



NACURH, Inc.

2026 Semi Annual Business Meeting

Hosted at Texas A&M University
January 3-6, 2026

2025-2026 NACURH Joint Board Roles

Presiding Officer:

Cade Perkins
NACURH Chairperson

Minutes Taken By:

Parrama Chouhan
NACURH Associate for Operations

Minutes Compiled By:

Parrama Chouhan
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
Riddhi Patel - ADNRRH

Intermountain Affiliate

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

NACURH Corporate Office

Carson Markovic - Director
Jacob Shoulders - ADAF

Annual Conference Staff

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

Midwest Affiliate

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

Northeast Affiliate

Kiara Wisniewski - Regional Director
Brandon VanValkenburg - ADAF
John Williams - ADNRRH

Pacific Affiliate

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



Saturday, January 3, 2026

1. Welcome
2. Placards exist, will get them in boardroom tomorrow
3. Parli Pro Refresher
4. 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.)
5. Recess until January 4 at 1:00 PM CST



Sunday, January 4, 2026

Roll Call (name, pronouns, season) - Called to order at 12:58 PM CST

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

1. Approval of 2026 Semi Annual Business Meeting Agenda | SA
 - a. Second | SW
 - b. Dissent | None
2. Approval of [2025 Annual Business Meeting Minutes](#) | MA
 - a. Second | CA
 - b. Dissent | None
3. [Annual Conference 2026 Presentation](#)
 - a. Q&A
 - i. GL | How will conference teams approach gender inclusive housing?
 1. Conference Chair | For housing we will be sticking to gender assigned at birth but we will have single rooms available. We will need to follow Texas State Laws.



2. AC Finance/Philanthropy Advisor | We will ask individuals to list any accommodations they might need.
3. GL | How about the folks who might have changed gender?
 - a. AC Finance/Philanthropy Advisor | We are working with our legal team to identify the best steps there and communicate as needed.
- ii. CA | Would you be able to elaborate on the capacity of the buses going from here to the airport?
 1. AC Chair | The buses can only fit about 35 but we are working on identifying several options. We have at least one secured but might have more. We will also have golf carts to navigate campus.
- iii. IA | For the dining, \$10 per person, is that gonna be in a card or a ticket?
 1. AC Chair | We do need a card to get in the dorms. We will have temporary cards for all so you can swipe into halls and dining halls.
 2. Conference Advisor | Dining will only be open to this group so not need to worry about that.
- iv. MA PPP | Can we finish the presentation before going into Q&A?
- v. Motion to caucus for 5 minutes | PA
 1. Second | IA
 2. Dissent | None
- vi. SA PPP | Can we put the speakers list on the screen?
- vii. MA | If someone flies to the airport other than college station. What is the process for that?
 1. AC | More than likely people will be flying into the Houston or Austin airport. If they don't fly into college station they will be in charge of their own transportation, we will only be providing the parking passes.
- viii. NE | YTR
- ix. NCO | Can you speak to what safety measures are set up for conference attendees (on-campus safety, personal safety, heat safety, etc.)?
 1. AC | So we will be having security (UPD), but for actual housing we will have CAs and RAs on duty as well as supervisors. We will also have our 24 hour desk open, so there will always be someone trained here for emergencies
- x. SW | Where is the parking going to be and are they closer to the dorms? Are there places for people to be dropped off?
 1. AC | Since you guys will be housed here, the garage is around 5 minutes away from here, and they can do a 30 min parking to drop off items.



- xi. IA | For philanthropy, would it be against regulations to ship supplies?
 - 1. AC Finance/Philanthropy Advisor | Working with our philanthropy chair, we ask that anything liquid not be donated in order to follow guidelines. We have our budget worked that we can buy these items
- xii. MA | Can you elaborate on the accessible housing and where they will be housed?
 - 1. AC Finance/Philanthropy Advisor | So we will have a text box on the registration form for people to tell us what kind of accommodations they need. We will then work with logistics to try and accommodate as much as we can. Some of the conversations that we had was we could open other buildings that have private bathrooms in their spaces. If folks need a private bathroom they could be housed in those areas, but that would be based on a need basis, which would need to be communicated to us
- xiii. SA | Will we have access to HDMI adapters to plug computers (such as Macs) in or do we need to provide our own?
 - 1. AC Chair | All rooms come with HDMI cords etc. but if you need more then you will need to bring. Mostly just bring your own adaptors.
- xiv. SW | Do you have ideas about risk management for philanthropy for going home to the elderly?
 - 1. AC Finance/Philanthropy Advisor | That is a on your own adventure prior to the conference, so if you want to do that you can share with us about that experience., The bag making would happen during the conference, and based on what I remember you could go beforehand and elaborate on your experience
- xv. GL | In regards to the police presence, is that just UPD being in the area or, for example, in corporate business when more than 100 people are gathered, will they have to be in the room? Also, is there a separate safety app or will they be communicated through the conference app?
 - 1. AC Chair | Does not have to be in the room but just around. For the safety app, we have code maroon which we use and we will encourage everyone to download it.
- xvi. NCO | On our tour of Dunn earlier we were told that pillows would not be included in the linen package and that is what was said in the presentation, but the photo of the packing list document shows that pillows and pillowcases would be included. I know the linen package is still being negotiated, but can you share the most



up-to-date information on linens?

1. AC Chair | The most up to date info that I have is that pillows and pillow cases won't be provided. We have confirmed that linens will be provided, but not pillows.

xvii. PA | With regards to the transportation is everything accessible and then for the housing is the bed accessible and how is that cost being paid for?

1. Logistics Co-Advisor | So we do have a bus that we are using to shuttle from the airport to the campus, and we do have accessibility options that can be requested. These requests would have to be mentioned during the registration process as mentioned before. If anyone needs housing accommodations they would be placed on the first floor. As for bed lofting, there would be no extra charge if you would like to have that done, and we are un-lofting all of the beds on the first floor.

xviii. NE | Will there be an alternative option such as a golf cart available for people with difficulties walking around the campus

1. AC Finance/Philanthropy Advisor | We are working with our professional staff to work out who all can be available to drive the golf carts. We have a lot of golf carts in the department already and we are working to reach out to other areas who might have more as well.
2. Logistics Co-Advisor | We also have the spirit bus who can come help with anyone who needs assistance.

xix. GL | Are the parking permits, per head in the vehicle or per vehicle?

1. Finance Chair | Those should be per vehicle because that is how the parking garage detects it.

xx. PA | We noticed the dates for ed sessions and registration dates. Is there a specific reasoning about why those dates were selected?

1. Vice-Chair | It wasn't noted that all of the priority deadlines are planning to be opened again for late submissions. We mainly just wanted to have an idea of folks that we were already thinking about doing.

xxi. SA | Has the conference team thought about an incentive to increase assessment responses?

1. AC Advisor | Yes, we are looking at the bylaws and policies to see what we are able to do. It is going to be talked about during the conference to bring awareness to it, so it's not just being talked about after the fact via email and via a conference app.

xxii. MA | What are the plans for the elements like heat, rain, etc.



1. Vice-Chair | We are fully prepared to have water and snacks during the conference, as well as having our safety team on board. A part of our swag bag is the fan that we have included for the comfortability of conference attendees. We are also prepared to change rooms around if needed.
- xxiii. PA | How early can folks come in for the conference?
 1. Logistics Co-Advisor | We are making accommodations for people that need to come early, but it would need to be communicated during the registration process, and they would be housed in a different area.
 2. AC Finance/Philanthropy Advisor | We also have a budgetary line item as well for anyone who might need to come early.
- xxiv. GL | How do you plan to communicate that accommodation requests do not need to be specific to ADA or campus-registered disabilities -- as that is often the assumption made for accessibility requests?
 1. Logistics Co-Advisor | That is something that we have outlined in the registration, it's not something that is lined item as ADA, but more so specific accommodations. We understand that not everything is exactly ADA, so we are recognizing that in the registration process.
- xxv. PA | Is it possible for the dining halls to publish the menus in advance for folks who have dietary restrictions?
 1. AC Chair | Yes, there is an app that has they info, but you can also find our dining menu online in case you don't want to download an app to access that information
- xxvi. NE | If the dining halls will also accommodate religious accommodations?
 1. AC Chair | It should be
- xxvii. SA | The South Atlantic is wondering if the conference team could provide clarity on the buildings that will host rooms on the first floor for accommodations?
 1. AC Chair | Housing accommodations will be on the first floor of all four buildings
- xxviii. Motion to move to grove for 5 mins - be back by 2:12PM | SA
 1. Second | SW
 2. Dissent | None
4. [Budget Guidance](#) | Parrama Chouhan, NACURH Associate for Operations & Bethany Stafford, Conference Resource Consultant
5. [Annual Conference 2026 Budget](#)



- a. Motion to bring AC26 Budget to the floor | SA
 - i. Second | NE
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Presentation
 - i. Albert Jara, AC Finance Chair | [Budget](#)
- c. Q&A
 - i. NE | I would like to have the presentation continued.
 - 1. Finance Chair | Budget Presentation Continued
 - ii. SA | The South Atlantic is confused when it comes to the parking permit situation on-campus. The information shared in the presentation doesn't match what is being approved for in the budget. In the presentation, on slide 21, it was shared that \$35,000 was being spent for 350 parking permits, but the budget is only requesting \$4,000 for 200. Can the AC team provide context on this discrepancy and clarify which model the AC team is wanting to move forward with.
 - 1. AC Finance/Philanthropy Advisor| We have lowered the number of post conversations with the NACURH execs. The presentation was made pre-winter break and did not get updated after the conversation with the NACURH execs.
 - iii. SW | The SW sees that there are quite a few items for a movie night but there is not allocated money for purchasing the rights for the movie. Do you foresee this increasing the budget significantly?
 - 1. AC Finance Vice Chair | I don't because we have cinema at TAMU that is provided for the university including the movies
 - 2. CRC | Also spoke with SWANK about movie rights and they have agreed to sponsor it.
 - iv. GL | YTR
 - v. PA | is this budget include all potential accessibility needs this including giving singles to delegates or transportation costs that require wheelchair needs
 - 1. AC | So we have worked through ADA accommodations and we won't need to charge an additional increase, so for all MAADA accommodations no further charges will be implemented.
 - vi. MA | We see that 10,000 is allocated for keynote speakers, how do we make sure there is a return on investment?
 - AC Finance Vice Chair | We are working on looking at different keynotes for leadership and experience that we want to provide.
 - vii. CA | Are there any expected insurance costs to be incurred that



have not been realized?

1. AC Finance/Philanthropy Advisor | Through communication with our risk management department, all departments meet the minimal NACURH requirements, so we won't have to pay for any additional fees.
- viii. NCO | YTR to CA
- ix. SA | The South Atlantic would like to know where special guests such as NACURH corporate sponsors would be listed in the housing tab?
1. AC Finance Vice Chair | No we would not need that to have need, due to the sizable donations.
- x. Motion to extend Q&A by 5 mins | CA
1. Second | MA
 2. Dissent
- xi. SW | The Southwest wants to know how you come up with the number of 100 yard signs and 100 wayfinding signs and do we see this as an area of cost to go down?
1. AC Finance Vice Chair | We do anticipate this number going down and the actual amount will be reflected later.
- xii. MA | Can you elaborate on the price difference between the NCC socials and the rest of them?
1. AC Finance Vice Chair | For the budgeting we did, we incorporated the spaces. We typically have more NCCs than any other delegates, so that space can hold that many people. It incorporated supplies for those socials. We wanted to provide comfort for that
- xiii. PA | It was mentioned that ADA accommodations won't have any increase in price, but what about accommodations that fall outside of ADA requirements?
1. AC Finance Vice Chair | We are looking at the same thing there. An example a student needs a single bathroom, they will be charged the same rate, so no additional cost
- xiv. CA | The CA is somewhat confused on the transportation that will be provided during the conference and it relating to the budget. Would you be able to explain the current transportation plan and how it relates to the budget?
1. AC Finance Vice Chair | Because College Station is pretty far from major airports, the cost to flying to the larger airports will most likely be cheaper but if they do fly there they will need to find their own transportation, and that is where the parking permits are for and then those flying into college station will have the shuttle service that is budgeted for



- xv. NCO | On the 'Pre-Conference' tab, it says that NBD/NCO/Advisors are arriving on Monday but meals and housing start for 45 people Sunday evening. Is the arrival information just a case of a typo?
 - 1. Chair | Yes, it will be fixed
 - 2. CRC | I struggle with calendars
- xvi. SA | The South Atlantic would like to know if the regional boards are included in the general conference dining costs?
 - 1. Chair | Yes, they are included.
- xvii. Motion to extend by 5 mins | GL
 - 1. Second | PA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- xviii. Motion to caucus for five minutes | SW
 - 1. Second | PA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- xix. MA | Can you elaborate on the budgeting for the photographer in both the AC budget and the NACURH budget?
 - 1. AC Finance Vice Chair | That is a cap, and we do not plan to go above that.
 - 2. NAO | We are looking at different vendors. NACURH is budgeting for the rights to the video and all the footage.
- xx. PA | Would like to ask if the equipment for A/V and tech included in the cost?
 - 1. AC Finance Vice Chair | Within those spaces that we want to use, it is already equipped with screens and projectors, but we should have staff on call so we don't have technology issues
 - 2. AC Finance/Philanthropy Advisor | Tech support is already included for student groups within reason from TAMU, so we shouldn't have to allocate money for that
- xxi. Motion to exhaust speakers list with additions | GL
 - 1. Second | CA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- xxii. NCO | We appreciate the context of why there are some differences in costs from the Updates Presentation to the budget. We do want to ask if there is any further explanation on the ~\$9,000 increase in cost for the Aggie Spirit Bus rental or is this an overestimation?
 - 1. CRC | Right now we are still trying to figure out what that transportation plan will look like, so it is an overshoot cost because we would rather have the budget and not use it versus being under and having to cut from the conference experience.
- xxiii. SA | The South Atlantic was curious if you could elaborate on the



transportation plans for ABM for Joint Boards and COs? We understand that the spirit bus would only be going to the College Station airport, are there plans to help coordinate transportation for RBDs/SECs as most boards cannot travel into College Station because of high travel costs?

1. Finance Advisor | So overall we are still working on that and examining all of the options that could happen. There are a lot of logistics to still analyze, but we are hoping that by over budgeting on things we can move extra money into different spaces in order to support everyone the best that we can.
- xxiv. SW | How does 10,000 compare to most years for keynote speakers and is that considered reasonable and/or doable?
1. CRC | It is very on par and very common for a keynote speaker. Last year, it was \$7,500 and that was discounted because they were an ISU alum.
- xxv. PA | Is the parking being treated as an add on or being charged to everyone?
1. AC Finance/Philanthropy Advisor | We are planning on adding it to the individual invoice of the institution. We were going to personalize the StarRez of each institution so we know what to charge everyone.
- xxvi. SW | Can we have some clarification on what the camera/photographer line item is that the conference team is purchasing?
1. Marketing & Assessment Advisor | \$10k Videographer is what we have used in the past. We are trying to not use previous videographers, and trying to do it in house. Looking to see if we can get an app where you can share photos and get someone who can take photos in house.
 2. AC Finance/Philanthropy Advisor | The reason for the camera is because we have the ability to rent cameras. We have to work with their schedule. If the cameras are all booked, we want to be able to get this so we do not need to work with their schedule to get content. Marketing is through grads so they may not be working, so this makes it so we are able to get photos
- xxvii. PA | YTR
- xxviii. SW | YTR
- d. Discussion
- i. SA | The South Atlantic supports the approval of this budget. We see the intentions in all pieces being proposed and believe it's going to be an amazing experience for all institutions and delegates in attendance. We do worry with the idea of "over



budgeting and then hoping to move money around" looking to then purchase extra items that aren't being included into the budget at this point. For the purpose of logistics and allowing the conference team to move forward, we still see the value of approving this budget.

- ii. Motion to caucus for 3 minutes | GL
 - 1. Second | NCO
 - 2. Dissent | None
- iii. MA | MACURH believes that, after the Q&A and reviewing the Texas A&M budget, this proposal will help ensure the conference can be as strong and impactful an experience as possible while remaining justified by a reasonable conference cost. Our only concern is the lack of detail regarding the usage of certain items. We ask that the host site consider adding more detailed explanations so others reviewing the budget can better understand the reasoning behind specific expenses. Overall, we appreciate the work that has gone into this budget, give it our full support, and look forward to returning and supporting them as one NACURH.
- iv. PA | The Pacific Region has concerns regarding the absence of conference-provided transportation from the Houston airport to College Station. For many Pacific institutions, flights directly into College Station frequently involve extended layovers and can cost up to approximately \$1,000 per attendee. By comparison, flights into Houston are often closer to \$650; however, this option shifts the burden of arranging and funding ground transportation to delegations, creating additional logistical and financial barriers to attendance. The Pacific Region is also concerned about the volume and specificity of information being collected during the registration process. Not all institutions or delegates will have finalized details available at the time registration opens, which may create unnecessary stress or inaccuracies in submitted information and limit accessibility.
- v. NE | The Northeast is in support of the budget, and feels that the conference team has been very thoughtful in their allocations for different needs
- vi. SW | YTR
- vii. IA | The Intermountain is in support of passing this budget. We do have some concerns with some higher priced line items, such as the Keynote Speaker, as we want to ensure that delegates are receiving an experience that aligns with the cost of their delegate fee and the conference at large. That being said, IACURH commends the conference team for the care and intention that



- they put into preparing this conference budget.
- viii. NCO | The NCO appreciates the work that the Annual Conference team has done in preparation for hosting the 2026 NACURH Annual Conference. We appreciate the conference team and the CRC's transparency on where the budget is and understands that negotiations are still in progress, but would like to echo the South Atlantic's worry about overspending and moving funds around.
 - ix. GL | The Great Lakes supports this budget and thinks that this conference team is in a great spot fiscally. We think that the transportation budget, specifically budgeted for the aggie shuttle system, could be used to explore a shuttle from either the Houston or Dallas airport as the costs to fly into the College Station Airport is much more expensive to fly into. This also might be cheaper if the existing transportation from those airports to college station is used and could have a group pricing. On a larger scale, this budget is lower than recent years and includes many details in each budget tab, making the Great Lakes feel confident that the Annual Conference Team will have enough room to allow this conference to flourish while also staying fiscally responsible.
 - x. Motion to exhaust the speakers list without additions | SA
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - xi. NCO | YTR to motion
 - e. Vote
 - i. 9-0-0, Budget cap of \$395 is approved.
 - 6. Motion to move to grove for 5 mins | MA
 - a. Second | GL
 - b. Dissent | None

Roll Call					
	Director	Finance Officer	ADNRHH	NACURH Exec	
CAACURH	x	-	x	Chairperson	x
GLACURH	x	x	x	NAO	x
IACURH	x	-	-	NAN	x
MACURH	x	x	x	NAE	x
NEACURH	x	-	x	Advisor	x



PACURH	x	x	-
SAACURH	x	x	x
SWACURH	x	-	x
NCO	x	x	x
Chair NBD Liaison Finance Chair			
AC	x	-	-

NRHH Advisor	x
CRC	x
ART	-
ADC	-

Quorum is present

1. [NBD 26-12 Clarification On Conference-Provided Hotel Housing](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-12 to the floor | SA
 - i. Second | GL
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the Piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | CA
 1. Second | MA
 2. Dissent | None
 - ii. Proponent
 1. CRC | Following our workshop during joint boards last semester, I took some feedback from many of you and made a few tweaks to this piece that I want to highlight really quickly as well as go into an explanation of a few things. Tweaks that were made:
 2. I tried to reword the housing options to read more as just that, the options for host institutions regarding the types of housing we would need from them when hosting. This includes contracting with hotels when needed, as per the suggestion from one of you who brought up the real need for some of our smaller towns that have limited hotel options. This also includes the option to not contract with hotels but to identify hotel rooms blocks or options for attending institutions to find their own housing for the purpose of cost savings both for registration fees and institutions to choose their own lodging, as well as to provide on campus housing or neutral host site housing needs. I then attempted to provide clarification on what each of those options mean.
 3. At the suggestion of the Great Lakes, I also included some verbiage regarding responsibility for the conference host to verify attending institutions have housing (assuming



hotels and on-campus housing isn't provided), as well as expanded the options for institutions within a certain range to be granted permission to not have housing to allow for what makes the most sense for the location of the conference. For example, cities may have more institutions within a mile radius whereas rural areas might be able to get places more quickly via a time limit due to interstate travel.

