



NACURH, Inc.

2024 Corporate Business Meeting

Hosted at New Mexico State University
May 24-28, 2024

2023-2024 NACURH Corporate Business Meeting Roles

Presiding Officer:

Kelsie Dillard
NACURH Chairperson

Minutes Compiled By:

Parrama Chouhan
NACURH Associate for Operations (2024 - 2025)

Parliamentarians:

Mack Shields
Midwest Affiliate Regional Director

Recording Secretaries:

Cade Perkins
South West Affiliate Associate Director for Administration and Finance

Claire Westby
NCO Director for Information and Services

Parrama Chouhan
Great Lakes Affiliate Associate Director for Administration and Finance



2023-2024 NACURH Board of Directors & NACURH NRHH Board of Directors

Central Atlantic Affiliate

Penina Schlesinger - Regional Director
Madison McCartha - ADAF
Xuxa Rossi - ADNRHH

Sheena Marie Agonoy-Pascua - Regional Director (2024)
Bri Lopez - ADAF
Anthony Ching - ADNRHH

Great Lakes Affiliate

Andres Lopez - Regional Director
Parrama Chouhan - ADAF
Lucy Ade - ADNRHH

South Atlantic Affiliate

Jonathan Hueftle - Regional Director
Keri Nguyen - ADAF
Janelle Lora - ADNRHH

Intermountain Affiliate

Alex Godfrey - Regional Director
Danielle Duran - ADAF
Lauren Gaiser - ADNRHH

Southwest Affiliate

Maya Landgrebe - Regional Director
Cade Perkins - ADAF
Hennessy Marte - ADNRHH

Midwest Affiliate

Mack Shields - Regional Director
Carissa French - ADAF
Michael Hodge - ADNRHH

Annual Conference Staff

Linda Anderson - Annual Conference Chair
Mo Cravenock - NBD Liaison
Michael Tavares - Finance Chair

Northeast Affiliate

Tania Sharma - Regional Director
Riley Kaler - ADAF Proxy
Helene Obonga Tongunga - ADNRHH Proxy

NACURH Executive Committee and Consultants

Kelsie Dillard - Chairperson
Payton Branson - Associate for Engagement
Jamie Lloyd - Advisor
Jen O'Brien - NRHH Advisor
Jen Kacere - Conference Resource Consultant
Rick Cazzato Jr. - ART Consultant
Anna Pietrzak - Advancement Society Consultant

Pacific Affiliate

Elijah Franklin - Regional Director (2023)



NACURH 2024 Corporate Info Meeting Minutes

- I. Call to order: Saturday, May 2024, 2023 at 1:44 PM MDT
- II. Roll Call
 - A. Yield to Regional Directors and Associate Directors for NRHH
 - B. 97 institutions present
 1. CAACURH: 14
 2. GLACURH: 18
 3. IACURH: 13
 4. NEACURH: 8
 5. MACURH: 9
 6. PACURH: 11
 7. SAACURH: 18
 8. SWACURH: 12
 - C. 77 NRHH Representatives present
 1. CAACURH: 12
 2. GLACURH: 9
 3. IACURH: 13
 4. NEACURH: 5
 5. MACURH: 7
 6. PACURH: 7
 7. SAACURH: 16
 8. SWACURH: 7
 - D. NCC Quorum is established
 - E. NRHH Quorum is established
- III. Corporate Information Session Agenda Overview | NACURH Chairperson
- IV. Appointment of Parliamentarians
 - A. NACURH Corporate | Mack Shields, MACURH Regional Director
 1. Motion | GL - University of Wisconsin Whitewater
 - a) Second | IA - University of Utah
 - b) No dissent
- V. PPP - GL - University of Wisconsin Whitewater | Can we have captions displayed?
 - A. Chairperson | Yes.
- VI. Parliamentary Procedure Presentation | Mack Shields, MACURH Regional Director & Kelsie Dillard, NACURH Chairperson
- VII. Setting Corporate Expectations
 - A. SW - West Texas A&M University | We are graceful with each other as there are a lot of new people here



- B. SA - East Tennessee State University | Emphasizing the importance of respecting different opinions, no tolerance for interruption and disrespectful behavior.
- C. NE - University at Buffalo | Respect everyone's time and YTR when necessary
- D. GL - University of Wisconsin Whitewater | YTR
- E. SA - University of Central Florida | Minority opinions be respected
- F. MA - Minnesota State University Mankato | Asks that we keep side conversations limited as it can be distracting for others
- G. SA - University of North Carolina Charlotte | Asks that everyone be unbiased and make decisions for us as a conference and not for own personal gain
- H. CA - Kutztown University of Pennsylvania | Keep an open mind to everyone's ideas and opinions
- I. NE - Northeastern University | Everyone listens to discussion points and questions rather than pre-determining an opinion
- J. IA - University of New Mexico | Asks that everyone respects the final outcome of the vote
- K. SA - University of Georgia | Asks that everyone be patient when questions are being asked
- L. IA - New Mexico State University | Points should be made with consideration to the interests of their region and the corporation
- M. SA - South Atlantic Executive Committee | Hope that you all support each other in these spaces and recognize the achievements that you make here
- N. NE - Northeastern University | Electronic devices are used to look at documents and not distractions
- O. IA - Northern Arizona University | Asks that the space remains aware of our language so things like size aren't used in reactions to others points
- P. NAE | Have fun!
- Q. GL - University of Wisconsin Whitewater | Encourages everyone to practice radical self love
- R. CA - University of Cincinnati | Everyone to be patient as there are people who are new to conference
- S. POI: SW - University of Central Arkansas | We don't have access to the chat bubble on the meeting minutes
 - 1. NAE | In order to see the chat function click on the number of people in the document and join chat, this is where you will paste discussion points. If you cannot see those numbers, zoom out within your browser (ctrl - OR command -). If you can't see that let me know and we can help.
 - 2. POC: GL | Should institutions add their name?
 - a) Chair | Yes, and no abbreviations. Region | Full Institution Name - Discussion Point



- T. NAE | Don't go crazy with adding comments as it will make document harder to use
- U. MA - NDSU | Try to avoid using institutional acronyms
- VIII. Example of how to put discussion points
 - A. NACURH - Minute Takers | Typed
 - B. OR email your regional director
 1. CAACURH: ca_director@nacurh.org
 2. GLACURH: gl_director@nacurh.org
 3. IACURH: ia_adaf@nacurh.org
 4. NEACURH: ne_director@nacurh.org
 5. MACURH: ma_recognition@nacurh.org
 6. PACURH: pa_director@nacurh.org
 7. SAACURH: sa_director@nacurh.org
 8. SWACURH: sw_director@nacurh.org
- IX. POI CA - Kutztown University of Pennsylvania | Is it possible to do one representative per institution to reduce the high traffic on the document.
 - A. Chairperson | Yes, you all are able to do it amongst yourselves
- X. Approval of the 2024 Corporate Business Meeting Agenda
 - A. Motion to approve the 2024 Corporate Business Meeting Agenda | IA - Northern Arizona University
 1. Second | SW - Texas A&M University
 2. Dissent | None
- XI. Approval of the 2023 NRHH Corporate Business Meeting Minutes
 - A. Motion to approve the 2023 NRHH Corporate Business Meeting Minutes | SA - Clemson University
 1. Second | NE - Stony Brook University
 2. Dissent | None
- XII. Approval of the 2023 NACURH Corporate Business Meeting Minutes
 - A. Motion to approve the 2023 NACURH Corporate Business Meeting Minutes | CA - The Ohio State University
 1. Second | GL - The University of Michigan Ann Arbor
 2. Dissent | None
- XIII. [Overview of the 2023-2024 NACURH Board of Directors Legislation + State of NACURH](#)
| Kelsie Dillard, NACURH Chairperson
 - A. Question & Answer
 1. PA - Washington State University | Did NBD 24-29 exist?
 - a) Chairperson | To clarify, from 16 to 40 all were seen this past week. It was just a typo.



