral and gender inclusive can mean two separate things, so can you explain why you used those two terms separately?
 - a) NAO | That might have been a mistake on my part. The initial piece of legislation was to remove the use of gendered pronouns from the NACURH By-Laws, so that might just be a mistake on my part.
7. Georgia College and State University | Wondering if these changes would require separate legislation to trickle down to the regional level?
 - a) NAO | No, this piece would task regions to ensure that the same is reflected in their governing documents.
8. University at Buffalo | Wonders to whose discretion will it be to decide between the gender neutral pronouns and the positional titles?
 - a) NAO | It would probably be whoever is in my position, the NAO role, because the NAO is the interpreter of the NACURH Governing Documents.
9. Virginia Tech | Have you thought about moving the verbiage of gender neutral pronouns versus positional titles so that it's not one or the other - it's one use and concise?



- a) NAO | This was intentionally generalized because it is supposed to be applied to regional governing documents, too. "Apply" is an umbrella here.
- 10. University of Massachusetts Lowell | Wants to know if there would be a timeline or required date for regional policy to reflect this change as it's not stated in the piece?
 - a) NAO | You're right, there is no timeline on this. Typically, regions have different timelines of when they update their governing documents. I believe that the next update should be before the next Regional Leadership Conference.
- 11. Kansas State | POI | Was it stated whether or not discussion and Q&A periods have a set amount of time?
 - a) Chairperson | I am not tracking that for now because we should have plenty of time, and I want to ensure that we are thorough here. If I feel that we need some crunch time, I will start to track and let you all know.
- 12. University of Maryland | Wanted to double check, you were talking about this piece being an umbrella that includes the positional part that we were discussing. A little confused about how this would be an umbrella covering all of that, because it does specify they/them pronouns when discussing the positional pieces of policy.
 - a) NAO | Essentially, it comes down to syntax. Going back to the example of describing the NACURH Chairperson position, the usage of "they / them" pronouns and the use of the "Chairperson" are describing the same thing in that sentence, so it would come down to syntax.
- 13. Kansas State University | YTR
- 14. University of Massachusetts Lowell | Moves to end Q&A with additions
 - a) California State University - East Bay | 2nd
 - b) Dissent | None
- 15. Missouri University | Wondering since the legislation never specifies replacing positional pronouns with titles, does the author intend to allow this?
 - a) NAO | Yes.
- 16. Colorado State University | We are wondering if it would be possible to have a yearly update with the gendered pronouns that are those of the individuals who currently fill the specific roles within the By-Laws?
 - a) NAO | A short answer to that would be no, because when the bylaws are updated - they're typically updated at the end of our



terms. It's very often seen over the years that there are positions left vacant immediately following the end of the annual conference, so it would be impossible to predict. If you had someone appointed at the end of the annual conference, the bylaws can only be updated here so that also wouldn't work.

17. Pennsylvania State University | POO | Yield, we remembered that we are using a tiered speakers list.
18. Kansas State University | Would like some clarification on the intent of the piece. If this passed, the trickle down effect would automatically update the regional policies, or would regions need to pass their own policies?
 - a) NAO | Since it is trickle-down, there would not need to be additional, regional legislation. Because you all here are passing this, there would not be a need for other pieces of legislation.
19. Georgia College and State University | YTR
20. POC - Virginia Tech | What is a Point of Order used for?
 - a) NACURH Parliamentarian | A Point of Order is used when the way things are proceeding in the boardroom is incorrect. So for example, if someone was skipped over in the speaker's list, that's a good case to make a Point of Order.
21. University of Massachusetts - Lowell | POI | Do we have a live-minutes document that we can review because we've noticed that there have been a couple redundant questions, so for efficiency's sake, we would appreciate it.
 - a) Chairperson | In the future we will instead ask that you all copy and paste your questions into the chat.

E. Discussion

1. Mississippi State University | Would like to recognize and appreciate the use of gender inclusive language throughout this piece.
2. Oakland University | We are in full support of CORP 21-01 for increasing inclusivity throughout NACURH and by putting current practice into policy.
3. University of New Mexico | Believes this is a wonderful piece of legislation, and we believe it's helping to increase inclusivity and recognition at different levels.
4. University of Illinois - Chicago | We are in full support of this piece as it does increase inclusivity, especially because of the trickle down effect.
5. Southern Oregon University | Would like to commend NACURH for creating a piece of legislation that works to include all delegates and all members of NACURH, even those that don't fit within the gender binary.