4. I also made sure that compensated guest housing is covered (RBD members, swaps, sponsors, etc.) regardless of the type of housing being provided.
5. To address a few things that were mentioned during our workshop discussion:
 - a. Regarding safety plans and travel, we already have a safety plan that we use when institutions are traveling to and from our conferences, are at conferences, and are traveling in and around the conference. If they make a Walmart, Taco Bell, or Target run and get in a fender bender, we have an incident report we fill out so that would still be in place even if institutions are staying in different locations.
 - b. I want to also recognize that the move from providing housing would be a change from our norm, but this is also something that, based on conversations with some regions/advisors/RLC advisors, is something that will be a welcomed change for many of your institutions. Hotels have often been a large factor in contributing to conference deficits or at least lowering the excesses we've seen, so if we remove those factors in many cases we are likely to increase our financial health. I also do not want to pretend that this won't pose some additional challenges logistically as it will need to pivot from our typical check-in processes in some cases, and bring a need for creativity for travel/shuttles, however, these are things that have been managed before and can be managed again.
6. For example, should a host school not provide housing, they could have check-in on campus and if institutions need to wait until their hotel or airBnB is ready, they can take a campus tour, hang out and play board games, do a small service project the conference provides, or some other



activity on campus until their check-in time. If a room block at a particular hotel is identified, a conference can arrange a shuttle from that location and delegations not staying there can provide their own transportation or just meet at that hotel.

7. Lastly, I want to close with addressing the conference attendee experience. We have heard significant feedback regarding the anxiety and concerns of our current practices around our housing of four people to a room. While the quad room delegate cost may be the more affordable cost option, we are seeing more and more institutions purchasing additional rooms for their students to avoid this practice. More institutions are implementing their own policies of one body per bed. As a corporation, we want all of our practices to be trauma informed. If an attending institution makes a decision for themselves to share a space a certain way, that's entirely on them. However, when we make that decision for them as they literally get out of the van and that's not something they're prepared for, or when we put them in a room with strangers to save money, are we really providing them with a welcoming environment? This was a practice that worked (somewhat) pre-COVID, but I think we have seen it's not a practice that still works for us now. It's for that reason that I am staunchly of the mindset that we move away from four delegates to a room and begin allowing each person who attends our conference to have their own bed so that every person can have that level of comfort.
8. Thank you for hearing me out and being open to this piece. I now yield to your questions.

iii. Q&A

1. PA | Wondering if this piece is absolute trickle down or if regions can introduce stricter regional practices.
 - a. CRC | Could you give me an example of a regional practice that you are referring to?
 - b. PA | We would prefer for conferences to still provide conferences, so at the regional level could we write a piece of legislation still requiring housing?
 - c. CRC | So the intention of this piece is to clarify what the housing options would be, not telling them what options they have to take. So do what works best for you and your region / the institution that is hosting. If continuing to have hotel housing works best for



- your region then make that piece, but it is worth considering how that may affect the amount of institutions that can host if they have policies that prevent them from contracting with hotels
2. GL | Noting that this changes NACURH policy for regional conferences, but still provides the ability for regional entities to implement more specific policies that make sense for that region's context but reflect these requirements, as the author of this piece, are there implementations that you would suggest or discourage regions from doing?
 - a. CRC | I think piggy backing off of what you said, I really want to get some things in our policy book to help support and clarify things to better help our conference host. There are different regional needs in the room here, but it is worth putting in policy what NACURH has done in the past and what our preferences are. I don't want the policies to be too strict considering there are always different circumstances in different regions.
 3. Motion to extend by 5 mins | MA
 - a. Second | PA
 - b. Dissent | None
 4. SA | The South Atlantic was seeking clarification on why the author is proposing to remove Article 11, Section 4 ("No Pay – No Key"), given that NACURH at large has moved away from promissory notes. Wouldn't removing this section conflict with the decision to eliminate promissory notes?
 - a. CRC | So we moved away from promissory notes and into late payment policy, but we haven't done that for some time now. This piece is just removing old policy, but now the practice is institutions have a certain amount of time before they are charged a late fee.
 5. IA - ROI | Is there somewhere in NACURH policy that outlines policy for regional retreats/summits?
 - a. CRC | No, there is not.
 6. CA | Acknowledging registration cost will go down if the conference decides not to purchase hotel rooms, do you have any insights to if the registration cost with purchasing a hotel room will be more expensive or less expensive for institutions then a registration price as is?



- a. CRC | I think that is up to an institution which is nice because they get more flexibility. Using professional conferences as an example, they have a hotel where they recommend attendees stay, but if attendees want to stay somewhere else they have the option to do that. Many attendees will stay at Air B&Bs, and some other institutions get discounted rates at different hotel chains, so it gives institutions more flexibility.
- 7. NCO | As the piece is written, this only impacts regional conference housing policies. For our clarity, this piece does not make changes to housing policies for the NACURH Annual Conference? Is that something that may be looked at in the future?
 - a. CRC | As it is written it is only a regional housing piece. I have not made plans to look at this specific process because at the regional level there have been various concerns such as deficits, etc.
- 8. Motion to exhaust with additions | SA
 - a. Second | CA
 - b. Dissent | None
- 9. IA | For conferences that occur on state levels would this piece apply?
 - a. CRC | No they are not a NACURH affiliated so that does not apply to them
- 10. MA | Just to clarify, if institutions are within that 45 minute/30 mile radius of the conference location, will they be required to pay the housing portion of the registration cost?
 - a. CRC | No but can be up for discussion. What is close and easy to get to. If there are more clarifications, I would accept those amendments.
- 11. GL | In your interpretation of this policy, or maybe the NAO's, would the more broad options apply to an institution that, for example, was approved at RBC 26 for RBC 27, as that conference takes place after the implementation date but was approved prior to?
 - a. CRC | I believe we should be able to give them the option unless that region is okay with that potential change. I will let you all make those decisions or I can have individual conversations with folks. I know we have a lot of conference holes to fill, and I have already talked to some conference chairs about this



piece and they have said they are okay with this change.

12. PA | Individuals must be guaranteed their own bed, does it require it to be an option or just required.

a. CRC | I think there might be a friendly amendment coming in discussion. We would like to see where we are giving people the option for people to have their own bed.

13. SA | YTR

14. IA | YTR

15. SA POC | The NAO recommended we make it known that we are working on two amendments for the piece to address those questions.

16. CA POC | Are there any resources planned for regional conferences that choose the new options provided?

a. CRC | I am a guides person. I plan to make resources for institutions to use.

17. GL | YTR

18. PA | Can you clarify what do you mean by traditional cost for housing type?

a. CRC | That is basically if you don't want institutions to hike, so that is basically what that part is. We don't want institutions to overcharge conferences attendees

19. PA | How do you think coordinating housing situations with institutions affects the overall logistical process for housing/hotels?

a. CRC | So one of the things I envision is an additional question on the registration, asking if they have gotten housing and if so where, so conference teams can get that information, as some regions already ask about transportation pieces.

20. PA | YTR

iv. Discussion

1. Motion to amend the piece | MA

a. Second | SA

b. Dissent | None

c. CRC | Accept as a friendly amendment

2. SA - Point of Clarification | We changed it to 30 miles to 45 miles for the Pacific and added that the RBD/SEC should work with conference teams to release an alternate delegate cost.

a. The author accepts it as friendly.



3. SW | The southwest appreciates the author workshopping this piece and listening and implementing the feedback given to make this piece more accessible for regions to apply. The SW already has regional housing practices that are similarly outlined in this piece and has seen success, and is excited to see how this will be applied on a larger scale for the corporation as a whole.
4. IA | The Intermountain supports this piece, as the new policy clearly defines housing options, a helpful formality for Conference Teams, specifically Housing and Logistics Chairs. Moreover, this piece enhances risk mitigation regarding on-campus housing and off-campus contracting options, as the new policy requires RBD approval. Delegates are also ensured privacy and safety with the Section 18, Subsection III. A. 1 provision. Overall, this piece standardizes housing options for attendees and reduces the gap between policy and practice.
5. GL | Following the workshop of this piece, the Great Lakes, in consultation with our regional advisor, considered how this piece could benefit and support the fiscal stability and decrease the host liability for regional conferences. Seeing these practices utilized by our professional counterparts in GLACUHO and UMR-ACUHO, we believe that providing more flexibility within the housing/lodging component of the regional conference experience will overall benefit the regional entities and support the long term sustainability of regional-level, student leadership conferences. The Great Lakes is in support of this piece as it will provide more individual autonomy for campus level policies around housing within the regional conference experience.
6. PA | Overall, while the Pacific is in support of this legislation, it places a lot of burden on the attending institutions to coordinate travel to conferences, between conference locations, and housing for conferences. That said, does this legislation make it more accessible for institutions to host conferences?
7. Motion to caucus for 3 minutes | MA
 - a. Second | SW
 - b. Dissent | None
8. SA | The South Atlantic Region moves to amend Section I.B. to "Should a school within 45 miles reach out about financial challenges, the conference team and RBD/SEC will work with them to release an alternate registration cost



exclusive of conference housing."

- a. Second | GL
- b. Dissent | None
- c. Author accepts as friendly

- 9. NCO | The NCO is in support of this piece as it will provide more flexibility with housing when it comes to conferences. We were initially hesitant about the piece in terms of the guaranteed one person per bed wording, but the addition of the South Atlantic's second amendment relieves our hesitations and YTR to other points of support.

10. PA | YTR

~~11. MA | Motion to split the piece, the one person per bed and the rest of the piece with conference~~

- a. Motion retracted

- 12. Motions to exhaust the speakers list without additions | SA

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

v. Vote

- 1. 9-0-0, Piece passes.

2. State of NACURH Presentation

- a. Execs
- b. CAACURH
- c. GLACURH
- d. IACURH
- e. MACURH
- f. NEACURH
- g. PACURH
- h. SAACURH
- i. SWACURH
- j. NCO
- k. Election Updates

- 3. Motion to recess until January 5 at 8:30AM CST | MA

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



Monday, January 5, 2026

1. Consultant Presentations

a. Alumni & Development Consultant | Cassandra Weston

i. Q&A

1. SW | Snaps %%%

b. Advisor Retention & Training Consultant | Rick Cazzato Jr.

i. Q&A

1. SA | What is your plan to adjust and resolve issues that advisors are experiencing with the program to ensure they are getting what they need out of the program?

a. ART | One of the things we are working on is creating a month between each cohort to reset. Our coaches are volunteers and the biggest piece we are working through is coaches not doing the work of the coach. Part of it is we are getting people through the program so then we can be selective in the process and increase the pool to pull from. For folks who have not been great coaches, we have opted to go with other people and do continual evaluation. From the post survey feedback, it took too long to complete the track. We have reviewed the content, videos, and assignments to be more intentional.

2. IA | You mentioned that level 1 is more for general advisors and level 2 is for RHA/NRHH advisors. For track 1, is that targeted to advisors for any position/group or is it also targeted towards residence life advising?

a. ART | So our old curriculum was just that, so we will have everyone go through the basics which is just hall councils or general other orgs on campus. From there folks will choose additional tracks. For NACURH advisors they may want to choose those tracks, and if they are bringing people to conferences they may want to choose the conferences tracks. It doesn't require them to participate in tracks that aren't relevant to them. Seeing the basics may be enough to prepare them to be a general advisor, but overall we want folks to choose tracks that are relevant to them.

c. Conference Resource Consultant | Bethany Stafford

i. Q&A

1. SA | The South Atlantic would like to know if this website is for NACURH leadership or delegates? When is it being



launched and what would regions be responsible for providing? If it's for everyone, does it affect anything legal since most of our documents are locked down?

- a. CRC | So my intention is that this is a majority for leadership, and everything that is going on there is mainly going to be provided by myself. I may need to reach out for some things like past bids though. I won't put anything in there that won't be sharable so if you have anyone that is curious about bidding you can share these items with them.
2. PA | Since we are having schools outside of the United States wanting to host conferences, do you foresee any issues with costs or waivers?
 - a. CRC | Not off the top of my head, that may be a good question for our lawyers because I don't believe we have ever had an international conference. I could see some additional cost if we have to ship items internationally with important fees that we may need to think about. I have already made a new budget template for the Canadian schools that we have bidding for conferences that is translated into Canadian dollars for bidding institutions
3. CA | You mentioned the housing resources yesterday, were there any other resources about the budgets or anything that was thought out for this specific website?
 - a. CRC | I am working on a list in my head. The conference components piece would have a lot of 'how-to' guides for the Annual Conference team but some logistics pieces like centralized check-in, bringing spirit while also being accessible, fiscally minded entertainment, building community related to conferences now that people may be staying in different locations are ideas that I have been working on.
4. PA | For the conference website, is it going to be part of NACURH website or independent website?
 - a. CRC | So I'm building this in Canva meaning the original plan was for it to be an independent website



Roll Call - Called to order at 9:39AM CST

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

1. [NBD 26-19 NACURH Affiliation Dues Increase](#)
 - a. Motion to bring NBD 26-19 to the floor | GL
 - i. Second | SW
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - b. Reading of the Piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | GL
 1. Second | MA
 2. Dissent | None
 - c. Proponent
 - i. Parrama Chouhan, NACURH Associate for Operations | As outlined in our bylaws, NACURH is required to reassess its affiliation dues



every three years and adjust them for inflation using the Consumer Price Index, rounded to the nearest five dollars. This legislation is not only compliant with the bylaws, but it is also the result of a thorough, intentional, and data-driven review process.

- ii. It is important to remember that the last dues adjustment occurred during the 2023–24 affiliation year and followed seven years without any increase. That adjustment was moderate, and this taskforce was intentional in ensuring that future changes would be more measured, predictable, and sustainable.
 - iii. Following the 2025 Annual Conference, the Affiliation Dues Increase Taskforce was convened to evaluate NACURH’s current and historical dues structure, assess rising operational and conference costs, examine inflationary impacts, benchmark our dues against comparable organizations, and gather direct feedback from our member institutions through a comprehensive survey.
 - iv. Through this process, the taskforce explored multiple potential models, including increases of 10%, 12.5%, and 15%. Each option was carefully considered with the goal of balancing financial sustainability with affordability and institutional accessibility.
 - v. Ultimately, the taskforce recommends a 12.5% increase. This option responsibly addresses inflation and rising costs while remaining mindful of the financial realities faced by our member institutions. Even with this adjustment, NACURH continues to remain among the most affordable organizations of its kind.
 - vi. This piece ensures that NACURH can continue funding essential operations, regional support, leadership development, digital infrastructure, and future initiatives that directly benefit our members, without placing undue burden on affiliates. Once this piece passes there will be two memos released to all of NACURH, one on January 7th and another closer to the annual conference about the increase in the affiliation dues to ensure transparency across NACURH.
- d. Q&A
- i. SA | The South Atlantic would like to know if you could provide context on the percentage breakdown of what goes to NACURH, the region, and the NCO currently?
 - 1. NAO | NACURH gets 50% of full affiliated, the regions get 40%, and the NCO gets \$20 for full affiliation

2025-26	Total	NACURH (\$)	Region (\$)	NCO (\$)
---------	-------	-------------	-------------	----------



Full Affiliation	\$200	100 (50%)	80 (40%)	20 (10%)
New Affiliate Membership	\$70	30 (43%)	40 (57%)	
Partial Membership	\$120	120 (100%)		
Individual Membership	\$50	50 (100%)		

- ii. SW | The Southwest would like to know if you could elaborate on the process of how the data was driven?
 - 1. NAO | The taskforce met multiple times post annual conference and we split into two groups. One group focused on collecting data that already exists within NACURH or outside and the other group focused on making a survey and collecting responses from the institutions. After the survey closed, the data all together was analyzed and a recommendation was put forth for the taskforce to deliberate on.
- iii. IA | IA was wondering if the task force plans to continue meeting to assess how this change affects regions.
 - 1. NAO | The task force was only trying to propose this, the task force won't be meeting in the spring but we have access to all of the ADAFs so we could if needed. Currently, we will reevaluate the price the next time it is due per policy
- iv. MA | How will this increase cover rising inflation?
 - 1. NAO | I think with inflation when we averaged out was around 7%
- v. Motion to exhaust with additions | SA
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- e. Discussion
 - i. MA | MACURH is in support of this piece because it was determined using a NACURH wide group to determine the cost and reflects the organization as a whole.
 - ii. SA | The South Atlantic is in favor of this piece because it keeps NACURH's prices competitive for future members but still keeps in mind the students and what our organizations can afford to support. While we originally weren't sure about the percentage breakdown, this is one of those pieces that you have to consider the larger future of NACURH instead of just the regions. Something to remember is that NACURH is our national



organization and with that responsibility there is a need to have more of an allocation and a need to see an increase in affiliation, since that is our primary revenue source, in order to continue to sustain itself so that we as regions can continue to exist and provide services for our affiliated institutions as representatives of NACURH. If we as regions suffer or struggle, we can look to NACURH for assistance, but if NACURH suffers or struggles, we as regions would be severely impacted, and negatively. While a very broad analogy, something that helps us to put this into perspective is that a square can be a rectangle, but a rectangle cannot be a square. NACURH can financially support the regions, but the regions cannot financially support NACURH without losing ourselves as well. NACURH needs the funds to better navigate an ever-changing systemic climate and to have security in the case of any unforeseen or unpredictable emergency. With all of the context of this piece, we are in full support.