2. CA - Bowling Green State University | The question BGSU is asking is in reference to I believe NBD 24-26 and legal services with NACURH as a 501C . In the past BGSU has felt the equity clause has been used to prioritize governmental and institutional policies and conditions over individuals rights, identities, and abilities. BGSU was curious given NACURHs 501C nonprofit status how does that status impact the use of the equity clause by conference business facilitators to designate institutions comments as equitable or inequitable given inequitable comments are typically disregarded by regional or national NACURH members?
 - a) Chairperson | First part about the piece, this piece allows NACURH to use our legal services to define what this status means in our policy book. Different 501(c)3 non profits are unable to make political statements without losing their status. This creates a plan that the next exec committee can put a definition of what this status means in our policy books, and decides whether we can or can not make statements online and provide resources in relation to what we are able to engage in. This way we can provide effective support to our institutions. With this status, there are things we cannot make statements on because they are seen as partisan, so we would lose our status and have to pay taxes and affiliation costs would have to go up. What this piece does is clarify that so that the legal team are able to legally tell us what these legal and governmental documents mean so that the Execs and RBDs can make statements and advocate for our institutions. This piece seeks to clarify what this status means so that we can provide resources, new services, and advocacy to our affiliates without threatening this status. NACURH's 501(c)3 status doesn't impact your individual rights or institutional rights. Those are your rights and NACURH cannot infringe or does not seek to infringe on those rights.
3. SA - University of Georgia | NBD 24-15 What does consent mean?
 - a) Chairperson | Consent means that everybody in the space agreed to the piece passing.
4. SA - University of Central Florida | Please provide a link to the presentation in the minutes
 - a) Chairperson | Working on it
5. IA - Colorado State University | More in depth description of NBD 24-19 and why it failed to pass.



- a) Chairperson | The piece failed for a few different reasons. The NBD believed that there needed to be more conversions about the IN and their functioning. The piece was not meant to infringe on the services that IN provide but elect a leader that a director would lead IN chairs to perform duties. Help them with administrative duties, so this didn't prevent any services provided by the IN as every single one of the 4 chairs in the IN are on the same level, so the intent of that piece was meant to provide a director. The NBD felt there should have been a further conversation on the IN at large as opposed to making these changes now.
 - 6. GL - Michigan State University | You mentioned NBD24-30-c, which splits the Conference Resource Consultant into 2 positions, failed, could you speak more to why they failed?
 - a) Chairperson | Absolutely.
 - b) NAE | As I recall, we acknowledged how the CRC does a lot of work. We wanted to evaluate the role prior to making any changes to the policy directly. There will be an ad hoc committee that will be established to start the evaluation process for the CRC role.
 - 7. POC: PA - Washington State University | You alluded to 16 all the way down have some sort of misnomer, are these going to show up this way in historical archives?
 - a) Chairperson | The only actual missed number was the one we previously discussed. All of the pieces in our grid have those numbers. Earlier the budget presentation had a number but that has been resolved
 - 8. NE - Northeastern University | Wondering if NBD 24-11 is going into effect next affiliation year or immediately?
 - a) Chairperson | It was effective immediately however it was a piece for leadership that does not go into bylaws
- B. NACURH Strategic Plan
- 1. Question & Answer
 - a) GL - University of Wisconsin Stevens Point | Would like to know what inspired the creation of this plan after not having it for 8 years?
 - (1) Chairperson | This came about because I faced the question of how to create a vision for NACURH. I spoke with the two NACURH advisors about what makes sense



and how to put all of these ideas together in a complex way. I began in 2017 when there was a strategic plan which was great. Being a 2 term chair and having a good team of leadership that wanted to have these conversations allowed us to approach many important questions that we were unable to answer. We asked these questions and wanted to create a plan to address them moving forward so that future NACURH leaders can have answers to these questions.

b) CA - The Ohio State University | Reading through the plan it seems a lot of written stuff is value based. We would like to know what concrete items are there that we could take back to our institutions?

(1) Chairperson | There are services that I couldn't even begin to think of that may come from this plan as that is the purpose of the plan, to figure out what is needed and what needs to be created. The reason the plan is values based is because once we have a foundation we can figure out what services we need to offer (e.g. conferences). Once we set that foundation we can build off of it

c) POI: PA - Washington State University | Curious when the acronyms are updatable, vs making an amendment to the strategic plan and specifying what areas are more lax?

(1) Chairperson | This was asked when presenting the plan. This plan is created to be adaptable and pieces can be dismissed if necessary. It is only a plan and if we have new information we can change.

(a) PA - Washington State University | Would there be any voting behind it?

(i) Chairperson | Acronyms can be changed later by the chairperson. It would not need to be amended by a vote. If something needs to be addressed, it would be a larger conversation. It aids the chairperson in creating a vision for the organization but is not the sole responsibility of the chairperson.

C. [FY2025 Budget Overview](#) | Parrama Chouhan, GL ADAF



1. CA - Bowling Green State University | Move to groove for 10 minutes
 - a) Second | SW - Stephen F. Austin State University
 - b) Dissent | None
 - (1) Return to business at 3:30PM
2. Question & Answer
 - a) POI: PA - Regional Board of Directors | What is EMA?
 - (1) Short term investment accounts from Merrell Lynch. A guy suggests what we should do with that money and we do it. Endowment Investment Account
 - b) SA - Clemson University | Will there be a direct budget link on the website? Or a link to the corporate website via the NACURH website?
 - (1) NAE | We are working to put everything on the NACURH website, please look at the presentation section of the corporate website
 - c) IA - University of New Mexico | Would like to ask about the annual conference loan that is mentioned in the budget?
 - (1) Chairperson | If the annual conference needs to take a loan, it is in the revenue because they have to pay it back and is reflected in the expenses as well.
 - d) PA - University of California Santa Barbara | Is the money in savings under an APY fund?
 - (1) NACURH Advisors | It is just a traditional savings account and we receive an interest on the accounts as well.
 - e) NE - Northeastern University | Seeking clarification on the federal taxes line item and NACURH's tax exempt status
 - (1) SW ADAP | We are a non-profit organization and pay reduced federal taxes, but we are not actually tax exempt. This line item is for those taxes as well as filing fees
 - f) NE - Columbia University | Seeks clarification on why are we spending \$2000 on zoom?
 - (1) Chairperson | This is not only for NACURH, but also for all of our regional affiliates and webinars.
 - g) SW - Texas AMU | Where can we find information on the investment policies of NACURH?
 - (1) Chairperson | NACURH policy book, under title 12 of finances
 - h) SA - University of Georgia | Regarding the taxes, why for FY 24 there were no taxes and FY25 we have budgeted the amount?



