



# NACURH, INC.

2016 SEMI-ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING  
UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE  
JANUARY 3-8, 2016

**Presiding Officer:**

Nathan Tack  
Chairperson - NACURH, Inc.

**Minutes Prepared By:**

Danielle Melidona  
Associate for Administration - NACURH, Inc.

**Parliamentarian:**

Meg Freeman  
Director - South Atlantic Affiliate

**Recording Secretary:**

Austin Lujan  
AD-BA - Intermountain Affiliate

---

# NACURH BOARD OF DIRECTORS & NRHH NATIONAL BOARD

## **Central Atlantic Affiliate**

Justin Schwendeman - Director  
Tommy Brown - Finance Officer  
Nickole Watson - AD-NRHH

## **Great Lakes Affiliate**

Elliott Hendrick - Director  
Julie Goodwin - Finance Officer  
Geoffrey Koester - AD-NRHH

## **Intermountain Affiliate**

Shannon Mulqueen - Director  
Austin Lujan - Finance Officer  
Aaron Ringsby - AD-NRHH

## **Midwest Affiliate**

Emily Braught - Director  
Megan Jimmerson - Finance Officer  
Kayla Morgan - AD-NRHH

## **North East Affiliate**

Cassie Deal - Director  
Zachary Perkins - Finance Officer  
Christina Coleman - AD-NRHH

## **Pacific Affiliate**

Mason Margotta - Director  
Robert Dunn - Finance Officer  
Katie Francisco - AD-NRHH

## **South Atlantic Affiliate**

Meg Freeman - Director  
Nick Cunningham - Finance Officer  
Taylor Hanley - AD-NRHH

## **Southwest Affiliate**

Molly McKinstry - Director  
Ashley Cantu - Finance Officer  
Jesse Moore - AD-NRHH

## **NACURH Information Center**

Ethan Schwarten - Director  
Sam Wilton - Finance Officer  
Lauren Scanlan - AD-Outreach

## **NACURH Services and Recognition Office**

Breta Moore - Director  
George Papp-McClellan - Finance Officer  
Abby Candalar - AD-NRHH

## **Annual Conference Staff**

Rachel Zolotarsky - Conference Chair  
Matt Hermenau - NBD Liaison  
Megan Clements - Technology Chair

## **NACURH Executive Committee**

Nathan Tack - NACURH Chairperson  
Danielle Melidona - Associate for Administration  
Jacob Crosetto - Associate for Finance  
Kaley Van Zile - Associate for NRHH  
Dan Ocampo - Advisor  
Christina Aichele - Conference Resource  
Consultant  
Adam Schwarz - NRHH Advisor

## SUNDAY, JANUARY 3RD, 2016

- I. Call to Order at 07:37 PM
- II. Approval of Minutes from the Annual Business Meeting
  - A. SA moves; 2nd by IA
    1. No objections
    2. Minutes approved
- III. Oath of Office
  - A. NAN & NRHH Advisor
- IV. Board-Driven Expectations
  - A. Keep the space clean
  - B. Make sure to speak up
  - C. Don't be afraid to yield to redundancy
  - D. Check your face
  - E. Conversations inside boardroom don't have to damage relationships outside boardroom
  - F. Have fun
- V. Executive Report
  - A. Presentation
  - B. Question & Answer
    1. PA: Is there a chance that other currencies will be on those Credit / Debit cards?
      - a) The process for interacting with international funds was something that is still a process, we would have to do a different procedure. If anything this would be regulated through the NAF
    2. NE: How will turnover work with Advisors that hold the cards in their names?
      - a) If there were someone to resign or be removed from the position then the card can be shut down by the NAF and the NACURH Advisor. The cards will not be tied to a personal credit score.
      - b) Regions are limited to \$3,000.00 for a transaction.
      - c) NSRO will be limited to the \$5,000.00 for a transaction.
- VI. Strategic Plan Report (2015 - 2018)
  - A. Presentation
  - B. Question & Answer
- VII. NACURH Services & Performance 2015
  - A. Presentation
  - B. Question & Answer
- VIII. Legislation
  - A. NBD 16-25
    1. GL moves to bring NBD 15-00 to the floor; 2nd by CA
      - a) No objections
    2. PA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by the SA