- iii. GL | The Great Lakes is in favor of this piece as it was clearly intentionally thought through, reflects cost increases, and is data driven. The percent rise of the cost is reasonable and, while it helps our regions financially, it is clear that this is not intended to make money; rather it is intended to continue the sustainability of the resources that NACURH & affiliates provide.
- iv. PA | While we are in favor of this piece as we see the benefits for NACURH, we would like to express some concerns on behalf of our region. As our constituents face increasing financial strain, it is important to situate these concerns within the broader fiscal reality. Many of our institutions are dealing with significant budget challenges, including multiple large-scale litigation affecting the UC system, hundreds of millions of dollars in withheld funding across our public institutions, and rising travel costs and restrictions impacting many member campuses. These pressures directly limit institutions' capacity to engage with in person opportunities at both the regional and national levels.
- v. In this context, the 54 percent fee increase in the 2023-2024 cycle prompted many campuses to more critically examine the tangible value NACURH provides beyond the in person regional and annual conferences. While efforts such as the OTM database are meaningful steps forward, their impact can feel indirect or difficult to communicate to campus leadership. Reliance on platforms like Instagram for major announcements also makes it harder to elevate this work institutionally, and the discontinuation of resources such as the NACURH Link has further reduced visible, consistent value for regional constituents.



- vi. Together, these factors have contributed to a growing gap between rising costs and perceived return on investment, particularly for regions already under significant financial pressure.
- vii. Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions | SA
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
- f. Vote
 - i. 9-0-0, 26-19 Passes

2. [Hangtight Corporate Sponsorship Agreement](#)

- a. Motion to bring Hangtight Corporate Sponsorship Agreement to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | GL
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | SA
 - 1. Second | CA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent
 - i. Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | Like the Storage Squad contract we heard a few months back, this is for a potential new NACURH Corporate Sponsor called Hangtight. Hangtight is an app marketed as an alternative to GroupMe and caters primarily to RAs and equivalents. They have been a conference sponsor of the two most recent SAACURH RLCs where they created a “conference circle” feature to serve as the conference app. Through this agreement, they hope to get visibility with RAs and student housing leaders at conferences by being our dedicated conference app and in return would provide financial support in the form of \$9,000 annually, free services, improvements to the conference feature based on feedback, and miscellaneous other benefits. The only conferences they would attend through this agreement would be the 2027, 2028, and 2029 annual conferences. Essentially the only limitation this agreement puts on you guys is that no one can use apps like Yapp or GooseChase during the term of the agreement, but to make sure we like what we are working with I added a trial period in the Spring conference season to the agreement and we will review at ABM. In the process of making this agreement, I did share the initial proposal with directors with an open door to consult with DADs and advisors so I am going to go ahead and open to Q&A since a good chunk of people here are already varying degrees of in the



loop.

d. Q&A

- i. SA | With the current partnership with Storage Squad, the NACURH chairperson serves as the primary point of contact for communication and conference coordination alongside the directors. However, SAACURH has prior experience using HangTight and has worked directly with the company's CEO to customize the app to meet our needs. As we consider this agreement, the South Atlantic seeks clarification on what the expected communication structure would look like. Specifically, would regional conference teams be able to communicate directly with HangTight once they have agreed to use the app for their respective conferences, or would all communication be required to go through the NACURH Chairperson/Director? Additionally, how far in advance would regions need to notify HangTight of their intent to use the app, given the time required for setup and customization?
 1. NACURH Chairperson | In terms of conferences being able to communicate, in the contract it is written that hangtight has to provide a liaison. Overall, ... For how far in advance we need to know, once the relationship is established the chair would work with hangtight to determine who the liaison is and get them in contact with conference teams
- ii. GL | Would this limit a region who has a regional Discord from using it as a "mock-app" or does this limitation only apply to apps specifically intended to host conferences?
 1. NACURH Chairperson | That was an email that I sent to Holly. For an official conference app, if you are sending messaging as a region communication that can be done.
- iii. CA | Seeing that we would be unable to use Goosechase during our conferences, are there any alternatives through Hangtight for spirit we would be able to use?
 1. NACURH Chairperson | I believe there is a scavenger hunt type of feature but i will yield to SA
 2. SA | We have had Hangtight the past 2 RLCs, and we are trying to get our RBC team to use it. There are different channels like Discord, and they are very customizable. They are more capable of making positional channels, There was a spirit channel and pinning all the submission forms on there, and was successful for us.
- iv. Motion to Extend by 5 mins | SW
 1. Second | MA
 2. Dissent | None



- v. IA | YTR to CA
- vi. MA | YTR to GL
- vii. PA | If this piece passes, what is the educational plan to get leadership and conference teams acquainted with the platform?
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | Immediately once it is signed, the education eternally is sending an email out to leadership about details, and gathering how you all want to be communicated with and sending that over. Since we have a quick turnaround, I would get the signed contract over to them and have a meeting to talk about communication.
- viii. CA | What resources would be provided to our RBC 2026 conference teams to help them with implementing the app on a short turnaround?
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | They will have a liaison available at all times, and I have to talk to them about having someone more available during conference times just in case anything crashes and something needs to be fixed immediately. Also, talking to them about customizations depending on the conference.
- ix. SA | The South Atlantic was curious, In the context of the Cure period, what circumstances would trigger this cancellation? Would this be if the app crashed during a conference and was unusable or can you give an example of what this might look like? If a region had a problem that would justify the cure period, how should we communicate that?
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | Essentially if something goes so wrong like the app is unusable, then that would be communicated with the chair so we can have a very quick conversation to attempt to fix that. If they cannot fix that issue within 10 days then we can terminate the agreement.
- x. GL | YTR to CA
- xi. Motion to exhaust with additions | MA
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- xii. NE | Is the previously mentioned liaison planning to attend the conference in person or work with the RBD virtually?
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | It would be virtually. I don't want to put more burden on conferences, and while I think it would be helpful to have them there in person, it is also entirely possible to do that virtually.
- xiii. IA | If any region or entity wants to propose a termination, would that need to be a separate piece of legislation or are the NACURH Execs the only entity that can propose a termination of the



contract?

1. NACURH Chairperson | The NACUR execs, specifically the chair, would be the one to communicate about agreements. If an entity would like to bring forth a resolution to have the agreement terminated, then that would be possible. Continuing on that, that is why we have a trial period, and if you don't like it we wouldn't have to renew the contract.

xiv. SA | YTR to MA

- xv. GL | Many similar conference apps have a Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) that informs users how accessible the app is and what types of accessibility softwares are usable with the app. The Hangtight App does not yet have this. Is the development of a VPAT something that could be discussed as Hangtight is developed for our conferences?

1. NACURH Chairperson | I am not too familiar with that so I can speak too much on that but I can relay that feedback to their team. They are super open to feedback, and a part of the discussion with them is they wanted feedback since they are a newer app

xvi. CA | Through the conversation, if something goes wrong, is there a risk of something going wrong?

1. NACURH Chairperson | There is always something that can go wrong. They are super supportive as far as creating the app in the first place. Every time you put a large amount of people on a new app there will always be something that goes wrong because you can't identify every little issue without testing it.

xvii. CA | To confirm, if we have signed a contract with GooseChase for RBC 2026 are we still able to use it alongside Hangtight?

1. NACURH Chairperson | I have not considered anyone using both, I would leave it up to Parrama to interpret that policy, but theoretically you could.

e. Discussion

- i. GL | As conference app acquisition and the increased expectation of providing one has become more common across conferences, the cost of hosting conference apps have become a bit of a barrier for interest in conference hosting in our region, the Great Lakes is in favor of this piece. We are hopeful to see a development of a VPAT, if approved, to ensure that all members of our region are able to access conference resources to the best of their abilities.
- ii. SA | SAACURH currently works closely with Hangtight on a regional level and feels confident that this partnership would be a good thing for NACURH as a whole as Hangtight representatives



have always been very responsive and quick to fix issues as they arise. Armando worked with our 2024 conference chair and completely customized the app to our preferences. At our 2025 RLC, we had some troubleshooting errors and Armando was there immediately to fix it. He is very receptive to adaptability in a quick manner. He is also one of the easiest people to work with and is very fast at answering emails while maintaining a friendly and professional manner. We have nothing but good things to say about him and his company. For being a startup company, he is offering many benefits and putting a lot on the line which shows his commitment and dedication. We appreciate how this agreement gives autonomy to the regions while planning for what happens if the app is no longer feasible in the future. We also appreciate that our feedback was taken into consideration after the Storage Squad piece and commend the NACURH Exec for taking regional autonomy into consideration.

- iii. MA | MACURH is in support of this agreement because this will help standardize conference apps for regional conferences NACURH wide eliminating stress associated with securing different conference apps at each conference. Since most of our DADs team was on former conference teams, we would have appreciated this being set before we began doing more planning.
- iv. NCO | The NCO is in support of this piece as this provides additional money that can be used by NACURH itself and regions. This piece is well thought out with the presence of a liaison as well as conference representatives. Although the NCO does not host conferences, we believe Hangtight will serve as a good medium for communicating with Reps, especially in the lens of merch outreach and advertising.
- v. SW | YTR to NCO
- vi. CA | Before Q&A the CA was somewhat hesitant to pass this as it would create limitations on our use of Goosechase which has become a staple in the CA. Hearing that Hangtight would be able to replace that tool gives us confidence in Hangtight. We are now in support of this agreement but have some hesitation in the implementation for our RBC 2026 with issues that may arise.
- vii. Motion to exhaust the speakers list without additions | SA
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None

f. Vote

- i. 9-0-0, Agreement Passes

3. [NBD 26-16 Hangtight Funding Designation](#)



- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-16 to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | PA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the Piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | SA
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent
 - i. Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | I tried to design this piece to be pretty straightforward and to go evenly to the people that are fulfilling the terms of the agreement. Of the \$2,000 trial period this Spring, it is split evenly between anyone who uses it and does not include AC26 as they aren't impacted by the agreement. Of the \$9,000 per year after that, \$8,000 goes to the regions with \$500 to each conference that uses the app and \$1,000 plus whatever isn't used by regions goes to the annual conference since they have costs related to Hangtight attending.
- d. Q&A
 - i. SA | The South Atlantic would like to know at what point during the conference process, the conference team would have access to the unrestricted funds if they choose to use the app?
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | With the trial period, it will take some time based on their fiscal cycle. If you use it in the spring you will get that a bit later. Any other time they will give us the \$9000 at annual conference and the NAO will move that money as it is needed
 - ii. SW | Suppose a school already has a contract or MOU with an app that goes against this agreement. Would there be consequences for the region or school, and funding-wise, in this event, how could we ensure fairness that regions would not be financially punished for circumstances outside of their control?
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | If the school already has an agreement with an app. They do not need to use an app. If it is a NACURH conference it is a separate independent thing.
 - iii. PA | Is there a baseline for the way the app is used and does Hangtight determine if the \$500 should be given
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | If it is used, it would need to be an actual conference app. It would be a bit embarrassing for the region to not use it appropriately... With hangtight the only expectation is that we have some sort of thing in each of the apps for feedback and some sort of advertising. Other than that you simply just have to use the app.



- iv. IA | With the \$500 to regions who use the app, within the contract there is a stipulation that they can provide additional funding to conferences. Can you give a little more information on that?
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | This agreement exists as a NACURH corporate sponsorship agreement. If Hangtight really wanted to go to IA RBC, they could reach out to you to talk about funds and send representatives to that conference.
- v. Motion to exhaust with additions | SA
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
- e. Discussion
 - i. GL | The Great Lakes is in favor of this allocation and the trial period in particular as a way to refine best practices for Hangtight that could be shared across regions.
 - ii. SA | The South Atlantic is highly in favor of this piece, as it offers a financial incentive to utilize HangTight without making its use mandatory. This approach preserves regional autonomy while also providing a clear benefit to regions, as choosing to use the app results in no cost and offers a direct financial advantage.
 - iii. PA | We are in favor of this because as a region that doesn't use conference apps, our conference host schools now have financial incentives to use one.
 - iv. MA | MACURH agrees that the funding for Hangtight is justified for the agreement and looks forward to seeing its success.
 - v. NCO | YTR to MA
 - vi. SW | The Southwest is interested in this app and is in favor of the allocation of funds following the approval of the contract.
 - vii. Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions | SA
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- f. Vote
 - i. 9-0-0, 26-16 passes

- 4. Motion to move to groove for 5 minutes | SA
 - a. Second | PA
 - b. Dissent | None

Roll Call					
	Director	Finance Officer	ADNRHH	NACURH Exec	
CAACURH	x	-	x	Chairperson	x
GLACURH	x	x	x	NAO	x



IACURH	x	-	-
MACURH	x	x	x
NEACURH	x	-	x
PACURH	x	x	-
SAACURH	x	x	x
SWACURH	x	-	x
NCO	x	x	x
Chair NBD Liaison Finance Chair			
AC	-	-	-

NAN	x
NAE	x
Advisor	x
NRHH Advisor	x
CRC	x
ART	-
ADC	-

Quorum is present

1. [LeaderShape Independent Contractor Agreement](#)

- a. Motion to bring LeaderShape Independent Contractor Agreement to the floor | GL
 - i. Second | SW
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the Piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | NE
 1. Second | SA
 2. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent
 - i. Bethany Stafford, Conference Resource Consultant | For at least twenty years, NACURH has had some form of partnership or relationship with Leadershape, a non-profit leadership development organization that has focused on teaching leadership skills to college students since they were founded in 1986. In the early years, the NACURH FYE award winner used to attend a week-long Leadershape Institute as part of their award, and over time the partnership grew to bringing the Leadershape experience to our annual conference.
 - ii. In 2017, we did our first pre-conference experience in which early arrivals to conferences were afforded the opportunity to attend a day-long Leadershape catalyst facilitated by staff members from their organization. At the time, NACURH paid the entire cost and it was free to attendees, however, as we know our financial situation has changed quite a bit since then. In more recent years, we have allowed participants of the Leadershape catalyst to pay



their own fees (about \$35/person) and their early arrival fees have covered their housing and lunch for the day, while NACURH has worked the facilitator's attendance into the overall conference budget, which is what we were able to do this past year at Annual Conference 25 at Illinois State University. Even with institutions paying their own catalyst fees, we consistently see full catalyst sessions during pre-conference. This was the case prior to COVID, as was also the case last year.

- iii. This experience has consistently been a positive experience for the attendees that have participated. Assessment data received from these delegates have shown significant satisfaction in the catalyst, with most strongly agreeing or agreeing that it developed their ability to lead, being extremely likely to suggest the catalyst to others, and some describing it as "An eye-opening reflection on leadership and different values you believe in" as well as "A way to reflect on who you are internally and who you are to others, present and future" (two quotes taken directly from this past year's Leadershape assessment).
 - iv. In addition to that, the Leadershape facilitators would like to support our advisors and conference by providing additional education sessions and working alongside our ART coordinator for those sessions. Probably most importantly, they have agreed to provide all affiliated institutions in NACURH with a 10% discount for their on-campus catalyst program. This on-campus experience typically costs between \$5000-6000 so this discount is a pretty significant amount of money.
 - v. Financially, all NACURH is covering is a max of \$1500, built into the conference budget, for meals, lodging, and travel for the facilitators. They have facilitators located all over the continental United States and are committed to sending the staff who are closest and make the most fiscal sense. For example, they have facilitators here in Texas that will most likely be the individuals sent to AC26. They only ask that they have private lodging spaces (either hotel or guest housing spaces) for their facilitators.
- d. Q&A
- i. PA | Would like to ask if that \$1500 per person cost if that is per person or an overall cost?
 - 1. CRC | Yeah, it is a capped total amount that was passed in the budget yesterday. It is around 10 per person for lunch, and some for travel, but it can be adjusted depending on where they are coming from. Overall, it is a \$500 max
 - ii. SW | Clarification would there have to be separate accommodations of housing separate to the residence halls we



typically use at these conferences?

1. CRC | That is what they have asked for. It doesn't need to be a residence hall, they asked for a more private room. More of a guest space is a way they can be accommodated.
- iii. NCO | In section 3, 'Term and Termination,' we notice that the agreement can be terminated upon "ninety (30) days prior written notice." Can you share whether ninety or thirty days is that termination period and are we still able to amend the contract to make those numbers the same?
 1. CRC | Yes, it is supposed to be 90 and that will be edited to reflect that
- iv. IA | In Section 2 (Compensation) of the contract, it's stipulated that NACURH will provide LeaderShape with "[p]ayment for supplies for the Catalyst program in the amount of \$35.00 for each participant of the Catalyst program" (i.e. 65 participants, as that is the participant cap outlined in the Program Delivery). IA is wondering, is the \$35 to LeaderShape for each participant as in the Proponent Speech (\$35 times 65) or just \$35 flat?
 1. CRC | that would be \$35 per person, which has been that way for a bit
- v. Motion to exhaust with additions | SA
 1. Second | GL
 2. Dissent | None
- vi. MA | What assessment tools were used for the catalyst program last year and what were the results?
 1. CRC | They used a survey in the catalyst. Transparently, I only have one of them but the responses were overall very positive.
- vii. CA | What would be the total cost to NACURH for this? Can you clarify the \$35 and \$1500 cost?
 1. CRC | So the \$35 would be an institutional cost, and would not be a cost to NACURH. Those who want to come early to participate would pay that fee. WE have seen consistently full experiences, prior to COVID they were full. institutions think that the cost is worth it. We will be building in the \$1500 to the conference budget, which is typically \$1 or less per delegate fee, depending on the delegate cap.
- viii. CA | What actually are the contents of the catalyst?
 1. CRC | Kind of, I have actually never attended a catalyst, but I have sent students to them and I know they do a lot of leadership development. I know they do community building and how to connect with others, as well as leading with integrity. It is a pretty day long, intensive leadership



training

2. Find more information here: leadershape.org/catalyst

ix. IA | Does this contract preclude conference teams from partnering with other leadership engagement programming services?

1. CRC | No it does not. This is one opportunity that we would offer during pre-conference, but we can offer other experiences as well such as service projects, leadership development opportunities like Clifton strengths, or true colors. There is not an exclusivity clause in this contract so we are restricted to just the catalyst. We can offer multiple pre conference experience and Leadershape is flexible to NACURH

x. SA | Expanding on IACURH's previous point, what does \$35 cover?