- (1) NACURH Advisor | Some years we file our taxes earlier and other years our accountant gets it done earlier. Some years we are able to do it more quickly and this year the regional finance officers were able to
- i) IA - University of New Mexico | Why was there a significant decrease in advertising?
 - (1) Chairperson | We have an operational NACURH Corporate Office who now handles those services (in a separate NCO budget)
- j) SA - University of Central Florida | Motion to exhaust Q&A with additions
 - (1) Second | MA - Missouri University of Science and Technology
 - (2) Dissent | None
- k) CA - Ohio University | What technology savings means and how that is accounted for.
 - (1) Chairperson | Yield to GLACURH ADAF
 - (2) GLACURH ADAF | We had an excess after last annual conference so allocated that to technology savings
 - (3) Ohio University | What type of account is that money in?
 - (a) Chairperson | Normal savings account

XIV. [Overview of the 2023-2024 NACURH NRHH Board of Directors Legislation + State of NRHH](#) | Payton Branson, NACURH Associate for Engagement (NAE)

A. Question & Answer

- 1. PA - University of California Santa Barbara | In NNBD 24 - 11, how will the award recipient receive the award?
 - a) Incoming NAN/GL ADNRHH| Usually this award is scheduled to be given out at the annual conference. If the chapter that nominated them is present then they can accept the award.
- 2. CA - Ohio University | NNBD 24 - 11, can the lifelong member be an advisor?
 - a) Incoming NAN/GL ADNRHH| They can be an advisor, they just need to be a lifelong member of NRHH
- 3. NE - Northeastern University | Hoping to get more context on NNBD 24-01D to understand the large number of abstentions
 - a) NAE | When this piece was being reviewed, the NNBD determined that they wanted to look at the chapters in the NACURH policy book so they weren't overlapping and connected together.



4. SA - University of Georgia | NNBD 24-03 what was the reason for the dissent on the legislation?
 - a) NAE | The reason for dissent was that there was a region that believed we should think a little bit more about existing categories before adding a new category.
 5. SW - Texas A&M University | In NNBD 24-04, how did the discussion go about avoiding bias?
 - a) Incoming NAN/GL ADNRRH| 24-04 was tabled temporarily to discuss bias and how to avoid it. The piece discusses anyone who is not involved in OTMs and also encourages individuals on OTM selection committees or otherwise involved to address biases. If there is suspicion of bias that OTM is disqualified
 6. PA - UC Santa Barbara| In NNBD 24-11, will previous members of NRHH be grandfathered in?
 - a) NAE | This piece is not an annual bestowment but the NNBD can discuss and see who they would like to award it. This does not conflict with the lifelong members piece.
 7. GL - University of Illinois Urbana Champaign | About NNBD 24-12, if this only pertains to the national NRHH board or if this will change how NRHH boards are run at the regional level?
 - a) NAE | The standing order piece is on the website if you're interested. This removal will not impact you on the regional level, we did remove some that may have impacted the regional level from this discussion
 8. SA - University of Central Florida | Moves to end Q & A with additions
 - a) Second | GL - Eastern Illinois University
 - b) Dissent | None
 9. CA - George Washington University | In regards to NNBD 24-09, what are the requirements and how are you choosing who is going to be on that committee?
 - a) Incoming NAN/GL ADNRRH | The standing committee is constantly going and will help complete goals of the committee. From what I believe anyone can be part of the committee, NACURH Leadership, non NRHH members, etc.
 10. CA | YTR
- B. NRHH Strategic Plan
1. NAE | Yield to Incoming NAN/GL ADNRRH
 2. Questions & Answer



- a) SA - Mississippi State University | How will the strategic plan also help with AI in OTMs?
 - (1) GL ADNRHH | Great question. The NACURH NRHH Board of Directors is having this discussion right now and we hope to have some sort of functionality in the database to check for AI usage.
- b) SW - Texas A&M University | Are there plans for the long term goal of inspiring identity and promoting commitment to recognition and service?
 - (1) GL ADNRHH | Something that is important to us with inspiring NRHH identity, a lot of it involves what recognition and service does, and how those are leading into those long term goals.
- c) PA - Oregon State University| Will the 3 focus areas be treated as individual aspects or will them being contingent on one another be considered?
 - (1) GL ADNRHH | They are built in a way to work together. These initiatives were developed without the focus areas being established so the goals will cross over
- d) CA - Bowling Green State University | How can individual NRHH Chapters work to implement the strategic plan at their own institutions, specifically the values portion?
 - (1) GL ADNRHH | It is going to be a goal of the NNBD very quickly and we would love to have feedback from you all on what you all think about recognition and service and when we define that on the NACURH level it is something that you all are able to take back to campuses easily.
- e) IA - University of New Mexico | For the short term goal, are we redefining the values we already have in place?
 - (1) GL ADNRHH | We are not adding anymore values. We only want to define what we mean when we say recognition and service.
- f) SW - Texas A&M University | Are there any tangible goals and results being set and met?
 - (1) GL ADNRHH | The strategic plan establishes some tangibles like the OTM database, but we hope to update everyone on progress made toward these goals at fall and spring quarterly meetings



- (2) NAE | Intentional conversations have been had in the NNBD about how we can reestablish services that aren't being used effectively
- g) GL - University of Wisconsin Stevens Point | Motion to end Q&A with additions
 - (1) Second | PA - Stanford University
 - (2) Dissent | None
- h) SW - University of Central Arkansas | Are there any potential ideas about the long term goal of service implementation?
 - (1) GL ADNRHH | Absolutely. One of the long term goals is to bring back National Residence Hall Month/Week. We used to do service initiatives within that. We have been talking about bringing things back like that, maybe like service months.
- i) SW - Texas A&M University | Wondering about the standardization of the services and resources. Is there a team or group of people planning to do that? How will that work?
 - (1) GL ADNRHH | That came from a long discussion within NNBD with something called Candidate member education. This program is meant for new members of NRHH to become educated on the history of NRHH and what it means to be a member. That will be looked at by the NNBD to figure out what you all want from an educational service.
- j) SA - University of Central Florida | What is the necessity of throwing out AI generated OTMs. Some people have the inability to write due to disability reasons so why is it necessary to throw out if everything contained is truthful
 - (1) NAE | We would love to answer that question but since this is not on the strategic plan we can answer this question outside of this space.
- k) CA - Case Western Reserve University | Elaborate on how you intend to enhance engagement of lifelong members?
 - (1) GL ADNRHH | We have been looking at similar organizations as NRHH and how they are interacting and engaging with their alumni. There are regions that are already interacting with their alumni members. We also have the advancement society and we hope to tap on them to get alumni information.



l) PA | Looking at some of the long term goals, conference philanthropy has had pretty low engagement over the years in our region, would this seek to improve this?