- a) No objections
- 3. Proponent Speech
  - a) Four main trademarks NACURH holds; passed two years ago - weren't renewed.
  - b) Utilizing \$1500 from Technology line since the line is underspent
  - c) Every 5 years, money will be transferred to pay for this recurring payments
- 4. Q&A
  - a) PA: Is trademarking OTMs, something that would be trademarked?
    - (1) Yes, but that is a different process than just renewing old ones.
  - b) SA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by CA
    - (1) No objections
- 5. Discussion
  - a) SA: Obviously having trademarks is important to our corporation, we do not want those to go away.
  - b) CA moves to end discussion; 2nd by PA
    - (1) No objections
- 6. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) Motion passes

B. NBD 16-21

- 1. IA moves to bring NBD 16-21 to the floor; 2nd by NE
  - a) No objections
- 2. SW moves to waive; 2nd by CA
  - a) No objections
- 3. Proponent Speech
  - a) IRS changed depreciation schedule again
  - b) Renaming it as a depreciation policy instead of accounting policy; need to be taking into consideration yearly in our taxes since they are assets.
- 4. Q&A
  - a) NIC moves to end Q&A; 2nd by MA
    - (1) No objections
- 5. Discussion
  - a) CA moves to end discussion; 2nd by NIC
    - (1) No objections
- 6. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) Motion passes

C. NBD 16-38

- 1. SW moves to bring NBD 16-38 to the floor; 2nd by Annual Conference
  - a) No objections
- 2. GL moves to waive; 2nd by PA
  - a) No objections

3. Proponent Speech
    - a) We had a few issues with shipping things this year; charged a lot to the purchase of inventory.
    - b) Asking to raise the budgeting line item from \$100 to \$500.00 for any expenses we may incur from now until April
  4. Q&A
    - a) PA: Is there a specific reason
      - (1) With the new AAFN stuff, that hadn't been done; the weather made it difficult
    - b) CA: Where is the money being moved from?
      - (1) The money will come from the NACURH General Fund, the difference will be taken out from this account.
    - c) Annual Conference moves to end Q&A; 2nd by NIC
      - (1) No objections
  5. Discussion
    - a) CA: It would be silly of us to not pass this.
    - b) CA moves to end discussion; 2nd by SW
      - (1) No objections
  6. Vote
    - a) 8-0-0
    - b) Motion passes
- D. NBD 16-19
1. PA moves to bring NBD 16-19 to the floor; 2nd by NE
    - a) No objections
  2. NSRO moves to waive; 2nd by NIC
  3. Proponent Speech
    - a) On the NACURH-level there is not a corporation-wide promissory note; when an institution checks in at a conference and they do not have payment, the advisor needs to write a personal check as a placeholder. If they do not fulfill payment within 30 days, the personal check is cashed and the institution is placed in bad standing.
    - b) This is an addendum to NACURH's pre-existing No Pay No Key Policy.
  4. Q&A
    - a) SA: Is the goal for this to be signed on behalf of the institution or the advisor?
      - (1) It would be the advisor since a student doesn't have signing power;
      - (2) Follow-Up: What if the advisor is not authorized?
        - (a) Would default to No Pay No Key.
    - b) IA: Doesn't the NIC already have one?
      - (1) The one the NIC has is based on affiliation. This would be separate from that.
    - c) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by MA
      - (1) No objections
  5. Discussion