1. CRC | There is usually a packet of booklets that comes with the experience and that is what is covered.

e. Discussion

i. MA | While MACURH was originally hesitant to support this piece, as we would have preferred using leaders already at NACURH conferences, over paying for a third party group to come in, hearing about how the assessment came back overwhelmingly positive, we are now supporting this piece.

ii. SW | The Southwest supports the agreement, as delegates from the southwest have expressed that they have enjoyed the program in the past, and we foresee that students from the southwest and all delegates across NACURH will continue to see benefits and gain impactful experiences through LeaderShape.

iii. GL | The Great Lakes is in favor of this agreement. Annual Conference 25 received a lot of positive feedback regarding LeaderShape and the conference experience it provided for attending delegates. We are also fans of the opportunity for institutional level sessions to be contracted at a discounted rate as we often get questions about what the tangible benefits of affiliating with NACURH are; this provides another "tangible".

iv. Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions | SA

1. Second | MA

2. Dissent | None

f. Vote

i. 9-0-0, Agreement passes.

g. [LeaderShape 2025 Numbers](#)

2. Move to groove for 5 minutes | SW

a. ~~Second | SA~~

i. GL - moves to amend it to 10 mins



- b. Motion to move to groove for 10 mins | SW
 - i. Second | NE
 - ii. Dissent | None
- 3. [NBD 26-09 Annual Conference Award Bid Selection Updates](#)
 - a. Motion to bring NBD 26-09 to the floor | GL
 - i. Second | MA
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - b. Reading of the Piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | CA
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - ii. Proponent
 - 1. [Presentation](#)
 - 2. Carson Markovic, NCO Director & Olivia May, CAACURH ADNRHH | This piece of legislation does a couple of things: changes the CO Awards Selection Committee into the NACURH Awards Selection Committee, redistributes award bids across the 4 voting bodies, and gives some flexibility to the NACURH Executive Committee to be able to use discretion to set the Annual Business Meeting schedule.
 - 3. Currently, the 'NACURH Awards Selection Committee' name is used by the already existing NACURH Executive Committee plus a representative from the NACURH Corporate Office. So instead of creating an entirely new committee, this piece proposes the changing of the CO Awards Selection Committee into the NACURH Awards Selection Committee and writing a small policy to guide the committee. That policy is meant to be flexible in who can be a part of the committee because there are scenarios where non-Coordinating Officers are present at the Annual Business Meeting (ABM) or Annual Conference Pre-Conference and can participate in the selection process. The way that the current CO Awards Selection Committee policy is written implies that a single group selects all award bid categories, but this past ABM saw three separate selection groups take on one category each. This new proposed policy should still allow for that flexibility, still requiring a representative from each entity.
 - 4. Last year the NNBD had to review 27 bids, 4 different categories, and 510 pages of bids alongside 10 legislation pieces. This was all in addition to the joint legislation pieces. In comparison, NBD had about 9 legislation pieces in



addition to joint pieces, 2 award bid categories, 17 bids, and around 400 pages. The difference this makes by putting the facts into reality resulted in the NNBD spending around 4 more hours in the boardroom than the NBD. We point this out not to gripe about the situation but to point out the inequities this created. A typical trend for all boardrooms is to start off strong with a lot of engagement and have that energy die slowly as the time goes on. There was a visible difference in the discussion and the engagement in the NNBD boardroom when we got the last legislation pieces and the last bids of the day. A 9:00am to 7:00pm boardroom is draining not only for the reviewers but can have unintended consequences on the voting process, not to mention our NBD counterparts ended their boardroom around 3pm. If this was not already concerning to you or ringing bells, imagine the discrepancy and the inequity that will emerge at Annual Business this year when NNBD now has to review 7 bid categories, with the recent addition of NRHH Lifelong Service, NRHH Advisor, and NRHH Excellence in Service.

5. Our students and institutions put a year's effort into these bids, having them get pushed around in discussion led by exhausted individuals is a dishonor to the process and what we believe to be unnecessary. They deserve to have their work properly discussed and voted on, which is why we have decided to redistribute the categories to create an even dispersion of bids amongst the four voting groups to help best fit this goal.
6. When deciding how award bids would be grouped, we focused on who the voting body interacts with, their [the voting body's] experience, and who would have strong knowledge in selecting a quality recipient. With that, the following is how we are proposing re-grouping of award bids:
 - a. NACURH Executive Committee: reviewing award bids about long-term service and both advisor award bids
 - b. NACURH Board of Directors: focusing on RHA (or equivalent) awards
 - c. NACURH NRHH Board of Directors: focusing on NRHH awards
 - d. NACURH Awards Selection Committee: focusing on the three awards for voting representatives [RHA Presidents, NCCs, and NRHH Presidents] and our



Outstanding Advocacy Initiative award

7. We recognize that this grouping still may not be ideal, but a step in the correct direction of creating equity amongst our voting bodies. With award bids, we do hold the assumption that multiple people from each entity's leadership are reviewing these award bids so that the voting representative from the entity can make an informed decision.
8. The last change is a new line in policy that allows the NACURH Executive Committee to use discretion in determining what award bids are selected by what voting body. This is something that is in policy in MACURH and was beneficial in keeping to schedule or based on award bid submissions. During my time on the MACURH RBD, we did not use this policy frequently, only in last case scenarios. Since award bid submissions can vary greatly, there may be heightened burden by one group and another voting body may be able to 'pick up' that category.

iii. Q&A

1. SA | The South Atlantic was curious what the intent was for moving to only requiring 1 (one) individual per region to vote upon the bids, similar to the format seen at last year's AC with CO involvement?
 - a. Carson Markovic, NCO Director & Olivia May, CAACURH ADNRHH | The current policy for the CO selection committee says there should be one CO per entity selected by the director.
 - b. Jamie Lloyd, NACURH Advisor & Patrick Rosengrant, NRHH Advisor | Always been three CO selection groups at ABM.
2. MA | Considering that COs and the like come a day early, when do you foresee the Awards Selection Committee coming to pre-conference considering there is a recommendation that the Award Selection committee consist of COs, Conference Chairs, and NCO Officers
 - a. Carson Markovic, NCO Director & Olivia May, CAACURH ADNRHH | The structure of CO selection will still be on the pre conference day and it will just be re-purposing the name and continuing the work that COs were doing as a long standing committee.
3. SW | With the number of people coming to pre conferences and vacancies does this impact how/where these will be seen?



- a. Carson Markovic, NCO Director | It would work the same way that it has been working, it changes the balance of things and accommodations all entities
 - 4. SA | The South Atlantic was curious if this piece requires updates to conference timelines or award submission deadlines for regional entities?
 - a. Olivia May, CAACURH ADNRRH | It shouldn't affect that because all of the awards are still being voted on at the same time.
 - 5. Motion to end Q&A | GL
 - a. Second | SA
 - b. Dissent | None
- iv. Discussion
 - 1. SA | Moves to amend the piece
 - ~~a. Second | GL~~
 - ~~b. Dissent | None~~
 - c. SA | Motion to amend the piece to reflect 4 categories and changing region to entities.
 - i. Second | GL
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - iii. Authors accept as friendly
 - 2. GL | The Great Lakes is in favor of this redistribution. Often, when one group of people is having to make several information-heavy decisions, their attention and energy is not divided equally among the pieces. Ensuring that the work is spread more evenly not only creates more fairness for those that are voting, but creates more fairness for those that are bidding.
 - 3. MA | YTR to GL
 - 4. IA | The Intermountain strongly supports this piece, as the piece enhances NACURH's representative democracy, necessitating a representative from each entity and ensuring equal representation of all entities in NACURH award bid decisions. Moreover, the piece recommends CO, Conference Chair, and NCO Officer involvement in the award bid decision-making process, encouraging a diverse range of perspectives to be heard within the NACURH Awards Selection Committee. It is clear that the authors intentionally redesigned voting populaces to ensure that the voters are knowledgeable about the bids that they are discussing.
 - 5. CA | The CA is in full support of this piece as it creates an equitable and sensible distribution of awards, flexibility in



the selection process, clarification on the selection process, and organization for our policy book.

6. NCO | YTR to IA
7. NE | The northeast is concerned that with the current state of numerous vacancies, that it will be impossible to have a representative in each space.
8. Motion to exhaust with additions | SA
 - a. Second | CA
 - b. Dissent | None

v. Vote

1. 8-1-0, Piece passes.

4. Motion to recess until January 5 at 1:00 PM CST | SA
 - a. Second | GL
 - b. Dissent | None

Roll Call - Called to order at 12:53 CST

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



1. [NACURH Finance Presentation](#) | Parrama Chouhan, NACURH Associate for Operations
 - a. Q&A
 - i. PA - RFI | We see there are more slides, is that part of the presentation?
 1. NAO | The excess slides are the budget
2. [NACURH Fiscal Year 2027 Budget](#)
 - a. Motion to bring NACURH FY27 Budget to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | GL
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - b. [Presentation](#) (Slides 22 - End) | Parrama Chouhan, NACURH Associate for Operations
 - c. Q&A
 - i. SA | The South Atlantic was curious if you could provide context for lowering the allocation for insurance from \$800 to \$500? (Line 82 & 83).
 1. NAO | We haven't really used that insurance money so it is mainly just a backup
 - ii. SW | YTR to SA
 - iii. IA | In the FY26 budget, why is the Zoom account generating revenue but it is zeroed out?
 1. NAO | That's under AC, so previously we just charged them but we were charging them then getting the money back, so it made more sense just to take it out
 - iv. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering if the Authors had any context on why the amount budgeted for supplies in Line 142 decreased by \$300?
 1. NAO | We haven't fully used it in past years so we decreased it.
 - v. CA | The CA is wondering why there was a \$6000 increase in total expenses from last year to this year?
 1. NAO | The formula is not picking it up, unless it is the NCO travel costs.
 - vi. PA | What line item 'supplies are used in the NACURH budget?
 1. NAO | things for semis or ABM and engagement things.
 - vii. GL | Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions
 1. Second | MA
 2. Dissent | None
 - viii. SW | Can we have insight into the decision to decrease the exec retreat budget?
 1. NAO | We haven't used all of it in the past and it was more of a buffer that was not needed.



- ix. SA | The South Atlantic is curious why the amount budgeted for the Advancement Society decreased by 300? (Line 149)
 - 1. NAO | That is based on the Advancement society, and since there is no written difference in what each induction price gets, we just decreased the overall amount to save more money.
- d. Discussion
 - i. SA | The South Atlantic supports the approval of this budget. Every line item seems well thought out and operational.
 - ii. MA | The midwest is in full support of this budget passing, we appreciate the NAO's work on putting this together, and find the budget transparent and reasonable.
 - iii. Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions | GL
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - iv. NCO | YTR to MA
 - v. PA | The NACURH FY27 budget has been thoughtfully done and completed within NACURH's financial stability in mind and appreciate the savings this budget makes for the regions
- e. Vote
 - i. 9-0-0, Budget passes.
- 2. Motion to move to groove for 3 mins | IA
 - a. Second | CA
 - b. Dissent | None
- 3. [NACURH Corporate Office Fiscal Year 2027 Budget](#)
 - a. Motion to bring NCO FY27 Budget to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | NE
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - b. [Presentation](#) | Jacob Shoulders, NCO Associate Director for Administration & Finance
 - c. Q&A
 - i. PA | On the Regional Allocation Line item, is there a reason why the regions haven't spent the extra \$300?
 - 1. Jacob Shoulders, NCO ADAF | Honestly, it comes really far from the 1500, and normally regions don't come close to it at all. Doping that minimal won't really affect them that much, and normally regions have left over merch that they sell first. Sometimes regions that have a lot more merch normally use that first, as opposed to creating new merch. Overall, this number shouldn't affect regions significantly
 - ii. SA | As an entity who solely relies on regional allotment would



- you be open to an amendment to increase it \$1500?
1. Jacob Shoulders, NCO ADAF | I would have to discuss with my entity
- iii. GL | Postage and freight did not increase, and we talked about increased engagement with international institutions, do you think that will affect that cost?
1. Jacob Shoulders, NCO ADAF | I don't think it will impact them too much, but I'm glad you brought it up. I don't think it is too relevant for this fiscal year, but it is definitely something worth talking about for the future
 2. NAO | Last year we had canadian schools ordering merch and it was under budget
- iv. IA | Could you please elaborate on the line item: Charitable Contributions?
1. Jacob Shoulders, NCO ADAF | Essentially, anything that the NCO donates for some charitable cause. It normally isn't used which is why it is 0d out
- v. Motion to caucus for 10 mins | SA
1. Chair | Not entertained. Caucus after Q&A
- vi. PA | YTR
- vii. Motion to exhaust Q&A without additions | SA
1. Second | SW
 2. Dissent | None
- viii. CA | Seeing as this is the second year seeing a decrease in amount given to regions, will there be future decreases as well?
1. Jacob Shoulders, NCO ADAF | No plans right now. We will have the merchandise conversation tomorrow and that will help us identify ways for the future since regions are moving to spreadshops.
- d. Discussion
- i. Motion to caucus for 10 minutes - come back at 1:50pm | SA
 1. Second | PA
 2. Dissent | None
 - ii. SW | The southwest is hesitant to pass the budget as is, as a smaller region, the southwest has concerns as we rely heavily on the NCO allocation for merchandise, and we cannot rely as much on affiliation fees and conference attendance for our revenue at this point. Since our board already has plans to use the entire budget for this fiscal year, we foresee the same to apply for next year, and think that could affect our region. However we do support the rest of the budget and look forward to hearing how the other entities in the space feel on this issue and the budget as a whole.



- iii. Motion to amend the budget to fix formula errors | CA
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - 3. Authors accepted as friendly
- iv. MA | The Midwest is in support of this budget, and appreciates the NCO's work on putting this together. We are excited to see all the great work they will do.
- v. POC - NCO | Based on data this fall as well as FY25, most regions hadn't utilized their allocations this past fall, and with the amount of the merch shipped, there hasn't been the necessary sales to keep a sustainable system with a high allocation, as the return in investment is often low, even with the higher than usual sales at the the recent full conference. Regions also can allocate money for merch as well if they need additional funds. At this time we would not entertain the amendment from the South Atlantic as friendly.
- vi. Motion to amend the regional allocation to \$1500 | SA
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - 3. Proponent
 - a. SA ADAF | I wanted to give some specifics as to why we are amending the piece back to what it was. The biggest reason is because this happened last year as well. Regions can put money into merchandise as well; however, it is difficult to balance adding an additional 1500 to the budget. Additionally, this isn't particularly being advertised to regions as well
- 4. Q&A
 - a. SA | What educational components do you plan
 - i. SA ADAF | Just because it is allocated to the merch doesn't mean it can't be allocated to other things as well such as spirit or AC. For example the SA used it for role calls. While yes it is there it doesn't mean it is being advertised to regions.
 - b. CA | Would you or someone be able to talk about which line items would be affected by this amendment?
 - i. Chairperson | So the only line items that would be affected are the sales for revenue, and then the other line item that would be impacted is the regional merch allocation. Everything balances out, but the way this



- works is there is a higher capital amount for the regions.
- c. GL | Motion to caucus for 3 minutes
 - i. Second | PA
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - d. MA | I'm curious if anyone on the NACURH exec committee or the NCO has any historical insight into how close regions have come to this 1500 cap in the past, beyond just the previous fall semester ?
 - i. POC - NACURH Advisor | Prior to FY24, there was no allocation for regions that the NCO has set aside time. Some may use for spirit packs or other merchandise that may make money. Previously, regions have had merch line items. When the NCO came back, this was implemented to supplement coming back to covid. Most regions do not have wiggle room in their budgets, there is often not that much profit made, so
 - ii. NAO | Starting FY24, \$2000, only one region got close to \$1,800, others used \$800-\$1000. Only 2 regions got close to \$1200 so not all regions have used the full amount. Spirit packs are to make money. You buy 100 spirit packs, and that is not being made, what we shifted to was a pre-order so institutions paid up front, and when it came time to purchase the spirit packs we knew exact numbers for vendors.
 - e. Motion to extend by 5 mins | SA
 - i. Second | CA
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - f. IA | The Intermountain was wondering how the SA plans to market Spirit Packs and merchandise with the prospective allotted amount?
 - i. SA ADAF | For our context, we do not allocate. SA has not done spirit packs and has not profited from it. Use this more for merchandise period. We buy, sell and restock. The region bought pom poms with the allotment.
 - g. NCO | This allocation is typically used to purchase and/or replenish regional merchandise. For regions



that may have an already high stock of items, can you speak to how regions can/should use existing inventory and how can regions balance older inventory with new inventory?

- i. SA ADAF | I think it all comes down to the marketing and purchasing plan of the NCO. Again, this should be a partnership between the NCO and regions. I understand that there is merch just sitting there, but it is the idea that it is there just in case for regions to use.
- h. Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions | SA
 - i. Second | SW
 - ii. Dissent | None
- i. Motion to caucus for 2 mins | PA
 - i. Second | SA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- j. PA | Can you explain what you mean by educating and marketing it to the region?
 - i. SA ADAF | When it comes to the education component, something that we are learning in our roles is that this allotment of funds is not advertised. This is what I mean when I say that this allotment of funds could be better communicated to the regions.

5. Discussion

- a. MA | Unfortunately, the Midwest region is not in support of this amendment as it won't significantly affect regions to keep this line item at \$1200; however, this would give \$300 back to the NCO per region, meaning a total of \$2400. Considering that the highest amount anyone has spent is around \$1200, the decrease by \$300 feels appropriate. It is already generous of the NCO to give regions this allotment of funds, and if there is an increased interest in this allotment then we can increase the fund back to \$1500 for the next fiscal year. It is important to recognize that this budget is solely for the next fiscal year, not forever.
- b. GL | The Great Lakes is currently not in favor of this amendment. This seems like a very region-specific issue, rather than a NACURH-wide or NCO-specific issue. We believe this amendment would unfairly



affect the NCO's budget in allocating funds that have historically not been spent to regions that historically have not spent those funds. Noting the differences in regional funding and the Great Lakes' use of Spirit Packs - we acknowledge that this change is not something that directly impacts us. We would like to hear from the NCO regarding how the requirement to hold these funds for the regions would impact their planned spending elsewhere in support of NACURH affiliated institutions.