(1) GL ADNRHH | We would like to interact with conference philanthropy so that is a potential goal to engage NRHH and non-NRHH delegates

- XV. Commercial Break - OTM Selection Committee | GL ADNRHH
- XVI. [Presentation and Updates](#) | NACURH Corporate Office
 - A. Question & Answer
 - 1. NCO | Please visit us in the NCO store at 8pm tonight if you have any questions!
- XVII. Preparation for the Corporate Business Meeting | NACURH Chairperson
- XVIII. Recess until Sunday for the Corporate Business Meeting
 - A. Motion | NE - University of Connecticut
 - 1. Second | CA - Stevens Institute of Technology
 - 2. Dissent | None
- XIX. Recessed at 4:51 PM MDT



NACURH 2024 Corporate Business Meeting Minutes

- I. Call to order: Sunday, May 26th, 2024 at 9:21 AM MST
- II. 4-Year Service Pin Recipients | Advancement Society Consultant
- III. Advancement Society Nominees | Advancement Society Consultant
- IV. Of the Year Awards | NACURH Chairperson
 - A. Regional Director of the Year
 - B. ADAF of the Year
 - C. ADNRHH of the Year
 - D. Coordinating Officers of the Year
 - E. Conference Chairs of the Year
 - F. NCO Staff Member of the Year
 - G. Advisors of the Year
 - H. Conference Chairs of the Year
- V. Gold Diamond Pin | NAE
- VI. Host School Acknowledgement | NACURH Executive Committee
 - A. Kelsie Dillard | University of Central Florida
 - B. Payton Branson | Ball State University
 - C. Jamie Lloyd | Northern Arizona University
 - D. Dr. Jen O'Brien | Arizona State University
 - E. Jen Kacere | North Dakota State University
 - F. Rick Cazzato Jr | Northwestern University
 - G. Anna Pietrzak | Chestnut Hill College
- VII. Roll Call
 - A. Yield to Regional Directors & ADNRHH's
 - B. Total institutions present: 104
 1. CAACURH: 14
 2. GLACURH: 18
 3. IACURH: 13
 4. NEACURH: 8
 5. MACURH: 9
 6. PACURH: 12
 7. SAACURH: 17
 8. SWACURH: 13
 - C. NRHH chapters/institutions present: 75
 1. CAACURH: 11
 2. GLACURH: 9
 3. IACURH: 13
 4. NEACURH: 5



- 5. MACURH: 7
- 6. PACURH: 7
- 7. SAACURH: 15
- 8. SWACURH: 8
- D. NCC Quorum is established
- E. NRHH Quorum is established
- VIII. Expectations | Chairperson
 - A. Comment discussion points on the document; if you are unable to do so, then send it to your Regional Director!
 - 1. Example: NACURH - Minute Takers | Typed
 - B. Points of...(information, clarification, etc.) should be fielded to your Regional Directors before announcing to the space to ensure we are efficient yet effective!
- IX. [NRHH CORP MM24-01](#) | NAE
 - A. Motion to bring to the floor | IA - University of Idaho
 - 1. Second | PA - University of British Columbia
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - B. Motion to waive the Reading of the Piece | NE - University of Connecticut
 - 1. Second | SA - Florida State University
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - C. Proponent Speech | GL ADNRHH & MA ADNRHH
 - 1. This piece has been a long time coming. It is finally putting the NACURH NAE role into the NRHH Bylaws as an Executive Officer of NRHH. Throughout the last few affiliation years, the NAE position has been supporting NRHH through policy interpretation, support for ADNRHHs, and more. There have been some situations in which the NACURH NAE has taken over NAN positional duties because of vacancies. This piece is putting practice into policy of the collaboration between the two positions for NRHH support, the interim situation in case a NAN vacancy occurs and if the Chairperson does fill or doesn't fill the role. The NAE positional duties that are already listed here are in both the NACURH and NRHH Policy Books and within the NACURH Bylaws. Additionally, this piece updates the roles of the NACURH NRHH Advisor to more fit in line with what we already do in practice. For the NAN role, we adjusted the first bullet to be the same in the NACURH Policy Book and to support the collaboration between NACURH and NRHH. We changed advise to support because the NAN doesn't serve as an "advisor" we have Regional Advisors.
 - D. Q&A
 - 1. IA - University of Idaho | Motion to End Q & A with Additions



- a) Second | NE - State University of New Paltz
 - b) Dissent | None
 - 2. SA - University of Central Florida | Would like to know why under Article 8 Section 2 Point H why the word has is used instead of shall have?
 - a) MA ADNRRH | Given the passing of another recent piece, any grammatical inconsistencies can be changed later during implementation. It is just more direct language to suggest that this is a duty of their position rather than authority presented to them
 - b) MA ADNRRH | Upon further reflection, we believe the language is consistent with the previous point. In point J it means that the NAN is doing the work with the NNBD and will make sure that all the voices of the NNBD are incorporated.
- E. Discussion
- 1. CA - University of Akron | Motion to vote by consensus
 - a) NAE | We do not allow motion to vote by consensus in corporate business. We want to have your votes on file and if someone dissent the motion it dies.
 - 2. MA - Missouri University of Science and Technology | The Missouri University of Science and Technology appreciates the addition of the NAE to the NRHH bylaws, since it allows for NRHH support in the absence of the NAN. This support is invaluable in helping navigate chapter issues, for chapters upcoming and established alike, and so we support this addition.
 - 3. SA - Clemson University | Motions to exhaust speakers list with additions
 - a) Second | MA - Washington University in St Louis
 - b) Dissent | None
 - 4. PA - University of Hawai'i Mānoa | YTR
 - 5. SW - West Texas A&M University | YTR
 - 6. GL - University of Wisconsin Stevens Point | In support as it updates the outdated bylaws that were in place
 - 7. IA - New Mexico State University | YTR
 - 8. MA - University of Nebraska Lincoln | YTR
 - 9. SA - Florida State University | YTR
 - 10. CA - Ohio University | YTR
 - 11. MA - Northwest Missouri State University | Supports this piece as this aligns practice with policy
 - 12. CA - Bowling Green State University | YTR
- F. POC: MA | Only vote if you have an NRHH chapter



- G. Vote
 - 1. CAACURH: 10-0-0
 - 2. GLACURH: 9-0-0
 - 3. IACURH: 12-0-1
 - 4. MACURH: 7-0-0
 - 5. NEACURH: 5-0-0
 - 6. PACURH: 7-0-0
 - 7. SAACURH: 13-0-2
 - 8. SWACURH: 8-0-0
 - 9. Total: 71-0-3, piece passes
- X. [CORP MM24-02](#) | NAE
 - A. Motion to bring to the floor | CA - University of Cincinnati
 - 1. Second | GL - Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - B. Reading of the Piece
 - 1. Motion to waive the Reading of the Piece | PA - Oregon State University
 - a) Second | NE - Northeastern University
 - b) Dissent | GL - University of Wisconsin Whitewater | For reasons of accessibility
 - (1) Second retracted
 - (2) Motion not retracted
 - (3) Parliamentarian | Per house rules, we will hear the piece for the reasons of accessibility if any dissent is raised
 - C. Proponent Speech
 - 1. NAE | This piece is providing updates to the HR policies that we established last affiliation year. Everything added or altered in this piece was given straight from our lawyer and provided as feedback for incorporation. In addition to this, our legal services specifically noted the addition of incorporating such policies in our bylaws as that is our officially recognized governing document legally. These additions further clarify and operationalize the purpose of the policy, guiding definitions, as well as equal opportunity.
 - D. Q&A
 - 1. NE - University of Connecticut | The University of Connecticut is seeking further information as to what constitutes "negative behavior" under Section 2 Sub-point 9.a.iv.
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | I am not sure how to measure negative behaviour, we have not dealt with that in NACURH spaces personally. Let NACURH know that something happened and



what we can do to move forward. I do not want to give specific examples. But we want to allow the incident report forms to be sent out as well so that individuals can voice their concerns.