- a) PA: We feel like this would be a more transparent and financially sustainable practice as a whole.
- b) SA: We are not sure if this is going to be enforceable if the advisor is unable to sign the promissory note.
- c) SW: This piece will give more of a guideline of what to do in the event something happens; streamlines the process well.
- d) IA moves to amend.
  - (1) "Therefore, let it be resolved that a Committee absorbing the Authors and a representative from the NIC Directorship work on streamlining / creating a consistent Promissory Note resource for the regions to be presented at the NACURH 2016 Pre-Conference."
    - (a) CA: Is this to make one promissory for everyone to use?
      - (i) IA: Mainly for regions and conference staff; NIC would keep their own.
    - (b) PA: Would this be open to others?
      - (i) Authors of the piece and a representative from the NIC.
  - (2) 2nd by NIC
    - (a) No objections
  - (3) Proponent Speech
    - (a) Having a document that is consistent for the regions makes sense because it gives NACURH the opportunity to streamline the process. By creating a resource, we are dissolving the assumption that the region needs to create it by themselves
  - (4) Discussion
    - (a) PA: Great idea to have a committee create this streamlined promissory notes. Research into what regions use promissory notes would be beneficial.
    - (b) NAF: Confused by this; the piece itself is for conferences and not affiliation. Would rather see people on this committee that represent those entities.
    - (c) CA moves to amend.
      - (i) "Add and a representative from each region/office and annual conference."
    - (d) 2nd by Annual Conference
      - (i) No objections
    - (e) Proponent Speech
      - (i) Feel it's important to include everyone on this committee to ensure all voices are heard.
    - (f) Discussion
      - (i) PA: Good change, but feels the more people who are on it, the harder it is to make a decision. Feel the authors would be able to do the necessary research.
      - (ii) CA: Feel it could easily be done during a meeting

- (iii) GL: The finance officers did have the chance to provide input on their practices during a chat already.
    - (iv) SW: Appreciate the regional and office voices and the Annual Conference. Since it stipulates it needs to be evaluated at Pre-Conference, we think that is enough.
    - (v) GL moves to end discussion; 2nd by NIC
      - (a) No objections
  - (g) Vote
    - (i) 1-6-1
    - (ii) Amendment to amendment fails
- (5) Discussion on Original Amendment
  - (a) GL: Agree the amendment is strong; should be something that is done prior to Pre-Conference so we can use the updated form for No Frills. May want to have it come back to an NBD chat in January/February
  - (b) CA: Our regional conference is in 39 days; streamline may not make sense for some who already have this process in place and have conference coming up.
  - (c) MA: Would like to see the possibility of bringing this to a committee this week prior to the end of Semis.
  - (d) GL: moves to end discussion; 2nd by SW
    - (i) No objections
- (6) Vote
  - (a) 0-7-1
  - (b) Amendment fails
- e) NIC: We have found a lot of benefit with how we utilize promissory notes; NACURH wide promissory notes in terms of conference finances would be beneficial.
- f) Annual Conference: The transition between conferences is difficult and a lot of standstill affects conference finances. By having a promissory note, it ensures action is taken more quickly and efficiently.
- g) SA moves to amend; 2nd by NSRO
  - (1) "Article III Section 12 2. b. If the institution's advisor is unable to sign a promissory note on behalf of the institution, a placeholder check will be accepted. If payment is not received within 30 days of the conference, the placeholder check will be cashed." "Article VIII Section 2 / 2. b. If the institution's advisor is unable to sign a promissory note on behalf of the institution, a placeholder check will be accepted. If payment is not received within 30 days of the conference, the placeholder check will be cashed."
  - (2) Proponent Speech:
    - (a) Without a promissory note, then we would have to turn people away from the conferences, if they have nobody to pay right

then and there. Though I think it is a good idea to have a promissory note, I think it is unfair that cannot meet the expectations of the note.

(3) Q&A

- (a) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by GL
  - (i) No objections

(4) Discussion

- (a) NE: To our understanding of the piece as a whole the idea of issuing placeholder checks goes against the spirit of the piece.
- (b) Annual Conference: Having this piece is important; it would be unfortunate to turn people away if the only reason is the advisor's inability to sign. Original piece get's rid of unnecessary placeholder checks.
- (c) CA: We do use promissory notes; if people knew they could sign a promissory note, they should be bringing a proof of payment to compensate.
- (d) MA moves to end discussion; 2nd by NIC
  - (i) No objections