- c. SA | The South Atlantic is in favor of this amendment as we believe this would be a great way not only to maintain regional funds but also encourages the NCO to create new educational opportunities for regions to learn about how to better utilize these funds. Furthermore, lack of knowledge is what often prevents regions from interacting with these funds, merchandising, and more. We know that educational components are a foundational opportunity of the NCO and we believe that it would be beneficial to the entirety of NACURH to work on a collaborative project on the different ways these funds of 1,500 could be utilized. One idea could be a meeting with all regional boards at the beginning of the year to explain how to purchase items and what the funds could be used for. Another idea is working with marketing CO's to encourage active merchandise marketing throughout the year. Further, we would prefer to see these new opportunities taken before continuing on a decreasing trend of lowering these allocations to regions further pushing our support of moving the allocation back to 1,500.
- d. SW | The SW would like to first acknowledge and appreciate the NCO for the allocation of a budget at all, due to the history of this line item not existing in the past. We appreciate the Amendment as this topic does impact our region, as Jaime said we do not have the wiggle room to allocate funds, especially since we do not have any old inventory, we understand that this decision is for the corporation as a whole, not just us, but this could happen to other regions.
- e. Motion to caucus for 5 minutes | NCO



- i. Second | CA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- f. PA | PACURH supports the intent behind this amendment, particularly its focus on increasing education and clarity for boards on how to effectively utilize their allocated funds. However, we do not support the proposed increase to a \$1,500 allocation at this time, given the historical underutilization of these funds. We believe a better next step would be to write legislation to enforce better education for boards, while leaving the allocation as it was proposed.
- g. CA | The CA is in favor of this amendment as it does affect us and our merchandise ordering by creating more capacity in what we make. One of the points mentioned as to why this number should be decreased is that regions have not used the full amount but we believe there is more context to it. For example, this year the CA was sent the merchandise ordering form 19 days before our RLC. In our experience, this was not enough time to complete a pre-ordering process and diligently spend our allotment. We would like to see the regions and NACURH as a whole keep their flexibility in their merchandising process and the ability to make merchandise at the current capacity.
- h. GL | Noting that the nature of this amendment is solely financial in nature and noting that this is impacting next fiscal year's budget which will be under the purview of the next NCO's board, a majority of this discussion has been surrounding education initiatives that would have to be taken on by the next NCO board. We cannot determine the priorities of future NCO boards. As such, the Great Lakes remain opposed to this amendment.
- i. Motion to caucus for 3 minutes | NCO
 - i. Second | GL
 - ii. Dissent | None
- j. Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions | SA
 - i. Second | PA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- k. SA | The South Atlantic tried to purchase new t-shirts



and had to cancel our order because it would have taken away our entire allocation. For regions, this takes away new merchandise opportunities for regions without merchandise allocations. It is apparent that this is not just a singular regional problem as multiple regions have mentioned it by now. Our hope is that as NACURH we would take into consideration the whole by considering the entities and the needs of the entities so that all of NACURH is prospering and not just a select few. We understand the role of the NCO to be a resource and an ally in supporting regional merchandise profits (which was done at last years AC when the former NCO director identified strategies to reduce old merchandise for regions) and in hopes of successful transition, and what we understand that to entail, the NCO can strategically identify priorities centered around educational strategies to support merchandise sells to help the next years NCO board.

- l. NCO | The NCO is not in support of the amendment. We understand that regions want to utilize these allocated funds, but this allocation has recently not been fully utilized by a majority of regions. As an extension of NACURH, we balance the needs of all entities in terms of goals and priorities. We believe that educating and collaborating with RBDs/SECs and the NACURH Executive Committee is a good idea and something that can be planned for in the future. The NCO fronts the cost of merchandise and we are unsure when we may see a return on those funds. A few clarifications that we want to offer is that an increase in allocation would also impact shipping costs to and from regional conferences and additional shipping costs to the host institution of the NCO Advisor. We also are seeing additional regions moving to Spreadshop, with the hopes that larger merchandise pieces can be purchased through Spreadshop and smaller items can be used by this allocation. We understand that this is speculative, but the NCO is planning to hold discussion and conversation about merchandise practices and would be a great opportunity to provide additional feedback. Lastly, the allocation is balanced between



revenue and expenses so adjusting this allocation would essentially be a wash in our budget.

6. Vote on the amendment

a. 5-4-0. The amendment does not pass.

vii. PA POO | Are we in Q&A or in discussion?

1. Chair | We are in discussion on the NCO FY27 Budget.

viii. GL | The Great Lakes are in support of this budget. We are particularly in favor of the ability for the NCO to have a retreat.

ix. Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions | SW

1. Second | MA

2. Dissent | None

e. Vote

i. 9-0-0, NCO FY27 Budget passes.

4. Move to groove for 10 minutes | GL

a. Second | CA

b. Dissent | None

Roll Call - Called to order at 2:50 CST

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



5. [NBD 26-13 Closing the NACURH Endowment Management Account](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-13 to the floor | IA
 - i. Second | GL
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the Piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | NE
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent
 - i. Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | As the NACURH accounts currently stand, each entity's funds are distributed between a Bank of America Checking account, a BofA Savings account, a Vanguard brokerage account, and a Merrill Lynch Endowment Management Account (EMA). For context, an EMA is a form of investment account where a nonprofit organization can place a large amount of principal investment, typically derived from donation revenue, to be managed by a financial advisor with the goal of getting operating revenue from the gains without touching the principal investment. This is a great goal, however it is complicated for NACURH because of both the small size of our reserves relative to annual operating expenses and our highly compartmentalized structure (i.e. 1 NACURH and 8 regional EMA allocations). Even following conversations to be more aggressive with the investment after COVID, our EMA sits at about a 2.5% annual rate of return which in a good year barely beats inflation and in most years falls short and actually loses value. While we could seek to be more aggressive and seek more like 5% annual returns, it is the nature of this type of account to prioritize capital preservation so is a much better goal for organizations who have an amount that they are happy to maintain and can sustain their operations with relatively low returns. NACURH, in short, is not in a place for that kind of conservative management as even the regions with the largest EMA allocations, if we took out the entirety of the gains each year, would get around \$2,000 each year. This doesn't even cover annual conference travel for most entities. Keep in mind, that is the regions with the largest EMAs, most of you would get significantly less. Thus, the purpose of this piece is closing that account as at best it maintains our funds and at worst makes it harder to access necessary funds in the event of urgent need. In the immediate period following the closing, these funds would be directed to the respective entity's checking account to be included in conversations about rebalancing that are more relevant to NBD 26-14. In my ideal scenario, these funds



would end up in a) a dividend-focused fund that would be more effective at providing operating revenue or b) a capital gains-focused fund that would have significantly higher total returns (2-5x) than the current EMA. In either fund, we would have much easier access to these accounts than we do to the EMAs and would not have to go through an external middle man.

d. Q&A

- i. SA | The South Atlantic is curious if there are any penalties, fees, or contractual obligations associated with closing the Merrill Lynch EMA accounts and transferring them into the respected entity accounts, to then be transferred again prior to AC2026?
 1. NACURH Chairperson | No, we just have to get approval from our boards to close the account
- ii. NCO | For clarity, is the \$693,970.24 solely in the short-term reserve accounts with Merrill Lynch?
 1. NACURH Chairperson | Yes, let me pull up that number (693,970.24). But they are across all 8 regional accounts and the NACURH account.
- iii. CA | Are there any capital gains in the investment accounts? If transferred, would those gains be realized? So we would pay the tax on it?
 1. NACURH Chairperson | Based on the last statement, Most of them are semi-liquid at this stage so there should be no unrealized gains. Will come back to answer the rest of this question
- iv. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering if this piece was designed to trickle down to entities that have mention of the Merrill Lynch accounts?The South Atlantic was wondering if this piece was designed to trickle down to entities that have mention of the Merrill Lynch accounts?
 1. NACURH Chairperson | Yes, if you have any references to the EMA in your policy book it would change that as well
- v. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering If the money is being distributed into each entity's account until it can properly be distributed, what precautions, if any, need to be taken to make sure that regions do not accidentally spend that money
 1. NACURH Chairperson | If you guys manage to spend \$90,000 we will have words for you... Essentially the plan would be to change this in the next couple of months, but it wouldn't exist in your checking account for very long
- vi. SA | Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions
 1. Second | MA
 2. Dissent | None



e. Discussion

- i. MA | Motion to caucus for 5 minutes
 - 1. Second | CA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- ii. POC - Cade | When we get this money, will we be taxed? Short answer, no we are a 501c3.
- iii. NCO | Although the NCO does not have a Merrill Lynch account, we appreciate the consolidation of finances for entities across NACURH as we see this as a beneficial change.
- iv. SA | Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- v. SA | The South Atlantic supports this piece because it streamlines NACURH's financial structure by eliminating an underperforming and hard-to-manage investment account. Consolidating funds into other accounts, which has historically shown stronger returns, strengthens our long-term financial stability, while temporarily routing recovered funds through entity checking accounts ensures they can be appropriately allocated before NACURH 2026.
- vi. MA | MACURH supports this piece as it will allow us to get more of a return on investment on our financial accounts.

f. Vote

- i. 9-0-0, 26-13 Passes

6. [NBD 26-14 Financial Restructuring, Consolidation, and Standardization](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-14 to the floor | GL
 - i. Second | NCO
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the Piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | NE
 - 1. Second | GL
 - 2. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent
 - i. Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | Given that this is such a large piece and has a pretty good amount of downstream implications, I may not be able to cover everything in detail in this speech. Knowing that, I met with at least one person here from each entity in November to either review the piece or discuss the overall concept and offered every ADAF here a chance to ask questions and provide feedback which led to some minor language changes and gave me some topics that I am going to focus on in this speech. Before discussing changes, I will briefly



touch on the why of this piece. Around August I was looking at some financial things and happened across the actual funds that NACURH and the regions are invested in for short and long term reserves and noticed that many of them are in accounts with poorer long term growth prospects. So initially this project started as trying to identify a better investing strategy and avenues to achieve it. In looking at those avenues, I did a deep dive into our financial policy and harassed Jamie and Parrama with lots of questions, statements, forms, and 1:1s and figured out that our financial policy is a bit of a mess and in need of overhaul to even begin pursuing a more solid financial foundation. This piece is the product of dozens of conversations and meetings to identify outdated and misaligned policies to create a comprehensive restructure that better matches the needs and directions of NACURH as they have evolved over the last decade. I will preface that while there are a lot of things being changed, the overall approach to our financial practices is not being changed since arguably 60% of the changes actually happening in this piece are just to align with existing practices. The easiest change is consolidation which constitutes about 95% of the actual text of this speech and is why there are about 13 pages of red. NACURH financial policy is currently distributed across several places in policy as well as some practices that don't exist anywhere in policy. This piece works to put all of the financial policy in one place and standardize the language to pare down on redundancies and excessive restrictions. As part of reducing these excessive restrictions, the barriers for moving money into or out of accounts have been reduced with short term reserves being accessible at the ADAF or NAO's discretion so long as it is for an approved purpose as opposed to needing NCC approval and long term reserves being accessible with $\frac{2}{3}$ approval of the ADAFs or NBD as opposed to needing full NBD approval for all entities. Due to this simplification, and in an effort to keep money in higher yield accounts, the regional savings fund has been co-opted into the short term reserves. Process-wise, the only change for regions to access their various funds in the STR instead of savings is that the NAO needs to do the actual transferring which is the same way savings accounts were two years ago. For the NACURH level, this piece eliminates the contingency fund and capital budget and adds the advancement society fund into policy. The contingency funds' purpose has been folded into the purpose of the general STR and the capital budget has never really been implemented since it was added to policy and contradicts the way we



approached the only major capital project in the last 5 years, the OTM Database. The advancement society fund has existed in practice and is referenced in policy but is not defined so this piece adds it in under the finance title. Reporting requirements for the NAO have been shifted to align with the current timeline and simplified a bit as there is no real reason for it to be as detailed or as frequent as policy dictates and is why that reporting doesn't happen exactly according to policy. Likewise, the finance committee that exists in policy is also removed as that has never really been implemented and these days the purposes assigned to the committee are largely served by the ADAFs as a decision-making body. What is not included in this piece, but is planned and this piece sets the groundwork for, is rebalancing and reinvesting of each entity's funds over the next few months to better set up NACURH for long-term stability. The last page of the piece includes some semi-current numbers and a proposed rebalancing. With our current financial structure, there is significant inconsistency, about half of the accounts are out of policy in some form or another, entities are unsure of how much money they have and how to access it, and 5/9 entities (NCO is folded into NACURH here as they do not have savings or investments accounts) have overall returns that leave them losing money against inflation over time. This piece lays the groundwork for us to move NACURH's funds from conservative and moderate funds that attempt to get decent dividends and decent capital gains to two separate funds that prioritize either current income as dividends or long term capital gains growth. In this case, the short term reserves would be the dividends fund and long term reserves would be the growth fund. Through this restructuring, several regions are set to see a roughly five-fold increase in the growth of their total reserve balances and see an increase in their annual dividend payouts which contribute to operating budgets. Some of these plans can be executed without this piece passing to some extent, however there are significant portions that are simply unrealistic without the clearer avenues this piece hopes to establish.

d. Q&A

i. SA | The author states that this piece will create a more "comprehensive financial transition and education model for the NACURH ADAFs." The South Atlantic was curious if you could elaborate on how this model would make things easier for ADAFs and transition?

1. NACURH Chairperson | A big part of this is making it more



accessible to ADAFs. Those who were at transition (ADAFs and Conf Chairs) have direct training. More resources and transition items that will be part of that.

- ii. PA | Is there a reason why the NCO doesn't have their own investment account?
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | That is because the NCO exists as part of NACURH and is the revenue making entity of NACURH. If money is needed for the NCO it will come from NACURH.
 - iii. IA | The Intermountain is wondering if the author could provide more context regarding the 1.25 maximum balance for the Entity Operating Fund?
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | Currently, the limit is your expenses. The reason there is a slight buffer, you can request that transfer fairly quickly. It might take 2-3 days to get that money transferred over.
 - iv. CA | To confirm, we just removed the short-term reserves. Will we work to move that somewhere else in the future?
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | What that piece did is it moved all the EMA to Checking. What this opens the door to do is put all the money in the different accounts. We will work with ADAFs and entities to get the needs of the region meant.
 - v. Move to exhaust without additions | SA
 - ~~1. Second | NCO~~
 - 2. Dissent | CA - We want added
 - 3. Second retracted
 - 4. Move to exhaust with additions | SA
 - a. Second | NCO
 - b. Dissent | None
 - vi. CA | There's checking, operating, short term and long term, is there other policy that talks about accounts?
 - 1. NACURH Chairperson | Checking and operating are the same thing.
- e. Discussion
- i. Motion to caucus for 5 minutes | IA
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - ii. PA | The PACURH region supports this piece of legislation as it modernizes policy in alignment with practice but instead of just doing it, it ensures to provide the flexibility for future NACURH leadership to deal with the finances in a manner they see fit, and the overall framework of this legislation in terms of the long-term and short-term reserve provides much needed returns for the



- regions and NACURH.
- iii. SA | The South Atlantic supports this piece because it finally brings structure, clarity, and enforceability to NACURH's long-disorganized financial system by consolidating accounts, aligning policy with actual practice, and establishing clear responsibilities for the NAO and ADAFs.
 - iv. GL | The Great Lakes is in favor of this piece as it will give NACURH a more fiscally stable future and allow the corporation as a whole to increase their return on investment. With the many concerns around finances we have heard this weekend and over the past several years, this plan will help increase the regional, long term financial stability and sets NACURH up for current and future success.
 - v. NCO | Again, the NCO is not directly impacted by this piece as we only have a checking account. But as an entity that represents NACURH-at large, we recognize and applaud the author on simplifying and consolidating the process of accessing regional funds and cleaning up policy.
 - vi. SW | The Southwest appreciates a way to simplify the current process. We are also very excited at the idea of an improved education track for finance officers.
 - vii. Motion to exhaust the speakers list without additions | SA
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- f. Vote
- i. 9-0-0, 26-14 Passes

7. [NBD 26-21 OTM Database Further Upgrades Proposal](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-21 to the floor | NE
 - i. Second | SA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the Piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | NCO
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- c. [Proponent](#)
 - i. Justin Luster, NACURH Associate for NRHH | The OTM Database has been a true journey and has shaped my entire term this year as it is the most important task that I work on each day. With that being said, I am here to ask the Joint Boards that we keep going. I want to quickly remind us of the Mission Statement. I argue to you that OTMs are the largest virtual tool that achieves our mission statement across NACURH by empowering recognition,



- motivating campus leaders, and equipping institutions with resources from each other to build positive campus communities and spread NRHH's value of Recognition.
- ii. There is way too much context behind the OTM Database to provide you all, but I will focus on some key pieces to bring everyone present to the same level. OTMs have existed for a long time and were centralized by NACURH in 1996. Andrew Bell from Kansas State University volunteered to build a NACURH OTM Database during the early 2000s which brought OTMs to the digital era. The website was maintained until 2020 when NACURH entered a short partnership with ACUHO-i that did not last, forcing NACURH to quickly adopt the Jotform and Google hybrid database that was used from 2023-2025. This brought us to the present where we contracted with a professional software development company to build a NACURH-owned OTM Database. The Initial Development started with two phases with Discovery meant to establish an understanding of the requirements among both NACURH and Azumo (to the best of our ability). The Endeavor Phase is the piece where Azumo began constructing the OTM Database. The Initial Development focused on essential components that were vitally necessary to the OTM process including submission, storage, administrative functions, and award selection. As these are extremely complex processes, we have learned and improved things along the way to provide a better result in the end. This allowed us to make some minimal upgrades during the development process. When we decided to release the OTM Database to NACURH-at large in October, we knew that pieces were still in construction, but it was necessary to begin the transition process. The success of the new system has been evident in the increase in OTM submissions.
 - iii. The financial context included on this slide has a record of when NACURH has allocated money toward the OTM Database. In early October, we elected to shift development models from a full-development team to a singular developer to extend the development timeline, adhere to budgetary constraints, and continue to identify bugs, fixes, and improvements that are needed. Current allocations will cover our development model until February 6th, and if this piece fails, we will transition to a maintenance model that looks drastically different and does not include improvements.
 - iv. A big reason for this proposal is the cost of waiting and the development team. There is a significant cost to waiting to complete any upgrades to the NACURH OTM Database. If we wait



to make upgrades, we will have to complete a new discovery phase that will not only include what we want to do, but will also include significant time to learn the current system functionality not only from a user perspective, but from the platform development perspective and the software coding perspective. When we discussed this with our executive liaison, he explained that while software development and coding all have lots of things that are uniform and easy to pick up between projects, there is a wealth of knowledge specifically related to the know-how of the system and how NACURH as a whole functions in relation to this system. If we continue and pass this piece, we keep our same team to make some of these improvements and continue development.