2. SA - Florida International University | Would you like further clarification on which position would have the responsibility of enforcing these policies?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | Yes, the specific position that will be in charge is the chairperson who is the executor and implementor of the policy book and bylaws, but is supported by the two NACURH advisors. They will consult our legal services and find resources that are otherwise inaccessible to students. If the chair is involved, the advisors will step in
3. MA - University of Nebraska Lincoln | In section 2 point 8, in the discriminatory harassment point, marital status was mentioned twice. Was this intentional and if so, do they have separate meanings?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | I copied feedback we received last affiliation year and I copied and pasted what our lawyer advised us to do. That is a typo, if this piece were to pass that could be adjusted since it was just a typo.
4. CA - Stevens Institute of Technology | Could you explain some of the resources that will be implemented for institutions, voting reps, etc?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | This would not be enacted for delegates. This would be for NACURH leadership members in NACURH spaces, like NACURH Annual conference, Semi and Annual Business meeting, Leadership chats and things of that nature. When you all attend conferences, there are incident report forms for institutional level, NACURH has a NACURH leadership level incident report form since we have so much interaction with each other. This is to hold each other accountable for that. A conversation could be had on the regional level, but this is for NACURH Leadership.
5. PA - University of California Santa Barbara | YTR
6. GL - Eastern Michigan University | Would like to know if there is any document or policy that previously existed and how were they enacted prior to this piece?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | We do have accountability processes in policy and are hearing another piece regarding accountability at large. I think this piece starts a good conversation about how to



respond to issues that may fall outside of HR and how to implement that into the bylaws

7. IA - New Mexico State University | In article 2 subpoint 3d2, there's discussion of what the procedure is if the NACURH chairperson commits violations, but NMSU is curious what the piece says if the advisors are the ones committing the violations?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | The NACURH advisors fall under leadership so they are covered, but the NACURH advisors are professionals in their institutions so have additional accountability
 - b) IA - New Mexico State University | What if both are committing violations?
 - c) NACURH Chairperson | That creates a lot of what ifs, but if it does happen there are processes that the NBD can initiate such as recall and removal outlined in the bylaws and policy book
8. Motion to exhaust speakers list with additions | SA - Clemson University
 - a) Second | GL - Saginaw Valley State University
 - b) Dissent | None
9. SW - Texas A&M University | Section 2 Subsection 8.a.i, subpoints 2-3 seem to have been split, when they were intended to be one point, was this intentional or inadvertent?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | Inadvertent, that was a formatting issue. That would not require an amendment to be fixed.
10. SW - University of Texas at Austin | YTR
11. SA - Northern Kentucky University | Regarding article 1 section 2 sub section 3, how is excessive alcohol consumption defined and determined?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | In NACURH spaces, you are not allowed to have any. Not even a little bit! We copied as it was sent to us by our lawyers.
12. NE - Northeastern University | Northeastern University is wondering if you can provide some examples of "certain social situations" as mentioned in Title 13, Article 1, Section 13, subpoint 2 ("Workplace") to clarify the verbiage?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | The biggest I can think of is improper conversation in NACURH zoom spaces. We may also leave campuses during conference during which time improper interactions may occur



13. MA - Northwest Missouri State University | We would like more explanation on this would affect the chairperson's responsibility as they already have so much on them?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | Speaking from experience, these instances have happened. Not having policies in place increases stress and increases support systems. The chairperson has a great support system including the NACURH advisors and other members of leadership at large.
14. CA - University of Cincinnati | YTR
15. IA - Colorado State University | In article 1 section 2 sub point 2a workplace, is it any interactions or only NACURH social interactions?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | This will be in NACURH spaces, if something occurs outside of NACURH spaces that impacts NACURH functions then individuals will be encouraged to advocate for themselves with relevant parties outside of NACURH
16. GL - Western Illinois University | Would like to know if there will be any training if this piece is passed in order to make decisions?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | Should this piece pass, yes. This is why we have our legal services so we can provide the opportunity to know how we should go about this as a non-profit. Our lawyer offers board training so we could do that.
17. SW - University of Texas at Dallas | Motion to End Q&A
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | We already did end Q&A and we are now in exhausting with additions.
18. SA - University of Central Florida | YTR
19. CA - Kutztown University of Pennsylvania | In section 3 it had said that if they're back they'd have to make an action plan, however if they have another violation they will be removed again, if they are back what would be implemented so it doesn't happen again? Would an advisor be implemented to help prevent that?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | The reason is that if an individual comes back after resigning from NACURH leadership we want to ensure that there are processes in place to allow them to come back.
 - b) If there are other violations following the first violation, the advisors will be able to support that individual as needed and will consult with the lawyer if something not already stated in the policy is brought up.
20. IA - University of Northern Colorado | University of Northern Colorado would like elaboration to understand the necessity of the 3 different uses



of "gender" within Article 1. section 2 under "discriminatory harassment" and under Article 7. We are curious if there is a clearer way to establish the intended meaning of these uses.

a) NACURH Chairperson | The reason it is mentioned multiple times is because it was explicitly copied from our legal counsel. If this piece were to pass, we can consult our legal services to make language clearer while still being legally sound

21. MA - Missouri University of Science and Technology | YTR

22. SA - University of North Carolina at Charlotte | YTR

23. IA - University of New Mexico | Section 2 definitions, subsection 3

Unprofessional Behavior examples include rumors and gossip. What are examples of what constitutes rumors and gossip as opposed to critiques? For example, would you take into account the validity of the statements?

a) NACURH Chairperson | Critiques are not meant to be harmful or make someone feel unsafe. Rumors and gossip are harmful and that makes the distinction to ensure that people feel valued in the space. We can have conversations to identify a chain of events and allow all involved individuals to advocate for themselves

24. SW - Oklahoma State University | YTR

25. CA - Stevens Institute of Technology | Wondering if there have been any instances in the past that prompted the creation of this piece?

a) NACURH Chairperson | Yes, since I've been in NACURH Leadership there have been at least a few instances that occurred that started this conversation and prompted the legal services to be consulted. Without divulging personal information, there have been at least a few instances.