6. University of Central Missouri | We are in full support of this piece, as it increases inclusivity for those who do not identify with gender-binary pronouns.
 7. Ohio State University | We are in full support. Not only does this piece increase inclusivity, this piece increases accuracy via gender-neutral pronouns.
 8. Case Western Reserve University | Is in full support of this piece. We also appreciate the acknowledgement of the use of syntax wherever applicable to avoid confusion.
 9. Boise State University | We are in full support of this piece of legislation as it is a wonderful marker of our generation and of NACURH as a whole.
 10. Kansas State University | Motion to end discussion with additions
 - a) Grand Valley State University | 2nd
 - b) Dissent | None
 11. West Texas A&M University | We would like to applaud this piece's dedication to inclusivity and for building a safe space for our affiliates.
 12. University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill | Is also in support of this piece as we feel it could lead to encouraging more individuals into pursuing positions.
 13. University at Buffalo | We are fully in support of this piece of legislation for overall readability of policy and for inclusivity of affiliates within NACURH.
 14. POC - University of Maryland | I was going to ask about amendment proposals. How do we go about that?
 - a) Chairperson | Amendments to pieces should be proposed during discussion. I ask that if you are thinking about proposing an amendment that you ask clarifying questions during Q&A to decide if you need to put forward an amendment. We would, then, commence with an ask for second, dissent, and if it goes through, then we would entertain a proponent, Q&A, discussion, and vote for the amendment before returning to the original piece.
 15. POC - Washington State University | Can we call to vote by acclamation?
 - a) Chairperson | I am not going to allow that in this space because the magnitude of this space is too large and I want to ensure your votes are heard.
- F. Vote: 133-00-06, the piece passes!!
1. University of Massachusetts - Lowell | Moves to grove for 3 minutes
 - a) University of North Florida | 2nd



- XIX. CORP 21-02 | Incorporation
- A. Arizona State University - Downtown | Moves to bring to the floor
 - 1. New Jersey Institute of Technology | 2nd
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - B. Reading of the Piece
 - 1. Pennsylvania State University | Moves to waive the reading of CORP 21-02
 - a) University of Wilmington | 2nd
 - b) University of Nebraska - Lincoln | We don't want it waived.
 - (1) Wilmington | 2nd stays.
 - (2) POI - Southern Oregon University | Are we voting on the motion or the dissent?
 - (a) Chairperson | The dissent caused the need to vote on the motion.
 - (b) Southern Oregon University | POI | We have a specific question about the form, so maybe PA Director can fix this?
 - (i) PA Director | I fixed it!
 - (3) Gonzaga | POC | Is that last question for every voting form? We thought that when we voted "yes" on the dissent that we were voting in favor of the dissent.
 - (4) Vote: In the eyes of the chair, we have decided to waive the reading.
 - C. Proponent Speech | NAO
 - 1. This piece is in regards to our incorporation status as a non-profit corporation. NACURH has been a registered non-profit with the state of Oklahoma, since this piece was put into place in 1971. Within our ARTicles of Incorporation, there was a 50-year time limit on the duration of the corporation. This piece would remove the 50-year time limit, and change the time status to "Perpetual." Doing some research into the state of Oklahoma's incorporation policy, no other changes would need to be made.
 - D. Q&A
 - 1. Pittsburg State University | Wondering, with the 50 year cap that it says on this legislation, does that mean that NACURH would have ended 50 years following 1971?
 - a) NAO | The original intent for the 50-year time limit is not known at this time. We do not know why that was decided upon in the



past, but to fix that now, we hope to make NACURH a perpetual non-profit now and moving forward.

2. University of Michigan | Would like to know if there were any benefits to being considered a non-profit in Oklahoma?
 - a) NAO | As far as historical background, we were incorporated in Oklahoma in the past because that is where NACURH was hosted at the time. In general, we do not have to pay taxes, and this non-profit status provides us with financial support and legitimacy of being a non-profit.
3. University of Delaware | Would like to know why the period of duration was originally set for 50 years and not perpetual in the first place?
 - a) NAO | The original intention behind the 50-year time cap is unknown. There aren't many clues as to why it was around in the first place.
4. University of North Florida | Would like to know how the passing or failure of this piece would effect the ability to adopt changes in corporate business meetings as state in the legislation proposal.
 - a) NAO | As far as changes goes, I am not sure what the impact would be if this is not passed and if the 50-year time limit. I would guess that we would lose our non-profit status, though there wouldn't be much change in terms of NCC governing authority, either.
5. University of New Mexico | Curious to know if other states or territories have similar durations?
 - a) NAO | To be honest, I'm not quite sure. I didn't research the corporation policies of other states. But as far as I know, no, it's all internal within NACURH.
6. Colorado School of Mines | YTR
7. Indiana University | YTR
8. Case Western Reserve University | Moves to exhaust the speakers list with additions
 - a) Southern Oregon University | 2nd
 - b) Dissent | None
9. San Jose State University | Will NACURH still be a non-profit organization within Oklahoma or will that status change with this piece of legislation?
 - a) NAO | Yes, we will stay the same.
10. Indiana University of Pennsylvania | YTR