(5) Vote

- (a) 0-7-1
- (b) Amendment fails

h) IA moves to table the piece to the authors and the NIC to meet before the end of Semis to discuss the piece

- (1) 2nd by NSRO
  - (a) No objections

(2) Vote

- (a) 4-3-1
- (b) Motion fails

i) PA: Would like to take a moment to come to grips with what is going on. A motion back to the authors to come up with a proposal to bring back prior to the end of Semis is the best decision.

j) CA moves to amend; 2nd by PA

- (1) "Therefore let it be further resolved that a committee be formed at Semis 2016 to complete a promissory note to be used NACURH wide. This committee shall include the authors as well as a representative from each region, office, and annual conference. To be presented before the close of Semis 2016."

(2) Proponent Speech

- (a) The Central Atlantic feels that allowing people that are currently in the room to form this promissory note, there are already existing resources that are in the regions. By just

working with the NIC we feel that it would disregard the entirety of our region.

(3) Q&A

- (a) NAF: Is your intention behind this for a conference-specific promissory note.
  - (i) Yes since the NIC already has one - work smarter not harder.
- (b) PA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by NIC
  - (i) No objections

(4) Discussion on Amendment

- (a) PA: We feel that we are in support because it will further the goals and initiatives of the region.
- (b) NE: We would like to propose a friendly amendment to the amendment being recognized.
- (c) Annual Conference: We are in support of this because everyone should have a voice.
- (d) NE: When this process what started, the original authors collected information - how many finance officers provided feedback?
  - (i) Seven.
- (e) MA: Questions the use of so many people; all opinions are valid, but it may not be the best use of time.
- (f) CA: 43 of us are having a conversation; 12 is more manageable to flesh out the promissory note and show what it will be.
- (g) IA: There has been a lot of conversations among finances officers on these items. We can agree that we want a NACURH-wide resource. We should just get to a decision and stop discussing it.
- (h) SA: It makes sense to have a committee that involves all of the regions. If this was just something that would only be implemented on the NACURH-level, it may be different.
- (i) Annual Conference: We're getting caught up in the wording; feel not everyone wants to be a part of it. That's ok. If there is a chance for one of us who has a stake to have our voice heard, taking that away would not be beneficial for us.

(j) NE: Would like to echo sentiments, requiring may be too much to ask especially since we have so many other things to work on. The fact that seven regions already responded with the necessary information is beneficial.

(k) Annual Conference moves to friendly amend changing shall to can.

(i) Discussion

(a) CA moves to end discussion; 2nd by NIC

(i) No objections

(ii) Vote:

(a) 8-0-0; amendment carries

k) CA moves to end discussion; 2nd by Annual Conference

(1) No objections

6. Vote

a) 7-1-0

b) Motion passes

IX. Recess

A. SA moves to recess until 8:00 AM; 2nd by NE

1. No objections

X. Positional Breakouts

## **MONDAY, JANUARY 4TH, 2016**

I. Call to Order at 8:12 AM

II. Roll Call

III. Legislation

A. NBD 16-14

1. NIC moves to bring NBD 16-14 to the floor; 2nd by CA

a) No objections

2. CA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by GL

a) No objections

3. Proponent Speech

a) Selling induction certificates at a lower rate than what we purchase the supplies for. Policy does not't outline what these should be priced at. This makes sure that we always make a profit.

4. Q&A

a) CA: Why are NRHH certificates not only available to NRHH members?