- v. The whole development team is listed here on the screen and if we waited to do any improvements or upgrades, we could lose these individuals as resources to the Program Developer. This does include myself as my term will end in May and I have personally dedicated much time as a Project Manager toward this beyond the initial expectation of a NACURH Exec. Azumo allowed NACURH more advanced access to project software and project management tools that have saved NACURH money throughout this project. Azumo has consulted previous team members for free throughout the project when those members have moved to other projects. The entire development team has learned a lot throughout this process and how EVERYTHING is WAY more complex than was previously understood. We have been adapting to these learning moments as best possible.
- vi. A second reason for these upgrades align with the desires and goals established by the original OTM Database Task Force. The group created needs, wants, and dreams. Of the Needs, 4 tasks remain. Of the wants, 3 remain. Of the dreams, none were fulfilled. This proposal looks to begin development on remaining needs and wants along with a few dreams and some new items that have emerged during development and release.
- vii. This is the context for why I wrote this piece and present to you all that we need to allocate more money toward this service that we provide to our affiliated institutions. We have the money, the team, and the power to do this and the time is now. These elements were included in the proposal divided by priority. Within each priority, the items are listed, but not ordered within the priority grouping by priority so just because it's first listed of high priority doesn't make it the highest priority. The complexity of the entire list is quite diverse resulting in these priorities being



- roughly sorted. Some things are more complex and will be way more time consuming to complete.
- viii. The items listed are also able to be roughly grouped into 3 main categories of improving user experiences, creating structures for assessment, and providing new ways of promoting OTMs as a system. I won't walk through each item, but I encourage you to utilize Q&A to get more context on items if you would like it! I do have updates since the piece was submitted that I'd like to cover. For our High Priority things, I have been working to dissolve many roadblocks for the Integration of Historical OTMs with guidance from Azumo and Azumo is already working on functions for Re-Categorizing OTMs into Correct Categories.
 - ix. I began discussing some of these tasks with Azumo. Pre-Set Institutional Organizations List, Institutional Deadline Integration, and Multiple Authors on OTMs are all going to take a LOT of time to complete as they are extra complex and will require some large redesign to current elements. For the medium low priority, an interactive flowchart has been completed designed by me through Wix that Azumo will be tying into the database shortly.
 - x. And lastly, no updates on the low priorities as the other priority groups are higher priority. While I know these are a lot of tasks all together, I don't see this as a set list of what we will complete, but what we want to complete. I wanted them all included for NACURH's record of what improvements can and should be made to the OTM Database! When the future Joint Boards come back and want to see what has been done and passed for this system, they should find ideas to help them as well as gain context. The last reason I believe we need to do this is because we rang the bell as Patrick put it. This means we started the project and we can't quit now. We have to keep going to truly make it the best we can and effectively use our human and financial resources.
- d. Q&A
- i. SA | There is a whereas statement that says the additional cost for upgrades is around 12,000, however, the therefore let it be resolved statement is asking to move 35,000 from our long term reserves, the South Atlantic was wondering if the Author could provide clarity or context on this wordage?
 - 1. NAN | That would be how much if we do this right now and how much we would save.
 - ii. PA | We want to ask for clarification on what are monthly emails to campus OTM administrators, Automated Monthly OTM Shoulder Tap Emails, and Monthly Certificates Report.
 - 1. NAN | The monthly emails are to remind administrators to



- submit to the regional level. ADNRRH has done that in the past, and has impacted OTMs submissions. Shoulder tapping emails, sending a reminder to those accounts who have not submitted OTMs towards the deadline. This report can be copy and pasted, to make those certificates in canva.
- iii. GL | In the 3rd to last Whereas statement, you state that 2 of the 38 "wants, needs, and dreams" were discarded due to the timeline, can you expand on that and clarify how this decision was made and, we assume, unforeseen?
 - 1. NAN | When I was on the OTM database task force, we went very far in those dreams, so the ones that were pushed out were an affiliation, and the other one was certificates being generated by the database. When we met with Azumo they said we would run through our storage base very quickly if we did that
 - iv. SW | What conversations have been had with Azumo about how far this \$35,000 will stretch to improve the database?
 - 1. NAN | For clarification, it would be 35, the 12 would be if we had to wait. We haven't had direct conversations with them because we pay the bills and decide as execs. I anticipate that they will be able to get to some of the larger projects in the next few months.
 - v. NCO | YTR to SA
 - vi. IA | The Intermountain is wondering if you could provide additional context regarding how the OTM Database Task Force prioritized items in the priority list. For example, does the high priority category address items that a majority of NRHH Chapters wanted?
 - 1. NAN | The OTM Database taskforce dissolved after selecting Azumo. I have gotten feedback from our form, ADNRRHs and campuses. Took feedback from multiple different areas and from what I have seen as the NAN
 - vii. Motion to extend by 5 mins | MA
 - 1. Second | NCO
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - viii. CA | Can you go into detail about how we are paying Azumo for their work (i.e hourly) and how that has affected their progress on the database?
 - 1. NAN | We pay Azumo hourly and because they are a software development company we pay them for an entire week at a time. We pay for 40 hours at a time, and then if we need further assistance we have people from their company on demand. They get done what they can during



that allotted 40 hours and if we don't finish something we continue the following week during the next 40 hour allotment

- ix. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering if this priority list is being set in policy or governing documents anywhere or if this would be a working list for the OTM Database Project Manager?
 - 1. NAN | This is more of a working list, and completed before my term would end. We have a task board that I put tasks on so Azumo does not have access to this list.
- x. GL | In the proponent speech, you mention that progress would be lost as we need to continue funding this project to keep going. Does NACURH not own the OTM Database system code meaning that if we decide in the future to not work with Azumo any more, we could go to another company and give them the code and framework Azumo has started on?
 - 1. NAN | We do own the entire data base however, the know-how of our developers is extremely important. They know all of our lingo and the structure of our OTM database. If we worked with another company they would have to relearn everything and this would cost us around \$12,000
- xi. PA | Do you anticipate that even after this \$35,000 more funds would be required to fund further upgrades and developments of the 38 needs, wants, and dreams? For example things on the low priority list ?
 - 1. NAN | Yes, we would have to, if we really wanted to do those things. This is our biggest service, and it has taken time and money.
- xii. SW | SW wants to know what needs to be accomplished for the OTM database to be in a state where it can be seen as a "complete project"?
 - 1. NAN | Some of the things on this list I wouldn't necessarily include on that list. Integration of historical OTMs would be a HUGE win, which would include all of the AZUMO, ACUHO, and Jotform OTMs would all be in one place
- xiii. IA | The Intermountain is wondering why some items, specifically the Reactions to OTMs and Commenting on OTMs, items that help student leaders realize their impact and contribute to NACURH's mission, were placed in the low priority category?
 - 1. NAN | This was something that the database taskforce thought would be cool. I placed it in low priority, because we had never had the ability to react or comment on OTMs, but it is not necessary for the functionality of the system



- xiv. Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions | NCO
 - ~~1. Second | MA~~
 - 2. Dissent | SW- Would like to extend if there are more questions that arise
 - 3. Second retracted
 - 4. NCO | Amends to extending by 5 minutes
 - a. Second | GL
 - b. Dissent | None
- xv. MA | YTR to NCO
- xvi. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering if the Author could elaborate on what the 'OTM Traveling Trophy Integration for regional levels' mentioned in the low priority section, would be as a few regions already have their own regional level 'OTM traveling award'?
 - 1. NAN | The old database used to have a cup system meaning there were points and the database compiled that on its own. As I have learned this year, it is super hard to do that, but I didn't include that as a high priority because I made a spreadsheet that has formulas to do all of the calculations for me.
- xvii. GL | Should this piece pass, can you expand on plans to navigate the current OTM database and OTM process whilst in continued development -- given the delayed April completion date given?
 - 1. NAN | We would continue communication. Winner selection will be usable and we will host those webinars again.
- xviii. PA | Will we see a gradual rollout for updates to come or will it be one big announcement of upgrades?
 - 1. NAN | There will be gradual rollouts, but we send updates weekly (there will be one tomorrow), with information about bugs and further updates
- xix. SW | The Southwest would like to know, in the case of this piece not passing, what the future of the OTM database will be, including the long-term lifeline of the OTM database, with the current funds already allocated/left for the database? I understand that you said that we would go into maintenance mode but we would like to know more about what that would look like?
 - 1. NAN | If we did not pass this piece, we would change the direction with Azumo, and give them 30 days notice to change the contract. We would move to prioritize the tasks on the task board and that are very quick. We would not be able to do a lot of the things listed and shifting the route. The maintenance would be an emergency plan and would



pay for a person if the whole thing crashes. We have only had 1 crash of the database and we know why it happened and if it crashes again we know how to fix it.

- xx. Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions | MA
 - 1. Second | NE
 - 2. Dissent | None
- xxi. CA | After it is completed, are we able to pay for improvements later on?
 - 1. NAN | Yes, we are able to do that. We would have to go through a completely new discovery and endeavor phase which is where that \$12000 comes from. We would also have to sign a new contract and bring that to the boards.
- xxii. PA | Why are things like emails to campus supervisors and monthly emails to OTM Administrators not higher on the priority list?
 - 1. NAN | The campus superiority role is different from the administrator. They are just someone who just sees the roster and separates from the campus administrations. The monthly emails can be completed by ADNRRHs which is why it is lower priority.
- xxiii. GL | When the NBD passed 26-01, assurances were made that the newly proposed allocation of \$20,000 included flexibility, and that the final project cost should not go over that amount. What has changed?
 - 1. NAN | We have learned so much in this development process. Everyone knows that within voting there are some many edge cases about what could happen. All of these cases have to go in separately. The discovery phase was also done with a different team, aside from our project manager. Once we did the discovery phase those items were shifted around. It was difficult because we have never worked with Azumo before and we didn't have a solid foundation in coding either
- xxiv. SW | The Southwest understands and applauds the success of the OTM Database seen during this first phase of rollout as a huge feat. However, how do we determine the return on investment (ROI) is equal, and that this is worth the cost?
 - 1. NAN | What I will say is, there have been more institutions participating in OTMs than any service besides conferences. It will be worth the money to market to institutions. We have a lot of money in our savings that we are not using.
- xxv. GL | What happened to the \$7,000 yearly maintenance cost that was part of the original contract? Would the maintenance phase not just cost this amount in the original contract?



1. NAN | So, the way that maintenance works is when we originally allocated 7000 we didnt know what maintenance would be like with the system. We still intend that it will be less than that 7000 amount. We use this for two different monthly costs, as well as an emergency fund. This amount is not meant to cover upgrades
- xxvi. SW | Are there solutions that the board has considered for the long term to continue funding this project so that we might not have to meet and make large sum movements?
 1. NAN | Yield to the Chairperson
 2. Chairperson | Improvements with another team would save the most money. We would not need to do another discovery phrase. The maintenance fee is not meant for upgrades and improvements. This is the most logical way, in a few years if they want to do these upgrades, it would be a lot more money.
 3. NAN | The discovery phrase is learning about the system. Endeavor phrase is when the upgrades would happen. We have explored other routes and this is the best route.
- xxvii. PA | YTR
- xxviii. GL | Circling back to when you were talking about the change in the Azumo team, was there a break in communication when describing what we need? Why are we just now finding out that this is going to cost a lot more than expected? Do we need to be more explicit on what our needs are before we continue so there are not unpredicted costs in the future?
 1. NAN | Honestly, I wasnt the NAN so i dont know what they did in that discover phase
 2. NACURH NRHH Advisor | So the big thing is, when we finally went through with the contract Azumo operated a bit differently. They didn't have to have everyone who originally worked with us meet with us, and that was just how they internally operated.
 3. NAN | There is more NACURH has learned about this process. Azumo has also learned how to work with non profits.
- e. Discussion
 - i. POC - NAO | There are a lot of questions about different teams. When you are developing software, you do not just start coding. The discovery phrase was looking at what was needed and what is being expected for us to do.
 - ii. POC - Chair | The piece that I just passed shows all of the money that NACURH has. We have over a million dollars in reserves. Yes,



this is emergency money but we are expecting to see a high growth on those funds and may bring a greater growth than this proposal costs. We have been getting great feedback on the database. We are hearing conversations from institutions on why they should affiliate with NACURH. OTMs are a service that we supply.

- iii. Motion to caucus 10 mins | GL
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- iv. PA | We support this piece because, as we have shared previously, at a time when our regional constituents continue to question the tangible value of NACURH, OTMs remain one of the most concrete examples of the value we provide to our institutions. OTMs directly translate student and professional staff work into recognition that resonates beyond our association and is, alongside bids, one of the few NACURH-related outputs that higher-level institutional leadership can readily understand and appreciate. As such, we strongly encourage the NAN to consider prioritizing features that make it easier for institutions to share their OTM wins upward to senior housing, student affairs, and university leadership. Streamlining the ability to export, summarize, and present OTM recognition in formats that align with institutional reporting would significantly amplify the perceived and actual value of NACURH at the campus level. We also want to name an important historical context. It is our understanding that NACURH previously moved away from the ACUHO-I system in part due to concerns around funding and sustainability, which resulted in a lapse into the JotForm-based process. We urge the Boards to be mindful of not falling into a recurring pattern of hesitancy around investing in the development and maintenance of a critical resource. From a technical perspective, we want to underscore why it is not trivial to pause development now and simply “pick it back up later.” When a system transitions into maintenance mode, the institutional knowledge of how it was built begins to fade. Re-entering a development phase often requires new developers to first reverse-engineer the existing system, which can be more time-consuming than building parts of it from scratch. Basically this means relearning the entire technology stack it sits on, how memory and storage are handled, how relationships between tables were structured, and how data integrity is preserved across thousands of records. Every new feature then has to account for existing data, historical submissions, regional and institutional



variations, and exceptions that may not be immediately visible in the code. On top of that, developers often have unique styles of coding, so learning someone else's code is cumbersome and extremely difficult. For that reason, sustained investment during active development is not just about adding features, but about preserving continuity, reducing technical debt, and avoiding significantly higher costs and risk in the future.

- v. IA | The Intermountain supports this piece, as the OTM Database is actively contributing to NACURH's Mission Statement. Furthermore, it is clear that NACURH has the fiscal capacity to transition into the Endeavor Phase of this project. In addition, transitioning into the next phase mitigates financial risk, particularly the projected \$12,000 loss of funds in the instance of stalling the project when NACURH still wants to pursue the project further. IACURH would like to see another OTM Database Task Force in the future, if such capacity exists, to reevaluate the priority list based on the needs and wants of various NRHH Chapters in NACURH, as this project appears to have the potential to become a passive program for members in addition to an advantageous administrative resource.
- vi. NCO | The NCO is greatly in support of this funding proposal. We believe that the extreme increase in OTM submissions since the rollout of the OTM Database justifies the continued investment into the database. Furthermore, we believe that this is the opportune time to do these upgrades because of the continuity of the NAN and the development team with Azumo. To lose that knowledge and experience means losing time and money. Our past ADRE [Carson Markovic] has been a part of the meetings with the NACURH Executives and Azumo and has seen the extreme back-end work that both parties have been doing to make the OTM Database a success! With being in those meetings, we have seen the development progress of the OTM Database while also seeing the navigation of set backs and understanding that the working relationship between NACURH and Azumo is a natural by-product of working with a third-party software development company who were unaware of NACURH or what OTMs are/were. We also do not have any plans for these funds, so the NCO believes this is a great way to continue development and honor recognition throughout NACURH.
- vii. MA | YTR
- viii. SW | Southwest would like to applaud the author of the piece for answering all of the questions presented and the amount of work that he has put into the project. The Southwest is in support of



moving money for the OTM database. The OTM database is a massive incentive for institutions to affiliate, which is a huge asset to the organization. The SW also supports the improvement in the quality of life of OTM administrators on all levels, ease of access for individuals to use the database, and offers an incredibly unique resource for our organization. We also appreciate the insurance that this will not create any financial hardship on a resource that will deeply benefit the corporation.

- ix. SA | The South Atlantic wants to send heavy amounts of snaps to Justin for his dedication to this project, the time he's put into it, and everything in between. The South Atlantic is in favor of this piece and appreciates the clarity and transparency provided by the Author through the proponent's speech, their presentation, and Q&A. Furthermore, we are in favor of the priority list acting as a working list for the OTM Database Project Manager to lay a foundation for the next steps of development of the database and we heavily appreciate the prioritization of Account/Profile Info Spaces, assuming this oversees things such as Campus Admin Accounts, and the creation of a fully functional rubric system within this list. Even with a few worries that the South Atlantic had previously during the review of this legislation, after reevaluations of the piece and through discussion today, we recognize the need to see this database operational and the South Atlantic believes that it is necessary to move these funds and establish a working priority list. Echoing IACURH, SAACURH would love to see the redevelopment of the OTM Database Taskforce. Further through the presentation given by the Author, we recognize that if we do not extend the development phase, we will significantly take steps backwards, further establishing our full support for this piece.
- x. Motion to exhaust with additions | NE
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent |
- xi. CA | The Central Atlantic would like to acknowledge the beast that the OTM database is. This is something that is not only growing in sustainability but growing in active engagement. Although pouring more money into this seems scary it is nothing we can't handle. We find the current high priority items to be in high demand within our region as we have been asked multiple times when: Integration of Historical OTMs, Fully Functioning Rubric System, Account/Profile Info Spaces, and Re-Categorizing OTMs into Correct Categories will be included. This project is currently taking a lot of money from us, but its money designated to do just



this, create a beast of a service. We have made our bed and now it's time to take a long well rested nap in it. Because NACURH starts with You and you can only be you with some nice beauty sleep.