11. Western Illinois University | Since NACURH has grown to be an international corporation, are there any other rules that need to be changed international or internally to maintain our non-profit status?
 - a) NAO | No, because we are headquartered within the States, we should be good. Taxation rules and our 501c3 status maintain in the States, so international affiliates will not be affected.
12. University of Georgia | The mission at our RHA is to directly improve the lives of the residents we represent, so how would this legislation help us achieve that mission?
 - a) NAO | The purpose of this piece is maintain our status as a non-profit. Being recognized as a not-for-profit v. non-profit is a big change, and the fact that we do not have to pay taxes is significant, which benefit our member institutions.
 - b) University of North Florida | POI | Would you also like us to type up discussion points?
 - (1) Chairperson | If you can, yes!

E. Discussion

1. University of Missouri | We are in full support of this piece as it will perpetuate NACURH's non-profit status, which is beneficial to all affiliates.
2. Southern Oregon University | Would like to encourage a yes vote on this legislation as it is continuing the practices that already exist within NACURH and would continue our non-profit status.
3. West Texas A&M | We would like to move to call the question.
 - a) Dissent | Southern Oregon University | We dissent because there is still a member institution on the speakers list.
 - (1) West Texas A&M | May I modify my motion?
 - (a) Chairperson | No, you would have to 'x' in again.
4. Pennsylvania State University | We call the question.
 - a) Dissent | None

F. Vote: 133-01-07, the piece passes!!

XX. Financial Overview | NACURH Associate for Operations

A. Q&A

1. University of North Carolina - Wilmington | I'll preface this by saying I'm not a finance major. When you put the money into the investment account for 10 years, can you move the money out of that account, or are we going to put more money into a different account and the money that currently exists will stay there for 10 years?



- a) NAO | When it comes to our overall investments, our history of investments goes back 10-15 years. That money stays in the investment accounts because they yield dividends that benefit NACURH and its regions. Prior to 2015, NACURH did unregulated investments; there were no policies. The Investment Policy was enacted in 2015 to provide guidance for future Finance Officers within NACURH
 - b) University of North Carolina - Wilmington | So this puts it in perspective for the future, not the present?
 - (1) NAO | Yeah so currently the way we currently do investments is in policy, but if finance officers and the NAO want to propose changes to investment policies, they would be able to do so.
 - 2. Colorado University - Boulder | We have a question on "Professional Fees." What went into that line?
 - a) NAO | A large portion of that amount went into an agreement that we had with ACUHO-i that sought to provide a variety of different services. Since we opted to exit that agreement, in the fall we will likely be making some updates to the budget. The budget will likely have a much lower number for professional fees since we will officially be out of that contract.
 - 3. University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point | Move to end Q&A
 - a) University of North Florida | 2nd
 - b) Dissent | None
- XXI. CORP 21-03 | NACURH NRHH Board Name Change
- A. Oregon State University | Moves to bring to the floor
 - 1. Stonehill College | 2nd
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - B. Reading of the Piece
 - 1. University of Nevada - Reno | Moves to waive the reading
 - a) DePaul University | 2nd
 - b) Dissent | None
 - C. Proponent Speech | NACURH Associate for Engagement & NEACURH ADNRHH
 - 1. NE ADNRHH | My name is Robert. I am the ADNRHH for NEACURH. Today, this piece has been a couple years in the making, and especially in the NNB. Over the past few years, we have seen the responsibilities of the NNB expand to mirror those of the NBD. We think about the big questions for NRHH: for example, "Where do we want to go with NRHH?" We realized that we really do serve as the Board of Directors for



NRHH, and so we propose this name change to show that ownership. We hope that this will fulfill NACURH's mission of empowering, motivating, and equipping NRHH leaders to do more in NACURH.

2. NAE | My name is Noheli and I've been working on this piece for the last year and a half. Last year I served as the PACURH ADNRHH, and through that experience I had the opportunity to work with individuals from other entities who have signed at the end of the piece. The three of us originally worked on this piece and brought it forward at our semi-annual business meeting (2019-2020). Unfortunately, due to time constraints, this piece was not able to be seen in NBD spaces, and therefore, unable to be seen in corporate spaces. However, this year, the piece was passed by both the NNB and the NBD, and that's why it's here with all of you here today. I really want to show you all the intentionality behind this piece, and it has been worked on really intensely with the purpose of identifying the ADNRHs as the ruling body for NRHH on the NACURH level. For example, in PACURH, the ADNRHH is the only ruling body for NRHH because there is not a coordinating officer for NRHH. So, that's where we found the validity in this, and that's why we're seeking to change the name from the NNB, to the NACURH NRHH Board of Directors.