- (1) We thought it wasn't relevant to that particular section. It usually just comes with membership; didn't feel like it needed to be included.
  - b) PA: Who is accountable for ensuring the prices are fair?
    - (1) The prices are typically run through the Directorship and NAF.
  - c) PA: Does this piece dictate when the prices would need to be announced for the year?
    - (1) No, generally prices are changed between affiliation years; no other stipulations exist.
  - d) GL: You crossed out only affiliated chapters in one section, but not another.
    - (1) No, sorry that's a typo; both were meant to be crossed out.
  - e) MA: Would you consider a structure for timeline for when pricing would change.
    - (1) We hadn't thought about that; we reassess printing every year for items whose pricing is not dictated in policy.
  - f) PA: Why have you chosen the ADAF to set the prices rather than the entire office?
    - (1) Feel this person is the best to do so; it's a consulted process, but that person is responsible for those items.
  - g) PA: What is the practice for setting prices for items not in policy?
    - (1) It's generally been a mix with the Director and ADAF due to us experiencing a lot of turnover with the ADAF; ADAF serves as voice of reason while we all discuss what prices items should be set at.
  - h) GL moves to end; 2nd by CA
    - (1) No objections
5. Discussion
- a) CA moves to amend: "All instances of determined by the NSRO ADAF shall read as follows: *determined by the NSRO Directorship.*"
    - (a) 2nd by SA
    - (2) Proponent Speech
      - (a) CA: Important to include more than just the ADAF; putting practice into policy.
    - (3) Q&A
      - (a) NIC moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SW
        - (i) No objections
    - (4) Discussion
      - (a) NE: Feels this is a good amendment because it adds some checks and balances to the process
      - (b) PA: Feels this is a good addition to the piece because as CA stated, this is putting practice into policy.
      - (c) NAF: Point of information - NAF sets prices on pins in NACURH Policy.
        - (i) CA: would accept a friendly amendment to add NAF as well.

- (d) CA moves to end discussion; 2nd by MA
          - (i) No objections
      - (5) Vote
        - (a) 8-0-0; amendment carries
    - b) CA moves to amend: "The price per the NRHH certificate will be determined by the NSRO Directorship ~~\$0.50~~ and is only available to affiliated NRHH chapters."
      - (a) 2nd by NE
    - (2) Proponent
      - (a) Certificates are for affiliated chapters only. Makes sense to add this.
    - (3) Q&A
      - (a) IA: Are OTM certificates different than NRHH certificates?
        - (i) Yes.
      - (b) PA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SA
        - (i) No objections
    - (4) Discussion
      - (a) CA moves to end discussion; 2nd by NE
        - (i) No objections
    - (5) Vote
      - (a) 8-0-0; amendment carries
  - c) SA moves to end discussion; 2nd by MA
    - (1) No objections
6. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) Motion passes
- B. NBD 16-16
  - 1. Annual Conference moves to bring NBD 16-16 to the floor; 2nd by NSRO
    - a) No objections
  - 2. SA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by NE
    - a) No objections
  - 3. Proponent Speech
    - a) In looking at this piece as a whole, we want to be proactive. Hazing goes against what our organization stands for. 44 out of 50 states have some type of law in place. From an NRHH perspective, we have a removal policy. It makes sense to implement a statement as such NACURH will not tolerate this type of behavior.
  - 4. Q&A
    - a) GL: How did you come up with the two statements?
      - (1) Looked at a bunch of different organizations; pulled a lot from [hazingprevention.org](http://hazingprevention.org).
    - b) NE: Do you feel this is enough of a problem within NACURH?

- (1) Trying to be proactive to make sure something is in place. Questioned who would be held accountable, the process, etc. Believe this is a good first step.
- c) NAF: Did you look into any corporations or associations of our size or similar?
  - (1) Nothing specifically; looking at fraternities and sororities which have similar values to NACURH.
- d) PA: In your research do you have any info as to what this would look like?
  - (1) Thought about putting institution in bad standing; want taskforce to develop this process. If this is an RBD member, we thought removal would be something to consider.
- e) MA: Do you think that creating something like this would result in a reaction?
  - (1) In looking at the trends across higher education, more and more people are raising awareness. We think it's proactive because we do not believe it is happening.
- f) NE: Could you speak about the definition you developed?
  - (1) We sought information from hazingprevention.org as well as our undergraduate and graduate institutions; really wanted to look at the intent of the behavior - was this person willing to do it because they felt obligated, etc.?
- g) NSRO: Can you explain more about the impact on NRHH chapters?
  - (1) A lot of CA chapters develop point systems to maintain active membership - to what point does saying writing x amount of OTMs become to much for one person?
- h) GL: Is there a case that prompted you to write this?
  - (1) We haven't seen it as much; we know it's a problem in higher ed; have not seen it in NACURH
- i) SA: Is this for institutions specifically?
  - (1) If we know it's happening at an institution, it's not our responsibility to handle that, but if it is happening at a conference, we have a responsibility to address it. If we are saying we don't stand for these types of behaviors, we need to be the ones to hold those accountable at conferences.
- j) SA: You've brought up greek life a few times. Is this statement just for residence life organizations?
  - (1) Thoughts would be just for RHA/NRHH equivalents.
- k) NAA: We spoke about corporate liability yesterday and how the Executives are held the most liable in any given situation. Is there a reason the NACURH Executives were not included as members of the taskforce?
  - (1) We would be open to that revision, we feel that this is a valid compromise to add the Executives to the taskforce.
- l) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SW
  - (1) No objections