- xii. Annual Conference | The Annual Conference is held in support of this piece, as it serves as an incredible resource and a meaningful opportunity to invest both time and financial support. OTM is a vital part of the heart of this organization, and investing in this conference is an investment in the people, mission, and future of OTM as a whole.
 - xiii. GL | The Great Lakes is not entirely sure how to communicate where we stand. While we are not anti-OTM databases and understand that we are fiscally able to make this investment, we want to make our concerns heard. We are concerned that in Virtual Business Meeting 1, we were assured that our initial increase from the originally approved substantial amount would be more than enough to sustain the OTM Database as we had completed the Discovery Phase. We appreciate the explanation of the background behind this situation, but the reality remains. We understand that some of these issues come with a transition of leadership overseeing this process and noting the nature of the executive roles being one year terms, we are concerned that while we do have the money to invest in this, and we support investing in this resource, we do not support the continued lack of efficiency or effectiveness of the program. If this isn't working effectively, we are concerned about continuing to invest large amounts of money into this project. In response to the point made regarding receiving positive feedback about the database, we want to point out that in our region, our advisors are not happy and we have not been receiving positive feedback. We have repeatedly been confronted with concerns from affiliated institutions -- students and advisors alike, both during and after our conference -- regarding not only navigating what we have of the OTM database but also the lack of plan moving forward, the lack of uniformity in OTM Submissions, and confusion regarding communication sent to institutions. Institutions have raised concerns about the transparency of the OTM Database and its status, and frankly, we, too, are concerned as we will have invested at least \$110,000 into this project if approved.
 - xiv. SA | YTR
- f. Vote
- i. 9-0-0, NBD 26-21 passes



8. Move to groove for 5 minutes | SA
 - a. Second | AC
 - b. Dissent | None

Roll Call:

Roll Call					
	Director	Finance Officer	ADNRHH	NACURH Exec	
CAACURH	x	-	x	Chairperson	x
GLACURH	x	x	x	NAO	x
IACURH	x	-	-	NAN	x
MACURH	x	x	x	NAE	x
NEACURH	x	-	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	x	x	-	Quorum is present	

1. [Program of the Year 2025 Selection](#)
 - a. Motion to bring Program of the Year 2026 to the floor | MA
 - i. Second | SA
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - b. Motion to open the floor for nominations | MA
 - i. Second | NCO
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - c. Nominations
 - i. SA | Nominates Knights of Connections - Rutgers University
 1. Second | GL
 - ii. CA | Nominates Sweets & Sibs Weekend - Wright State University
 1. Second | MA
 - iii. SW | Nominates Paws-itive Impact Gala - Indiana University



- Indianapolis
 - 1. Second | SA
- iv. NCO | Nominates Apache Santa-Cruz Swap N' Shop - University of Arizona
 - 1. Second | SA
- v. GL | Nominates Lunar New Year - North Dakota State University
 - 1. Second | NE
- vi. MA | Nominates Artist-in-Residence - New York University
 - 1. Second | IA
- vii. IA | Nominates Whole Foods Shopping Social - Loyola Marymount University
 - 1. Second | NE
- viii. GL | Nominates Spring Fling - University of British Columbia
 - 1. Second | MA
- ix. PA | Nominates Equipment Lending Program - University of California, San Diego
 - 1. Second | SA
- x. NE | Nominates IRHCarnival - Florida State University
 - 1. Second | MA
- xi. NCO | Nominates Taste of Athens - University of Georgia
 - 1. Second | IA
- xii. GL | Nominates Build a Louie! - University of Louisville
 - 1. Second | AC
- xiii. AC | Nominates Los Coogs - University of Houston
 - 1. Second | GL
- d. Motion to close the floor for nominations | MA
 - i. Second | SA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- e. Discussion
 - i. MA | The Midwest appreciates IU's ability to partner with a local community organization to bring an engaging event to students, as well as getting NRHH to a more focal point on their campus, but would have liked to learn more about other parts of the event such as the dance and music areas.
 - ii. SA | The South Atlantic is in full support of the University of Arizona bid for Program of the Year. SAACURH believes this program presents a simple yet highly effective concept that teaches individuals about sustainability and the fast fashion industry while encouraging community engagement. We appreciate the strong collaboration with campus partners and resident assistants, as well as the evident engagement from residents through donations. We like how this program educated students on fast fashion while also teaching them life skills such



as sewing. Additionally, the South Atlantic values the multiple feedback outlets and the clear, step-by-step guidance provided for implementation at both smaller and larger scales. The program's success on its home campus, leading to the creation of year-long collection bins, highlights its sustainability and adaptability. Overall, the initiative is viewed as easy to replicate across campuses and extremely educational, inspiring some of our board members to think of ways they could implement this idea on our host campuses. I yield to SAACURHs ADAF. Continuing on, the South Atlantic supports, with reservations, the bids from Rutgers University, Wright State University, and Florida State University for POY, as each presents a strong and impactful initiative while also acknowledging areas for consideration. Rutgers University offers an innovative and well-supported approach to addressing roommate conflict, though its scale may challenge smaller institutions. Wright State's program is well organized and highly collaborative but may be difficult to replicate and would benefit from stronger evaluation tools. Florida State's Carnival shows effective use of student feedback, adaptability, and collaboration, though it requires significant planning and established hall councils. Overall, all three programs effectively address common challenges and demonstrate innovation and impact, leading the South Atlantic to support these bids, but with reservations. I yield to our ADNRRH. Furthermore, the South Atlantic is not in full support of the following bids for POY, however, we are open to considering the bids from Indiana University Indianapolis, North Dakota State University, Loyola Marymount University, University of Louisville, and University of Houston for POY. The bids from each of these institutions had several strengths such as service oriented foundations, meaningful campus collaborations, and positive impacts to their respective participants. However, some common concerns that we had with these bids were the lack of clarity in different program descriptions, underdeveloped logistical plans such as crowd management tools, limited replicability and evaluation methods. While the South Atlantic wants to hear other perspectives from other entities about these specific programs, we believe that there are other bids that clearly demonstrate comprehensive planning measures, have stronger replicability efforts, and more developed educational components. I yield to SAACURH's ADAF. Finally, the South Atlantic does not support the bids from New York University, University of British Columbia, University of California - San Diego,



and the University of Georgia for POY, as each bid lacked complexity and were basic in nature. New York University's Program lacked the entire student engagement piece. The University of British Columbia showed a strong commitment to accessibility and students needs, but lacked a strong program structure, and had minimal evaluation tools. The University of California's bid lacked originality; most institutions already have an initiative similar to this with renting out equipment/items. Finally, the University of Georgia's bid had minimal educational components and felt as though it better served the vendors rather than the attendees, leading us to believe that the event was not truly student focused. We argue that these programs don't scream "Program of the Year" and further state our 100% support of the University of Arizona's bid for POY 2026.

- iii. Motion to extend by 5 mins | MA
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- iv. IA | Rutgers University "Knights of Connection" is a remarkable program, and IACURH would like to express its appreciation for such a program. The programming team addressed a pressing need at Rutgers University: a space for its residents to find compatible roommates. The program is also highly unique, featuring a wide range of activity stations and volunteer opportunities. Moreover, Rutgers presented a great amount of qualitative and quantitative data in evaluating the program's efficacy and the problem that the program addresses. IACURH believes that Rutgers is a top contender for Program of the Year, as the program is of high quality and addresses a problem that appears to be prevalent across many campuses in NACURH.
- v. Motion to narrow the field to 5 | NCO
 - ~~1. Second | SA~~
 - 2. Dissent | PA - Would like to hear thoughts from other regions.
 - 3. Second retracted
 - 4. Second | None
 - 5. Motion dies.
- vi. CA | Central Atlantic would like to commend Loyola Marymount for creating a very well put together program with clear goals and providing resources as well as matrix for success. Their program was impressive due to this large scale programming including over 600 students that were new to the program. We would also like to highlight that they bused people to the place and provided multiple stations that allowed them to try the food they can buy.



We would also like to commend Rutgers's University for their program. As this program was produced out of student feedback. There was no viable form of roommate matching which led to several roommate conflict issues. This program directly impacted the needs of the students helping them to create healthy living relationships. Each station was set to address roommate conflicts to help residents address these issues early on. Finally we would like to support Wright State as this program excelled by hosting an in depth week-long experience to bring families to campus creating an enhanced community. The amount of activities hosted made this program stand out in comparison. Although we support these three, we would like to state we do not support any of the other 10 programs as we found they either were not student-led, had an impact on the residence halls, or they lacked depth needed for POY.

- vii. SW | Southwest believes that the most important aspects of the program of the year is the impact the program has on the students and residential population and the replicability of a program on other campuses. While we want to give a round of applause to all bids, however, out of all the programs, we felt the following programs were lacking in these important aspects: Rutgers University, University of California - San Diego, and New York University.
- viii. NE | The NE is in support of Rutgers University's bid, as they have found an effective and engaging way to address a common and crucial issue faced among students within the residence halls. Roommate conflicts are a very common issue that often evolves into larger more explosive incidents, and Rutgers's Universities initiative to help combat this is very meaningful and unique.
- ix. GL | The Great Lakes was impressed by the program brought forth by Loyola Marymount University. Their program was relevant to local concerns and engaged with local businesses and communities. The event itself was widely advertised, had a clear budget, sustainable supplies, clearly defined goals, and clearly defined evaluation tools. The event itself had strong, tangible impact and would be easy to translate to other institutions
- x. Motion to narrow the field to 5 bids | MA
 - 1. Second | NCO
 - 2. Dissent | None
- xi. Vote - POY Round 1
 - 1. Knights of Connections - Rutgers University
 - 2. Sweets & Sibs Weekend - Wright State University
 - 3. Apache Santa-Cruz Swap N' Shop - University of Arizona



- 4. Whole Foods Shopping Social - Loyola Marymount University
- xii. Motion to extend by 5 mins | MA
 - 1. Second | CA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- xiii. SW | Motion to caucus for 5 minutes
 - ~~1. Second | PA~~
 - 2. Dissent | SA - would you amend to 10 mins
 - 3. Second retracted
 - 4. Motion amended to 10 mins
 - a. Second | PA
 - b. Dissent | None
- xiv. SA | The South Atlantic would like to express full support for the University of Arizona as we believe they made a huge difference on their campus. This program capitalized on Resident excitement and the multiple feedback options showed its success. The South Atlantic would also like to mention that they gave step by step instruction on implementation for both the smaller and larger scale meaning that it can be produced by all members of NACURH regardless of institutional size. We would like to refer back to our previous points on our support for the University of Arizona. The South Atlantic believes Rutgers's program is a strong and thoughtful response to a significant student housing concern. The initiative offered a variety of engaging activities that provided residents with opportunities to learn about roommate conflict resolution, explore roommate matches, and participate in fun and interactive activities. We appreciate the inclusion of resident guides, step-by-step instructions, and shopping lists, which support replication at other institutions. While there is some concern that the program's scale and multiple moving parts may present challenges for smaller institutions, the region values that the presenters acknowledged this limitation and indicated plans to provide a scalable implementation manual if selected. The South Atlantic also recognizes the program's effective use of multiple feedback mechanisms and its innovative approach to assessing impact by comparing common roommate issues identified in housing assessments to see if certain problems improve. Overall, the program appears highly successful and has helped solve a problem that all institutions face. The South Atlantic supports Wright State University's Bid for POY as it was a strong, well-organized program with a clear timeline and solid foundation. It emphasized collaboration by engaging multiple organizations and community councils, making it, from our



perspective, one of the top submissions. While effective, the program may be hard to replicate due to its multiple day length and limited evaluation tools. The South Atlantic would like to further advocate against Loyola University's bid as we believe the concept of partnering with a grocery store is a strong and innovative idea, particularly in its focus on food nutrition and helping first-year and incoming students become more acquainted with their campus community. However, SAACURH finds the proposed event somewhat complex and potentially difficult to replicate at other institutions. Aspects of the transportation plan and the partnership with Whole Foods were unclear, leaving the region uncertain about the full scope of the program. Furthermore, the Marketing plan for this program was somewhat nonexistent, which shocked us as it was a collaboration with their on-campus orientation staff. While the South Atlantic would have appreciated more detail regarding the partnership structure and clearer evaluation methods, the region recognizes the limitations of a short bid and understands that further details would be provided if selected. Pulling from the POY Website, it states that "NACURH and one of its professional counterparts, ACUHO-I recognizes the most outstanding student-implemented program concerning residence halls through Program of the Year (POY)." This program was fair from this, furthering our vote against Loyola.

- xv. PA | As we evaluate these bids, it is critical that we ground our discussion in both the intent of the Program of the Year award and the mission of NACURH as a residential organization. While all four submissions reflect effort and care, not all programs meaningfully center the residential student experience or advance residential education in a way that aligns with who we are as an affiliate. Wright State University's program is thoughtfully executed and clearly beneficial at the campus level, but it remains largely programmatic rather than residential in nature. The bid does not consistently tie outcomes back to the lived experience of students in residence halls, nor does it articulate how the program strengthens residential communities specifically. Assessment focuses primarily on participation and satisfaction rather than sustained learning or long-term developmental impact, limiting its applicability as a national model. With respect to the University of Arizona, similar to concerns raised about other bids, we have seen many events similar to Arizona's Program of the Year. We believe it is not unique in its own right and as such the bid falls quite flat.



Regarding Sweets & Sibbs, while the concept is creative and unique in framing, it ultimately consisted of many small, low-impact events. Taken individually, these programs lack depth, and collectively they struggle to function as a cohesive, intentional initiative. The residential connection is diffuse, and the fragmented nature of the programming makes meaningful assessment difficult, resulting in diluted overall impact. In contrast, Rutgers University and Loyola Marymount University are two submissions that are truly residential at their core. Both programs are intentionally designed around the residential experience, targeting students where they live, leveraging residence hall infrastructure, and strengthening community within housing environments. As a residential organization, PACURH has a responsibility to elevate programs that directly advance residential education rather than those that merely intersect with student life more broadly. Rutgers University's bid stands out for its clarity of purpose and depth of execution. The program identifies a specific residential student need, builds a targeted response grounded in student development, and evaluates success using both qualitative and quantitative measures. The bid clearly demonstrates adaptability and transferability, making it valuable not just to Rutgers, but to institutions across varying housing models and resource levels. Loyola Marymount University's Whole Foods Shopping Social further exemplifies residential programming at its strongest. The LMU bid transforms a familiar campus space into an intentionally designed residential program, reflecting both long-standing stability and a strong pillar of residential services grounded in community care. The program is explicitly centered on residents, particularly those living on campus, and addresses student health in a tangible and meaningful way through access to nutritious groceries. As a residential organization, we consistently recognize student hunger as a critical issue within residential communities, and this program directly combats that challenge rather than merely acknowledging it. Importantly, LMU pairs these tangible benefits with intentional accessibility. The program's proximity to residential housing, combined with measurable outcomes such as consistent attendance growth and strong social media engagement, demonstrates sustained relevance to the residential population. LMU's ability to staff, coordinate, and refine this program year after year further strengthens the bid, with each iteration showing improvement in participation and execution. This consistency demonstrates not only effectiveness, but a



commitment to doing right by the community rather than relying on novelty alone. Ultimately, while Wright State and Arizona present programs that are creative and locally valuable, they do not demonstrate the same level of residential focus, cohesion, or depth as Rutgers and Loyola Marymount. Given NACURH's identity as a residential organization, prioritizing programs that most clearly embody and advance the residential student experience is both appropriate and necessary. On that basis, backing Rutgers University and Loyola Marymount University is the most aligned and defensible decision.

xvi. Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions | MA

1. Second | SA

2. Dissent | None

xvii. NCO | The NCO believes that Wright State University is deserving of being the recipient of the 2026 Program of the Year award. This bid amazed us with the variety of activities and highlighted a lot of coordination and effort from the program team. We believe that their collaboration with other campus organizations across both student and academic affairs and an overall tie-in with other campus events (i.e. Family Weekend) creates a strong, unique program, one that is deserving of such an honor. We appreciated that this program had many overarching goals, to which most were achieved. We also appreciated the in-depth section on conference presentation. Lastly, we appreciated that Wright State University used their unique campus demographic as a 'suitcase school' to be able to fuel the planning and success of this program. While we did appreciate Rutgers University's for their strong program and bid and we place it as a close second with its strong engagement and relevance, we do believe that the overall impact to students and roommate selections similar to what the Central Atlantic previously stated were not quantified through the bid, concluding with our ultimate choice being Wright State University. At this time, we were not in favor of University of Arizona or Loyola Marymount University as top contenders.

xviii. GL | Of the selected bids, the Great Lakes is still most in favor of Loyola Marymount University for POY. The University of Arizona's bid is a close second for us, they share many of the same pros, but lacked a detailed budget. As mentioned before, Rutgers' bid is not very translatable to many other universities, and was quite expensive. Wright State's bid had no outward facing educational component and no quantitative feedback. We would also like to acknowledge that NACURH has set a precedent in previous years of not requiring our POY winners to be specific to residence halls



- themselves.
- xix. CA | The Central Atlantic found that the University of Arizona's program was unique in nature, as it started from an RA. They taught students about the importance of avoiding fast fashion and gave them a space to recycle clothes and upcycle them. However, we find that the other programs are more developed in nature and express more creativity and uniqueness. In addition to this we would like to echo SAACURH's points of Loyola's Program. With this we give our full support to Wright State University and Rutgers University. Both these programs tie back to the residential experience. Wright State's program acknowledges that a residence hall should feel like a home away from home and bringing your family on campus not only makes the environment more inviting but also encourages students to stay on campus during the weekends, which was a consistent problem for their university. We also would like to point out the uniqueness of Rutgers University's program. We hear concerns about transferability, but we find that multiple universities struggle with roommate problems. They have found an effective solution and think they breakdown just how this solution provides other institutions with the ability to reflect on how they can implement this program. We find both of these bids to be exceptional programs that are targeted for residents and find them both to be a true representation of POY.
- xx. IA | IACURH would like to commend all of the bids presented. Nevertheless, IACURH does not support Wright State University and Loyola Marymount University for Program of the Year, as these programs operate on a larger budget, or, in the case of Wright State University, last for multiple days. In knowing that replicability is an important aspect of POY criteria, as the POY team presents at both ACUHO-I and NACURH to motivate other affiliated institutions to produce a similarly-situated program, IACURH believes that both Rutgers University and University of Arizona put forth programs that are easily replicable for other institutions, and, therefore, are top contenders for this award.
- xxi. SA | YTR
- xxii. SW | The SW appreciates how the majority of the details for the University of Arizona's "Apache Santa-Cruz Swap N' Shop" program was laid out in immense detail, providing a basis for efficient replicability across other institutions. We enjoyed that they had laid out successes and challenges, as well as provided details for the replication process and a detailed description of impact. While we thought that the program, "Knight of



connections, R U My Roommate” from Rutgers University was an incredibly creative program, we echo the Great Lakes and think it lacks major details that may potentially make it difficult to implement on various campuses of different sizes.

- xxiii. MA | MACURH is in full support of Rutgers University for Program of the Year. We appreciated their commitment to building a strong bridge between students and their housing organizations. One specific highlight was their evaluation component was incredibly detailed and allowed for us to get a full grasp of the impact it has on their students. We would also like to give thanks to Wright State University, for their hard work, we loved their usage of being a Suitcase school. We would like to echo SAACURH’s point on LMU and PACURH’s point on Arizona.