26. SA - University of Georgia | Would like to know why the discriminatory and harassment definitions are listed as separate and not as sub points of each other?

a) NACURH Chairperson | I had the same question when reviewing our legal counsel's feedback, but they encouraged us to delineate definitions clearly

E. Discussion

1. MA - Southeast Missouri State University | In support of this piece and appreciates the work of the execs to ensure continuity of the corporation.

~~2. GL - Eastern Illinois University | Motion to end discussion~~

~~a) Second | PA - Oregon State University~~



- b) Dissent | CA - The Ohio State University | As many organizations would like to contribute and it is equitable for everyone to voice their concerns
 - c) Second retracted
 - d) Motion retracted
3. SA - University of North Carolina Charlotte | Would like to praise the NACURH Leadership as it reflects sincere dedication
4. IA - University of New Mexico | Motion to caucus for 5 minutes
- ~~a) Second | GL - Eastern Illinois University~~
 - ~~b) Dissent | SA - University of South Carolina | Would like to amend and make a move to groove instead~~
 - (1) NAE | Cannot do that since we are in the middle of a piece. You can rotate with your institution as needed
 - (2) Dissent retracted
 - c) Dissent | SW - Oklahoma State University | With respect to timeliness we feel like 5 minutes is too long to caucus
 - d) Second retracted
 - e) Motion not retracted
 - ~~f) Second | MA - North Dakota State University~~
 - g) Dissent | SA - Florida International University | Believes that with the number of regions on the speakers list there should be enough time to discuss
 - h) Second retracted
 - i) Motion not retracted
 - j) Second | CA - Stevens Institute of Technology
 - k) Vote on the Motion
 - (1) CAACURH: 7-7-0
 - (2) GLACURH: 0-18-0
 - (3) IACURH: 7-5-1
 - (4) MACURH: 4-5-0
 - (5) NEACURH: 0-7-1
 - (6) PACURH: 12-0-0
 - (7) SAACURH: 4-12-2
 - (8) SWACURH: 0-12-1
 - (9) Total: 34-66-5
 - (10) Motion dies
5. CA - The Ohio State University | Would love to commend the board and leadership for this piece of legislation. We think that it completely covers



many aspects of sexual harassment that are otherwise pushed to the side and ignored, and the institution appreciates the full depth of this piece.

6. SW - Oklahoma State University | Commends the board for referring to legal counsel for this piece
7. NE - University of Connecticut | Motion to exhaust speakers list without additions
 - a) Second | GL - Ball State University
 - b) Dissent | None
8. SA - Clemson University | YTR
9. IA - Arizona State University Downtown Phoenix Campus | YTR
10. CA - University of Delaware | Believes that this piece promotes a healthy and unbiased environment in NACURH leadership spaces.
11. MA - Missouri University of Science & Technology | Motions to call the question
 - a) Dissent | IA - Colorado State University | Has additional things to add to the discussion
 - b) Motion dies
12. SW - Texas A&M University | YTR
13. GL - University of Wisconsin Whitewater | The University of Wisconsin supports this legislation as our institution believes that the ability for leadership to be held accountable by themselves and their advisors is incredibly important. The actions, behavior, and culture of those in top leadership reflect that of the national and the regions, and this piece of business will directly affect that.
14. NE - Stony Brook University | Supports the addition of this legislation since there were past incidents and we would like to prevent any more occurrences in the future.
15. SA - University of Georgia | Appreciates the addition of the inclusion statement as it addresses DEIB and appreciates addressing issues quickly.
16. IA - Northern Arizona University | As HR violations can have a huge impact on everyone in the space, we support this piece as we feel that it impacts Leadership in a positive way. Additionally NAU would like to reiterate board training to prevent further violations.
17. CA - Stevens Institute of Technology | While in support, we question the impact of the prior legislation written on this topic and what changes have occurred as a result
18. MA - University of Nebraska Lincoln | YTR
19. GL - Eastern Michigan University | YTR



- 20. IA - Colorado State University | Appreciates the additional context provided by the NACURH chairperson, yet believes that the additional context is subject to interpretation and suggests adding examples to better allow future leadership to have a common understanding of what these terms mean
- 21. MA | YTR
- 22. CA - Bowling Green State University | Supports this legislation as it was advised to be added by NACURH's legal team which expresses the need for it. It protects NACURH from liability and allows us to have a stable and inclusive future
- 23. POI | IA - University of New Mexico | Would like to make a point of information on what are protocols regarding the side chatter?
 - a) NAE | You all are able to talk amongst your institutions but not to other institutions within your region or to other regional entities
- 24. IA - University of Idaho | YTR

F. Vote

- 1. CAACURH: 14-0-0
 - 2. GLACURH: 18-0-0
 - 3. IACURH:12-0-1
 - 4. MACURH: 9-0-0
 - 5. NEACURH: 7-0-1
 - 6. PACURH: 12-0-0
 - 7. SAACURH: 15-1-2
 - 8. SWACURH: 13-0-0
 - 9. Total: 100-1-4, piece passes
- XI. Move to groove for 10 minutes | SA - University of South Carolina
 - A. Second | MA - Missouri State University
 - B. Dissent | None
 - C. Resume at 11:37AM
 - XII. PA | Can we get the AC down a little bit, it's really cold.
 - A. NAE | We'll get started on that.
 - XIII. [CORP MM24-01](#) | NACURH Chairperson
 - A. Motion to bring to the floor | CA - Bowling Green State University
 - 1. Second | NE - State University of New Paltz
 - 2. Dissent | None
 - B. Reading of the Piece | PA - Western Oregon University
 - 1. Second |SA - Clemson University
 - 2. Dissent | MA - Minnesota State University | The piece is hard to find and not very accessible.



C. Proponent Speech

1. Chairperson | When communicating with our Lawyer about our accountability and removal processes this year, they advised us to update our bylaws removal process, since currently it doesn't clearly delineate what we can do and doesn't indicate that the processes we have in our policy book exists. So, this piece breaks down our removal practices into removing a member of NACURH Leadership, removing a NACURH executive and the various ways that could occur and removal of an entity staff person. The other thing this does is give power to our other processes that are outlined in the policy book, which in the future will give teams the ability to use what our bylaws outline, OR can utilize the processes that compliment this process in our policy book. Ultimately, our Lawyer advised us that our bylaws needed to be clearer so this is another piece aiming to do so.

D. Q&A

1. NE - Columbia University| With regards to the NCC initiated process, how is an NCC supposed to contact 25% of NACURH NCCs given the difficulty of communicating between regions?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | If an NCC wants to initiate a process, they can contact a regional board to gather those emails.
2. PA - Western Oregon University | PPP
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | Linked in minutes and on the NACURH website
3. GL - University of Wisconsin Stevens Point | Motions to end Q & A with additions
 - a) Second | SW - West Texas A&M University
 - b) Dissent | None
4. IA - The University of Northern Colorado | How is this piece different from the pieces where the amendments to the legislation were not needed to be voted on?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | First part is the distinction between the initiated processes, I think the largest change is from corporate office director to entity leadership. We have other entities that might be able to use these processes as well. This allows us to not just use NCC meetings for a recall process but for other pieces as well. Technically we are not able to adjust for clerical errors unless a later piece passes.