## 5. Discussion

- a) SW: We have two concerns - wondering how we come at this with no real experience and understanding; don't really have the experience to qualify what is hazing; everyone has a different definition - worry we may get into a lot of hot water. Universities have anti-hazing policies to look at those to make decisions based on their university structure. Don't have the authority or resources. There is a lot of room for us to get burned. Don't feel we are the ones this information should be reported to.
- b) PA moves to friendly amend the piece to add provincial; accepted.
- c) PA: Feels the taskforce could look at something similar to our drug and alcohol policies which default to the institutional policies of the conference host if this were to occur at a conference.
- d) CA: Clarification - purpose of the piece is to figure out what we as a corporation believe is best.
- e) GL: Feels this piece would not benefit NACURH as a whole. Having this piece could reflect negatively on our Policy Book, and in turn, scare away new member institutions looking to affiliate with NACURH. We also feel that the Equity Statement covers what this piece is trying to address, "This includes, but is not limited to, policies established by the student's' institution and housing department, and laws established by governmental entities with relevant jurisdiction," without carrying the negative consequences that a hazing statement would.
- f) SA: There's been a lot of comparisons drawn to greek life. Each member is aware of requirements when they join; do not see how the point system could be seen as hazing if members are aware of requirements ahead of time.
- g) NE: We acknowledge the importance of taking a stance. With the vague definition of hazing, there are many activities that we ask our delegates to do at conferences (such as cheering) that could use this definition to accuse us.
- h) SA: Feels this is concerning because people who are involved in housing could be involved in hazing in other organizations and that it can carry over into NACURH - we are unsure of where we stand.
  - (1) CA: Intent of the piece is to take a stance against hazing as a corporation. We have a responsibility to act in the best interests of member institutions and need to have such a statement to ensure that we protect those interests.
- i) IA: Concerned about the jurisdiction that is involved with the piece. By putting the statement in the piece we would absorb the legalities of hazing at our member institutions. There's a lot of cloudy jurisdiction.
- j) PA: Feels this piece just defines hazing in our policy which is a proactive statement; the taskforce for this piece would be able to address the issues we are bringing up.
- k) CA moves to amend: "...consist of at least one member per region, office, annual conference team, and NACURH executive committee; not to exceed

two members per entity. The Director/Conference Chair of each entity will be in charge of choosing those two members.”; 2nd by SA

(1) Proponent Speech

- (a) Add this part in due to the fact the Executive Committee has worked to obtain legal counsel; helps to navigate liability and what we stand for as a corporation.

(2) Q&A

- (a) NE moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SA

(3) Discussion

- (a) SA: Feels it’s important for Executives since they hold corporate liability. Not including the people who are ultimately held liability doesn’t make sense.