- xxiv. NCO | YTR

- xxv. IA | YTR

- xxvi. SA | YTR

- xxvii. Vote - POY Round 2

- 1. Conclusive majority reached

2. [NBD 26-17 Fairness in Bidding-Down](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-17 to the floor | MA

- i. Second | SA

- ii. Dissent | None

- b. Reading of the Piece

- i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | MA

- 1. Second | PA

- 2. Dissent | None

- c. Proponent

- i. Damien Davis, MACURH CONA | Hello everyone! For those of you that don’t know me my name is Damien and I am the Midwest CO for NCCs and Assessment. I originally was inspired to write this piece after NBD25-09 was passed during the previous academic year. With this piece, NACURH leadership that haven’t attended the Semi-Annual Business Meeting are now eligible to run for the NACURH Associate for Engagement position as long as they have been in their NACURH Leadership position for at least 6 months. With this considered, the applicant pool for the NAE position has now significantly expanded. Simultaneously, there is also a NACURH policy that states there can only be one applicant per region that is allowed to bid for a given position. Considering this, when applicants bid down to positions lower in the gavel order they count towards that one person per entity rule. Looking back at last year’s NACURH Exec Committee election, there were



multiple applicants that bid down from their original announced position to positions lower in the gavel order including the NAE position. So for example, If candidate 1 bids for X position, but bids down to NAE, but candidate 2 bids solely for NAE, then their entity would have to vote on who they want to run for the NAE position in the event candidate 1 didn't get their announced position. This leaves room for potentially only candidate 1 being allowed to run for a NACURH Exec position leaving candidate 2 not being able to run for anything. Originally, my plan was to increase the amount of applicants per region that are able to apply to the NAE position to 2, but after conversations with folks from my region, as well as folks from the NACURH Exec Committee, I came to the conclusion that adding a part to the bidding down process would better serve my original purpose. Essentially, this piece would give priority to candidates whose announced position is lower in the gavel order vs someone bidding down to a different position from that of their announced position. A couple of regions did reach out to me prior to the start of the Semi-Annual Business meeting and requested a hypothetical scenario, which I think would be beneficial to include in my proponent speech which is as follows: If a member of the DADs team is bidding for NAN as their announced position and bidding down to NAE, and a CO is bidding for the NAE position, the CO would get priority for the position if both parties running would leave their entity without a voting representative. This train of thought would apply to all of NACURH leadership, not just in a DADs position vs CO scenario. Overall, this piece is just to ensure fairness given the larger applicant pool to the NAE position, but is also extremely applicable to other positions if multiple DADs candidates are running from a given region.

d. Q&A

- i. IA | Could you elaborate on the voting representative piece?
 - 1. Damien Davis, MACURH CONA | How I interpret it as the NACURH exec elections are in joint boards. If the Director, ADAF are running for the position, it would give the next person the vote.
- ii. POC | Where is the one person per entity rule
 - 1. Chair | It is in the bylaws. NACURH website -> Member Resources -> Password -> linkslove!
- iii. NCO | Regions are able to bring proxies to the NACURH Executive Committee elections. Can you explain what impact this piece would have with bringing proxies to elections being possible?
 - 1. Damien Davis, MACURH CONA | A proxy is a voting



representative so if a proxy can come, they would count as a voting representative within the space.

- iv. SA | Going off the NCO question. If proxies are a thing then what is the point of the piece?
 - 1. Damien Davis, MACURH CONA | If there are no proxies available, this would be incorporated. This is a loophole to not change the bylaws. It still goes toward the intent and purpose of the piece.
- v. CA | In the first part, we are confused about the wording. Can you explain what that means?
 - 1. Damien Davis, MACURH CONA | That was where the two entities reached out to me about. If you recall when the advisors talked about Exec elections, so your highest position is what you bid for and if you bid down, the announced position is the highest position, but their highest announced would take priority over the person bidding down IF they would be without a voting representative.
- vi. Move to extend by 5 mins | CA
 - 1. Second | SA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- vii. IA | Do you believe that this addition would encourage entities to leave their entities without a voting rep?
 - 1. Damien Davis, MACURH CONA | This wouldn't allow an entity to do anything. Through this they have to have a voting rep for Joint.
- viii. Motion to exhaust with additions | MA
 - 1. Second | SW
 - 2. Dissent | None
- ix. SA | YTR
- e. Discussion
 - i. NCO | The NCO is hesitant to support this piece because we don't necessarily see what this piece is doing when entities can bring proxies to elections. We do see scenarios where entities may have limited RBD/SEC members available to attend elections. We do see potential necessity to explore options to allow additional people to run for the NAE position and at this time would recommend that the piece is tabled back to the author for edits.
 - ii. Motion to amend the piece | GL
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent |
 - 3. Author accepts as friendly
 - iii. Move to caucus for 5 minutes | SA



1. Second | SW
 2. Dissent | None
 - iv. CA | We are confused about how useful this would be. For example, Olivia runs for Chair and bids down to NAE and Will runs for NAE then it leaves Ryan (our ADAF) still in the space as a voting rep.
 - v. Motion to table this piece back to the author to workshop and present at a later point | SA
 1. Second | CA
 2. Dissent | None
 - f. Vote
 - i. Tabled back to the author.
3. Motion to recess until January 6 at 8:30 AM CST | MA
 - a. Second | NCO
 - b. Dissent | None



Tuesday, January 6, 2026

Roll Call - Called to order at 8:31 CST

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

1. Sponsorship Update
 - a. Andy McDade, CEO Storage Squad
2. [NBD 26-20 Policy Manual to Operations Manual](#)
 - a. Motion to bring NBD 26-20 to the floor | GL
 - i. Second | SW
 - ii. Dissent | None
 - b. Reading of the Piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | CA
 1. Second | MA
 2. Dissent | None
 - ii. Proponent
 1. [Presentation](#) | Policies and Practices Committee
 - iii. Q&A
 1. SA | The South Atlantic would like clarification on if these policies are still in the policy book and this is just copied over or has this information been removed from the policy



book? If it's being removed and delegates notice/ need it, what is the plan for providing context as many delegates use the policy book to confirm NACURH policy to keep entities accountable?

- a. NAO | If you look at the working policy book, it highlights what is being moved and what is being removed. The parts that reps are holding entities accountable is still part of the policy book, the stuff that got moved is more internal things.
2. CA | What are the inherent differences between the PB and OM?
 - a. NAO | The policy book is something that helps with our governing documents. It helps dictate how we do certain things like emails and things that are only relevant to NACURH leadership. These are things the committee looked at to move to the operations manual like policy and branding since they are more internal and not relevant to people and students outside of the NBD.
3. NCO | With relevance being the primary reason for most of the presented changes, which of course makes sense, what was the standard set for each member of the committee to objectively decide relevance in the policybook?
 - a. NAO | We all had time to review our parts and agreed on it as a group, as we discussed it as a committee.
4. SW | We have a question about the movement of the NRHH Celebration and NRHH day of service to the operation manual verses keeping it in the Policy book, as this could create some visibility to a newer thing that NRHH is doing and might be something that an institution might find interest seeing it while going through the policy book, have you considered this point of view in that decision and could you give more context to that decision?
 - a. GL Director | A lot of what is described in policy is out of date for what we do. A lot of these events become out of date quickly. We want to create a lot more visibility in specific sections to help give ideas for events we could do. It's not something to lock us in and there's other ways to help encourage visibility outside of the policy book for the events that we do.
5. PA | If it is being moved out of policy, how are we going about changes in the Operations Manual?



- a. NAO | This piece allows the committee to review the operations manual annually so we can keep it up to date. If you would like to change something in the operations manual, you would talk to a committee member and they can help change it.
- 6. Motion to extend by 5 mins | CA
 - a. Second | SW
 - b. Dissent None
- 7. SA | The South Atlantic would like to clarify if this is going to be a governing document or simply a resource.
 - a. NAO | This will not be a governing document, like a resource on your regional level.
- 8. CA | Are the things written in the operations manual required for individuals to complete or something more similar to suggestions?
 - a. NAO | A lot of these things are like travel. We have to follow guidelines. If it changes it's based on communication. We won't change how we operate, it's more so a leadership only document and recommendation. This is not something required like forms. We plan on linking rubrics, guides, and templates in the next semester so it's easy for NACURH leadership to see what's in our drives. There is a list of things that could be included in the future as well.
- 9. Motion to exhaust with additions | MA
 - a. Second | SW
 - b. Dissent | None
- 10. IA | The Intermountain was wondering if RBD members are prohibited from referencing the Operations Manual and/or displaying it to Representatives in explaining NACURH Leadership items such as the NACURH Days of Service?
 - a. NAO | It's not prohibited to share those things, it's just meant to tell you what is being promoted so when the NBD sets the timeline and then leadership can reference it later.
- 11. PA | YTR
- 12. SA | YTR
- 13. CA | Is there any concern that because the manual can be changed without legislation that the intent of the pieces would be diluted?
 - a. NAO | That was already passed in NBD 25-33, if we make changes our practice does not align with that



and we would need to update policy through legislation. Legislation is taking away from what boards can do, and it will be reviewed and evaluated by the policy and practices committee.

iv. Discussion

1. Motion to caucus for 5 mins | SA
 - a. Second | CA
 - b. Dissent | None
2. SW | The Southwest appreciates the time and effort of the committee and commitment to improve our very long policy book and making it more accessible to the members of the organization by keeping relevant information to institutions while moving information that might make the policy book overwhelming for those looking at the policy book and reducing some of the amount of information overload that some may feel. We also appreciate that this makes it easier to update practices that change more year to year rather than having to repeatedly make legislative changes that get overturned just a few years later.
3. MA | The Midwest is in full support of the passing of this piece, we appreciate the hard work the committee put in to the project. We believe that having an operations manual will enable better communication of information to leadership. Having a shorter policy book will also allow for a lower barrier to entry for new members of leadership.
4. IA | While the Intermountain is apprehensive about transferring some of the proposed policy sections, such as the NACURH Days of Service and Election Code, to the Operations Manual, we support this piece in knowing that NACURH Leadership can always propose a piece to reverse any of these changes if needed. We are curious to witness the implementation of the Operations Manual within NACURH Leadership and are hopeful that the Manual will provide NACURH Leadership with a resource that outlines living practices in addition to the steadfast policy provided in the policybook.
5. PA | The Pacific Region appreciates the intent and thoughtfulness behind this piece; however, we would like to note a few minor concerns. First, there does not appear to be a clearly defined process for formally communicating updates or changes to the manual back to the respective boards. Additionally, given the number of existing NACURH resources and manuals, we have some concern that



introducing an additional document may increase the complexity of onboarding for incoming leadership rather than streamline it.

6. POC - NAO | Right now any changes to our policy book and/or bylaws needs to be communicated to NACURH at large within 45 days by the NAO.
7. GL | The Great Lakes is in support of this piece as it allows for both a uniform practices resource to refer to and be easily updated with procedural changes to the benefit of current and future NACURH leaders, as well as the flexibility that a living document provides for reflective change when needed in the organization.
8. AC | The Annual Conference supports the proposed changes outlined by the Working group to the NACURH Policy Book and the Policy Book to Operations Manual and believes these updates will strengthen the transparency, usability, and long-term organization of these documents.
9. NCO | The NCO is in support of this piece as it provides an accessible place to house leadership information. One concern with this piece is the worry of losing valuable information over time within the operations manual that was previously in the policybook as there is no approval process to alter this resource. A large part of NCO procedures and guidelines will live here, so efforts by NACURH leadership will need to be made to ensure that this doesn't happen.
10. SA | The South Atlantic is in favor of this as it is not changing policies but simply moving them into a consolidated document to better our operating procedures throughout NACURH. At first we had concerns about removing these policies from the policy books and not allowing the boards to vote on future changes. However, after further reflection, we acknowledge that this manual would have originated from the policy book to update current practices and not create brand new policies from scratch without board approval. We are in support of this piece
11. Motion to end discussion | GL
 - a. Second | MA
 - b. Dissent | None

v. Vote

1. 9-0-0, Piece passes.



3. Motion to recess Joint Boardroom until Annual Business Meeting 2026 | NE
 - a. Second | PA
 - b. Dissent | None

NBD Boardroom

Roll Call - Called to order at 9:30 CST

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

1. [NBD 26-15 Expedited Accountability Process](#)
 - a. Motion to bring NBD 26-15 to the floor | CA



- i. Second | AC
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the Piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | MA
 - 1. Second | NE
 - 2. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent
 - i. Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | This piece slightly redesigns the accountability report process to allow entity leadership more options in the beginning stages of the process. This is due to the fact that many people see the submission of an accountability report as an extreme or final measure whereas a first report is meant to be an internal discussion and opportunity to improve. This perception has led to several instances of individuals resigning immediately upon receipt of a first report or of individuals refusing to submit a report due to the implications and eventually having to submit a report and start over once internal processes were unsuccessful. By allowing entities who have created and documented an action plan to address behavioral concerns the option to “skip” the first report, leadership can intervene without the disciplinary implications of NACURH Exec involvement or the worry of their efforts lacking impact. Further, this change better facilitates regional-level accountability procedures that often mirror the NACURH accountability process.
 - ii. Morgan Lakey, SAACURH Director | The original 48-hour response window was extended to three business days to allow regional boards sufficient time to consult with advisors, NACURH Executives when necessary, and to schedule required meetings. Accountability forms frequently lack crucial details, which can make it necessary to contact the individual who submitted the report before scheduling follow-up meetings. In many cases, these reports are submitted over weekends, making timely outreach challenging. Moving to a three-business-day timeline provides regions with a more realistic and manageable timeframe while still ensuring timely action. Regarding follow-up procedures, it is important to clearly define who is responsible if the Director is unable to participate. The updated language specifies that the next individual in gavel order who is not directly involved in the case, will assume responsibility for the follow-up. This offers regional boards a clear process to follow, particularly when members of the DAD team are implicated.
- d. Q&A
 - i. GL | Would this piece require regions that don't have an internal



- accountability process to create one?
1. Chair & SA Director | Not at all. This only updates how regional processes exist and how they operate.
- ii. NCO | Is 'second report' and 'if two reports are received' the same scenario?
 1. Chair & SA Director | It's for two reports on the same issue. The second report usually is what leads to the follow up. It's often up to the discretion of the entity and chair.
 - iii. CA | In the proponent you mention this would create different options for accountability, would you be able to describe those options?
 1. Chair & SA Director | Right now, the policy reads that if regional accountability is submitted, if sent to the NACURH level, the process will have to start over again. This allows for a continued process.
 - iv. SW | We would like to ask for clarification on why three days were selected?
 1. Chair & SA Director | We saw that sometimes advisors weren't able to work as fast on the turnaround and the three business days allows there to still be good accountability but at a more reasonable timeline. This gives more time to get the individual story before setting up the accountability meeting. Basically you have three days to set up an action plan.
 - v. RFI - PA | What time zone is defined for what an exact business day is?
 1. Chair | NACURH bases most policy on HST and then translates that to the region.
 - vi. PA | Are we correct in our interpretation that if this is followed, the region or entity can still choose to report it as a first report or would it default as a second report?
 1. Chair & SA Director | When that gets submitted, the report would get sent out to the necessary people, the process would be explained, then a meeting would be held to put the story together. Then the reporter and leadership would be given the option to bring this to the NACURH level.
 - vii. Moves to exhaust the speakers list with additions | CA
 1. Second | PA
 2. Dissent | None
 - viii. GL | YTR
 - e. Discussion
 - i. NCO | The NCO is in full support of this piece as it allows an easier transition from an internal to the NACURH level reporting. It also



gives the choice to regions to start from scratch with the process as well.

- ii. GL | The Great Lakes is in favor of this piece and is appreciative of the requirement that the decision to incorporate previous instances of accountability processes into the report being brought to the NACURH level must be made at the beginning of the process to ensure equitability.
 - iii. PA | The Pacific is in full favor of this piece because this will allow our accountability process to be better at the NACURH level.
 - iv. MA | YTR
 - v. NE | NEACURH believes that this piece will help increase productivity during accountability processes. This piece accommodates cases that need further action, and is inclusive towards advisor capacity.
 - vi. Motion to end discussion | GL
 - ~~1. Second | CA~~
 - 2. Dissent | SW - Would like to get on the speakers list
 - 3. Second retracted
 - 4. Amended to exhausting with additions
 - a. Seconded | CA
 - b. Dissent | None
 - vii. SW | The southwest appreciates the clarification of this piece as we have also had similar experiences with accountability processes and appreciates taking the time to make it easier and less stressful on the region.
- f. Vote
- i. 7-0-1, NBD 26-15 Passes

2. [NBD 26-18 Letter of Support Practice Alignment](#)

- a. Motion to bring NBD 26-18 to the floor | CA
 - i. Second | PA
 - ii. Dissent | None
- b. Reading of the Piece
 - i. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | CA
 - 1. Second | MA
 - 2. Dissent | None
- c. Proponent
 - i. Cade Perkins, NACURH Chairperson | This piece aligns NACURH Policy with existing practice as letters of support and host support in general do not necessarily need to come from housing professionals and can be provided by pretty much anyone who is able to verify good academic standing and serve as a point of contact on the campus level. The example I tend to use is



someone like a Dean of Students or student government advisor but the language is left intentionally vague and someone like a research mentor could just as easily provide a letter of support, though regions wanting to provide greater direction have the option of keeping the requirement as student affairs professional in the final therefore clause. This helps to further work out the kinks of the transition to not requiring leadership to live on campus by lessening the chance of internal institutional policies preventing students from being involved in NACURH Leadership.

d. Q&A

- i. SA | The South Atlantic was wondering if passed, would there need to be updates to the Leadership Host Acknowledgement Form or other documentation to reflect these changes?
 1. Chair | With the piece that passed previously, NACURH execs just have a section the campus advisor needs to sign to sign off on their support.
- ii. PA | The Pacific is wondering if we have to remove the requirement for it to be a housing professional at the regional level, or if we can keep it?
 1. Chair | Highly discouraged from keeping the language restrictive for just housing, as it is very restrictive on students wanting to be resolved.
- iii. GL | Has this historically limited interested individuals from filling these positions?
 1. Chair | Yes.
- iv. NCO | Is there worry that removing the requirement of the support of a housing professional may lose the connection to the campus residence life experience?
 1. Chair | No, part of that is that either way people need to be barring forward a bid or application that can be reviewed. When they have no connection to their on campus community, that's a different scenario. You need to have some kind of connection to your on campus community and no connection to residence life that's pretty obvious when they apply and/or make their bid for a position.
- v. CA | Is the term full-time professional defined in policy?
 1. Chair | Not necessarily, but the way that we define full-time on any level is left to the discretion of the institution. This would be similar to student status.
- vi. Motion to exhaust the speakers list with additions | MA
 1. Second | CA
 2. Dissent | None

e. Discussion



- i. SA | The South Atlantic supports this piece because it removes unnecessary barriers that limit student involvement in NACURH Leadership.
 - ii. NE | YTR
 - iii. GL | YTR
 - iv. MA | YTR
 - v. SW | YTR
 - vi. Motion to exhaust with additions | NE
 - 1. Second | SA
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - f. Vote
 - i. 8-0-0, NBD 26-18 Passes
3. NCO Merch Discussion
- a. [Presentation](#) | NACURH Corporate Office
4. Motion to recess NBD until Annual Business Meeting 2026 | NE
- a. Second | AC
 - b. Dissent | None