5. CA - Stevens Institute of Technology | Could you explain the difference between the removal of NACURH Executives and the removal of NACURH entity staff
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | Main difference is that it begins at the entity level for that group, but since they are not a regional affiliate they don't have their own regional policy book and bylaws.
6. MA - Missouri University of Science & Technology | YTR
7. SA - Mississippi State University | Mississippi State University would like clarification on article 10 section 2 Part C, and the timeline of notice for these meetings to those attending. Would there be a set notice requirement in order for those attending to make arrangements for those needing to be there in order to be represented?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | This is something we could further define within our policy book because it will be good to ensure that all NCCs are present. This can be something that can be added to the policy book, and doesn't need to be in the bylaws.
8. NE - University of Connecticut | YTR
9. SA - University of Georgia | The University of Georgia would like to ask what the procedure is for removing the NACURH chairperson since it seems that the chairperson facilitates the removal process.
 - a) IA ADAF | In case of the chairperson, the process is taken over by the NAO and the NACURH Advisors.
 - b) SA - University of Georgia | Would that be included in the piece?
 - c) NACURH Chairperson | It has already been stated.
10. CA - Stevens Institute of Technology | Could you discuss the changes in article 9 section 2 and how that would affect changes to regional bylaws
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | We just broadened the language of this. This is just a broader definition of this. This is just saying NACURH Leadership members which includes regional representatives. We just brought in the language to broaden and make it more clear.
11. IA - University of New Mexico | Would like to ask for clarification on the defining generalizing process for the consultants?
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | We struck through CRC because that is one of our consultants, but we have more now. The verbiage of consultant was added in because we now have 3 consultants and might have more in the future. This way we can prevent the need for further pieces.



12. SA - University of Georgia | The University of Georgia would like to ask why Article IX Section 2 regarding the removal of Regional Affiliate Board members was taken out.
 - a) NACURH Chairperson | Please refer to the earlier section of the minutes.

E. Discussion

1. IA - University of Idaho | In favor of this piece, we feel like this clarifies the language. We appreciate the ability of the corporate office to call additional meetings to have time sensitive issues brought to the whole organization.
2. MA - University of Nebraska Lincoln | Believes Bylaws should remain up to date and include details on how to remove individuals from office
3. CA - Stevens Institute of Technology | Supports this piece but would like to in future to look for more easily accessible and more fleshed out instructions to help the process be usable to make a change to such a structure.
4. GL - University of Wisconsin Whitewater | The University of Wisconsin - Whitewater is concerned about the process for NCCs to be able to acquire the contact information of the other NCCs without encountering a conflict of interest and would encourage an exploration of this concern in the future. Despite this concern, the University of Wisconsin - Whitewater supports this legislation similarly to NCC CORP 24-02 because of the ability for leadership to be held accountable by their constituents in a way that provides agency for member institutions.
5. NE - University of Connecticut | Motion to exhaust speakers list ~~with~~ without additions
 - a) Second | ~~SW - Oklahoma State University~~
 - b) Dissent | SW - University of Louisiana at Lafayette | Would like to motion to exhaust without additions
 - c) Second retracted
 - d) Motion amended
 - e) Second | SW - University of Louisiana at Lafayette
 - f) Dissent | None
6. SA - Florida State University | Supports this piece as it clarifies the removal processes and allows for the utilization of policies. We would like to highlight the importance as it was recommended by NACURH's legal services.
7. IA - Colorado State University | Colorado State University is concerned there are no existing rules for the timeline for additional Corporate



Business Meetings where recall meetings would be held as mentioned in Article X Meetings: point 2 c. It could lead to unfair conditions for both parties during the recall process. Overall CSU is in support of this legislation.

8. SA - Clemson University | YTR
9. IA - University of New Mexico | YTR

F. Vote

1. CAACURH: 14-0-0
2. GLACURH: 18-0-0
3. IACURH: 13-0-0
4. MACURH: 9-0-0
5. NEACURH: 8-0-0
6. PACURH: 13-0-0
7. SAACURH: 18-0-0
8. SWACURH: 13-0-0
9. Total: 106-0-0, piece passes

XIV. [CORP MM24-04](#) | NCO Director for Information and Services

- A. Motion to bring to the floor | IA - Arizona State University Downtown Campus
 1. Second | SW - University of Arkansas
 2. Dissent | None
- B. POI: SW - Oklahoma State University | Seeing the time are we able to get through the piece
 1. Chairperson | Depends on how efficient we are
- C. Motion to waive the Reading of the Piece | SA - Florida State University
 1. Second | GL - Ball State University
 2. Dissent | None
- D. Proponent Speech
 1. NCO Director of Information and Services | The NCO is made up of 8 students, with 4 hosted virtually and 4 hosted at the host site, Kent State University. Staff members are currently from 3 different regions. We handle NACURH wide processes like affiliation, technology services, merchandise, and historical record keeping to name a few. Historically, the NCO has had voting rights in Exec elections prior to the dissolution in 2020. Previous initiatives to secure rights failed due to the previous office structure having all of the officers being in person, with concerns being that it would be like giving a region a second vote. Due to NBD 24-25 passing earlier this week, the NCO currently has voting rights for Exec Elections, NACURH Budgets, and within the NACURH Award selection committee. This legislation seeks to give the NCO voting rights



in NBD spaces, which would allow us to make our voices heard on legislation, the NACURH strategic plan, etc. Would allow us to specifically advocate for NACURH-level priorities and the functionality of our office. Many pieces seen this year directly have impacted our office, like NBD 24-04, NBD 24-36, and NBD 24-40. We've had to try and advocate to other regions to vote on our behalf, which takes away from their priority of voting on behalf of their affiliates. The NCO provides a different perspective than other regions as we facilitate the administrative side of NACURH, and we would also bring the total voting count up to 9 which would prevent inconclusive votes.

E. Q&A

1. CA - X | Wondering if there are any redundancies if NCO does end up at one institution in the future and if there are any policies in place to avoid that?
 - a) NCO Director for Information and Services | That is impossible with the structure of the NCO. There are 2 positions that must be hosted virtually meaning that the board is required to be diverse
2. MA - North Dakota State University | Wondering if there was any consideration for which NCO director sits on the board of directors?
 - a) NCO Director for Information and Services | Originally this piece was more specific but was amended to be more inclusive and not require changes should this occur
3. IA - Motion to exhaust Q&A without additions | Northern Arizona University
 - a) Second | GL - Eastern Michigan University
 - b) Dissent | None
4. PA - University of California Santa Barbara | Wondering when there were 8 voting regions, what was the policy on a tie?
 - a) NCO Director for Information and Services | In the period if when there are eight votes, we would re-enter discussion and vote again until there's conclusive majority
5. SA - University of North Carolina Charlotte | What mechanisms would be in place for NCO to participate in spaces?
 - a) NCO Director for Information and Services | Throughout this year NACURH has done well incorporating us into spaces, we just haven't had the ability to vote
6. NE - Northeastern University | YTR
7. SA - Northern Kentucky University | What actions will be taken to protect the voting rights of individual institutions



- a) NCO Director for Information and Services | Brings voting rights only in leadership spaces so similar to what your RBD currently votes on.
- 8. MA - Minnesota State University Mankato | YTR
- 9. SA - Florida International University | YTR
- 10. MA - Northwest Missouri State University | YTR
- 11. SA - Appalachian State University | YTR
- 12. SA - University of Georgia | There will be no more than forty individuals, is there a possibility for other members to be added to the NACURH Boards?
 - a) Chairperson | NACURH Board of Directors includes 8 regional directors, 8 ADAFs as non voting members, NACURH executive committee, and advisors are also part of the NBD. If we were to add any more members with the voting power it allows us the flexibility to do so.