D. Q&A

1. University of Florida | Why would this change increase NNB recognition? How would it make a difference?
 - a) NE ADNRHH | I think it's important to recognize that the NNB is still fairly new in the history of NACURH. I don't remember exactly when the NNB was created, but NRHH has really been developing its vision within NACURH, starting with the NAN role in 2008, utilizing working groups, etc. We've seen a lot of development so this is mostly about recognizing that work.
 - b) NAE | Like NE ADNRHH said, I am an advocate for words having a lot of power. The power of "Board of Directors" holds a lot of weight in NACURH. When we hear this phrase, we think of sitting leaders. When we look at the ADNRHH's across NACURH, seeing them as just a Board in NACURH and not a Board of Directors, can be minimizing their work. This is still an on-going process to better enhance the NRHH experience and stakeholdership in NACURH.



2. Mississippi State University | Would like to ask why wasn't this name already considered before, if the board is already made up of regional ADNRHHs?
 - a) NAE | I'm interpreting your question as, "Why hasn't NNB been referred to as the NNBD before?" Is that correct?
 - (1) Mississippi State University | Yes.
 - (a) NAE | Going back to what Robert first said, the NNB is still very new. Our NAN is still very new - still within about 10 years of its implementation.
 - (b) NE ADNRHH | I think when the NNB was created it was a different time. We were exploring what NRHH was in NACURH then. We are now at a point in time where we recognize that NRHH deserves its own Board of Directors. I think it's also important to note that this piece was approved by the NNB last year, and was unable to make it to NBD because of time constraints.
3. Colorado School of Mines | Would like to better understand the historical structure of the NNB. Was the initial structure of the NNB always the ADNRHHs from each region, or is that just the structure that has been adopted over time?
 - a) NAE | Good question! Historically, the NACURH NRHH Board has solely been composed of the ADNRHHs from each of the 8 regions. One of the reason why I was initially one of the co-authors of this piece because the NACURH NRHH Board only sits our ADNRHHs. We don't want it to be misleading in terms of who is allowed in this space and who isn't. By noting that it's a Board of Directors, we will confirm that it is only for ADNRHH's.
4. University of Missouri | Has there been any discussion leading to this legislation around spinning off NRHH as a separate entity?
 - a) NE ADNRHH | Yes and no. There has always been a conversation simmering in NACURH Leadership on this topic. NRHH's independence and unique identity is a conversation that is constantly in flux, and so it is something that needs to be developed in the years to come.
5. Willamette University | Moves to end Q&A
 - a) California State University - Fullerton | 2nd
 - b) Dissent | None

E. Discussion



1. University of Massachusetts Lowell | Recognizes the need for this legislation, as there's a need for equality between NRHH and RHA. This piece acts to reflect the work that is already being done by the individuals on the NNB.
2. University of North Carolina - Wilmington | YTR
3. Mississippi State | Would like to note that this piece does not enact any kind of harsh change because the people holding these roles do this work.
4. Northern Arizona | We strongly support this piece as we feel that it would provide the NACURH NRHH Board with the legitimacy and recognition that they deserve. As ADNRHH's of the past and present have invested a great deal of time in this piece, we feel that it is important to recognize that and move in favor of it.
5. GL Director - PPP | The 'x's' got mixed up so we will be clearing out the speaker's list and asking folks to 'x' back in.
6. Mississippi State University | POI | If we already X'd in before, do you want us to do it again?
 - a) GL Director | No, we have you.
7. Willamette University | The NNB to NNBD is no big deal.
8. Indiana University of Pennsylvania | We strongly support this piece because we see how hard the CA ADNRHH has worked, and we feel that all other ADNRHH's have worked just as hard, so we encourage others here to support this change.
9. University of Nevada - Las Vegas | Supports these changes because we recognize the hard work that has already been completed and hopefully this will attract more interest in the future.
10. Colorado School of Mines | YTR
11. Missouri University of Science & Technology | YTR
12. Appalachian State University | We move to exhaust the speakers list with additions.
 - a) Cornell University | 2nd
 - b) Dissent | None
13. University of Missouri | We want to acknowledge that this name change, while recognizing and allowing for growth in NRHH, may distance themselves from NACURH, rather than allowing them to serve as a branch within NACURH. We do feel that it will offer more room for growth for NRHH, however.
14. Western Illinois University | Stands fully behind this piece. WE feel that renaming the NRHH Board will promote a sense of equality between the



NBD and NNB, and we feel that a change like this does reflect the many successes of the NRHH vision of the corporation.

F. Vote: 129-04-09, the piece passes!

- XXII. Advancement Society Nominees | Regional Directors
- XXIII. Of the Year Awards | NACURH Chairperson
- XXIV. Host School Acknowledgement | NACURH Executive Committee
- XXV. University of Iowa | Move to recess until Closing Ceremonies
 - A. University of Florida | 2nd
 - B. Dissent | None