F. Discussion

- 1. NE - Northeastern University | Northeastern loves the new representation of multiple regions and institutions in the NCO and believes this effectively solved the issue that led to them losing the rights in 2020.
- 2. MA - Minnesota State University Mankato | Supports this piece so the NCO can advocate themselves, rather than advocating for regions to vote for NCO causes, when their true responsibility is for their constituents
- 3. IA - Colorado State University | Calls the question
 - a) Dissent | MA - Northwest Missouri State University
- 4. SA - University of North Carolina at Charlotte | Believes that the passage of this bill will allow a unique and administrative perspective from the office and that is exciting.
- 5. SW - University of Louisiana Lafayette | Motion to exhaust without additions
 - a) Second | MA - North Dakota State University
 - b) Dissent | None
- 6. GL - Eastern Illinois University | YTR
- 7. IA - University of Idaho | The University of Idaho is in favor of this piece. The NCO provides critical services to the NACURH executive board and regions, and we feel that their voice should be heard when making decisions that affect both their jobs and the organization as a whole
- 8. SA - X | In favor of this piece, the NCO provides important services and they should have voices for things that impact their job.



9. SA - East Tennessee State University | Believe the NCO is a great thing to have and work will be added prior to 2020.
10. MA - Northwest Missouri State University | Northwest is concerned with the lack of opportunity for diversity in regions. We understand there are two virtual positions that need to be filled, but we have concerns with those applications coming from the same region.
11. SA - University of Georgia | The University of Georgia supports the piece given that NCO is involved in many operations for NACURH and certain legislation, including the budget, impacts NCO. The legislation is made more meaningful by the fact that it was authored in part by an individual from the office.
12. IA - Colorado State University | Appreciates the dedication of the NCO and recognizes the importance of the NCO having a voice in NACURH-level decision making.

G. Vote

1. CAACURH: 14-0-0
2. GLACURH: 16-1-1
3. IACURH: 12-0-1
4. MACURH: 8-1-0
5. NEACURH: 7-0-1
6. PACURH: 13-0-0
7. SAACURH: 17-0-1
8. SWACURH: 13-0-0
9. Total: 100-2-4, piece passes

XV. [CORP MM24-03](#) | NAE & GLACURH ADAF

A. Motion to bring to the floor | CA - Bowling Green State University

1. Second | IA - University of Utah
2. Dissent | GL - Eastern Illinois University | Moves to adjourn the meeting
 - a) Second not retracted
 - b) Voting (Adjourn-Don't Adjourn-Abstain)
 - (1) CAACURH: 2-10-2
 - (2) GLACURH: 2-15-1
 - (3) IACURH: 0-12-1
 - (4) MACURH: 3-6-0
 - (5) NEACURH: 1-7-0
 - (6) PACURH: 1-12-0
 - (7) SAACURH: 5-11-2
 - (8) SWACURH: 0-13-0
 - (9) Total: 14-86-6, not adjourning the meeting



B. Reading of the Piece

1. Motion to waive the reading of the piece | NE - Columbia University
 - a) Second | SA - Georgia State University
 - b) Dissent | SA - University of Georgia | Accessibility Purposes

C. Proponent Speech

1. GL ADAF | So, the proponent was us essentially reading the piece. However, There are a large number of clerical, syntax, grammatical and outdated information (such as old positional titles/acronyms) found in the NACURH Bylaws, Currently, some of our old positional titles (NACURH Associate for Finance & Administration) are presently in the Bylaws or sometimes policy may be copied over incorrectly.
2. NAE | I'd like to reiterate that the purpose of this piece is not to allow randomized bylaws changes, but to allow a sweep of these clerical pieces when new pieces are passed, and; any current and future syntax, clerical, grammatical issues are authorized to be removed, with notice given to the NACURH Board of Directors and National Communications Coordinators, in writing no later than forty-five (45) days from the edits being made. We will now yield to questions.

D. Q&A

1. SW - Texas A&M University | Are the expressed reasons the only reasons why things would be considered to be outdated?
 - a) NAE & GLACURH ADAF | The acronyms and the inclusion of positions. So long as meaning or interpretation do not change.
2. SA - Florida International University | Motion to exhaust without additions
 - a) Second | GL - Illinois State University
 - b) Dissent | MA - Minnesota University Mankato
 - (1) Second Not retracted
 - (2) Voting
 - (a) CAACURH: 13-1-0
 - (b) GLACURH: 18-0-0
 - (c) IACURH: 9-3-1
 - (d) MACURH: 4-5-0
 - (e) NEACURH: 8-0-0
 - (f) PACURH: 13-0-0
 - (g) SAACURH: 16-1-1
 - (h) SWACURH: 13-0-0
 - (i) Total: 94-10-2, exhausting without additions
3. NE - Columbia University | YTR
4. GL - University of Wisconsin Stevens Point | YTR



5. MA - Washington University in St Louis | Why 45 days?
 - a) NAE & GLACURH ADAF | It is part of the policy that we must notify you within 45 days.
6. CA - Stevens Institute of Technology | In some instances parli-pro does not believe that you need permission to fix clerical errors, are you aware of this?
 - a) NAE & GLACURH ADAF | NACURH uses Robert's rules lightly, this is a transparency piece. We could, but we want to be on the same page.
7. PA - Western Oregon University | YTR
8. IA - New Mexico State University | Who sends this out?
 - a) NAE & GLACURH ADAF | Communication like that is recommended to be sent to the NACURH Chairperson since they are the executor of the NACURH policy book.
9. MA - Missouri University of Science and Technology | YTR
10. SA - University of Georgia | The University of Georgia would like to ask if the fourth "whereas" statement means that multiple pieces can be corrected at once rather than individually.
 - a) NAE & GLACURH ADAF | Bylaws are a whole piece instead of different pieces, so it will all be sent at once.

E. Discussion

1. NE - University of Connecticut | Calls the question
 - a) Dissent | None

F. Vote

1. CAACURH: 13-1-0
2. GLACURH: 18-0-0
3. IACURH: 12-0-1
4. MACURH: 9-0-0
5. NEACURH: 8-0-0
6. PACURH: 13-0-0
7. SAACURH: 18-0-0
8. SWACURH: 13-0-0
9. Total: 104-1-1, piece passes

XVI. Motion to Recess until Closing Ceremonies | CA - University of Maryland Baltimore County

- A. Second | SA - Florida A&M University
- B. Dissent | None