- (b) NE moves to end discussion; 2nd by MA

(4) Vote

- (a) 8-0-0; amendment carries

- l) CA: Subject requires involvement of legal counsel; since we are seeing a piece later this week to find legal counsel, this will help to ensure we are
- m) PA: Having seen anti-hazing statements in NRHH constitutions, this could be something important we move to recognize as a corporation.
- n) IA: Many institutions and professional staff members work with Title IX - if we do not have the appropriate training and resources, how can we effectively navigate this as a student organization?
- o) Annual Conference: Believe we should pass the piece to at least cover ourselves in the meantime; the taskforce would give us the ability to determine the next best steps.
- p) CA: Echoes Annual Conference; this is meant to cover NACURH. We’re not looking at covering hazing on the campus level.
- q) MA: Echoes Annual Conference; the statement is saying that we will not tolerate these behaviors; however, the interpretation of the statement means we have a plan and right now we do not.
- r) SA: Feels while the intentions are good, we feel the overall policy could be interpreted that it is something that could expose NACURH to liability to something we are not currently handling.
- s) GL: Feels we may have the carriage before the horse - like the idea of a statement, but need to have the taskforce in place to help us get a better understanding of what this means for us as a corporation prior to creating a statement.
- t) SW: Echoes SA; we’ve discussed a lot of about implications on the campus-level. NRHH point systems are specific to campuses. There is no way to do this without including campuses - worry about where the line is drawn because of this.

- u) CA moves to amend: “strike If this policy is violated, action may be taken against all participants, including NACURH appointed or elected officials, delegates, advisors, or institutional representatives”; 2nd by PA
  - (1) Proponent Speech
    - (a) Statement can be stricken as of right now because we do not have an action plan in place; taskforce could decide to include later on.
  - (2) Q&A
    - (a) PA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SW
  - (3) Discussion
    - (a) SW: Feels this is a major shift in the spirit of the legislation.
    - (b) NE: Echoes SW; with the removal of the specific statement about action being taken against the perpetrator, it removes the need to create such a statement and action plan.
    - (c) SA: Now with the removal of this last statement; we feel that this shouldn’t be a policy and should be more of a resolution. This would serve better as a resolution to support as a greater conversation with NACURH membership as a whole.
    - (d) SW calls the question; no objections
  - (4) Vote
    - (a) 2-6-0; amendment fails
- w) SA calls the question; PA dissents - feels discussion on this piece hasn’t been completed yet. There are still points to be made.
  - (1) SA does not withdraw; 2nd by SW
  - (2) Vote
    - (a) 2-6-0; dissent fails - moving into a vote
- w) GL moves to go into a ballot vote; granted automatically per NACURH Bylaws

6. Vote

- a) 2-6-0
- b) Motion fails

C. Recess

- 1. NE moves to recess until 9:50 AM; 2nd by NIC
  - a) No objections

D. Call to order at 9:54 AM

E. NACURH 2016 Pre-Bids

- 1. Pre-Bids are not required by policy; these institutions have taken the time to put together information for feedback - this is not final.
- 2. This is a confidential process you are privy to as board members
- 3. There is no right or wrong when it comes to pre-bids; final bids aren’t due until June 1st. Give them as much feedback as you can. We expect all three to submit final bids.

4. You can utilize NACURH policy to help guide what may be missing to help guide them
5. General Feedback
  - a) Check into trademarks and registered copyrights for various items (check into programming tracks, logos, etc.)
  - b) Information on gender inclusive housing
  - c) More detailed budget, explanation of line items
  - d) Consistent language throughout the bid - we are not familiar with
  - e) Cohesive theme throughout the bid
  - f) Page numbers
  - g) Realistic sponsorships and ways to obtain
  - h) Distinct definitions of programming tracks and selection criteria
  - i) Detailed information on how registration will work
  - j) Expansion on transportation plans
  - k) Information on when housing will be offered for early arrival
  - l) International inclusivity (currency, travel, etc.)
  - m) All photos of campus and graphics are relevant and clear
  - n) Detailed information on collaboration with other offices and organizations and how they will be involved in the conference
  - o) ADA Accessibility
  - p) Expansion on dining options
  - q) Fixed cost assessment (entertainment, socials, food costs)
  - r) Sustainability plans
  - s) Incorporation of Guidebook
  - t) Capacity of all spaces used
6. Purdue
  - a) Formatting - odd hyphenations; refer to NACURH Chairperson as National Chairperson.
  - b) Keynote speaker information missing
  - c) Wordy bid
  - d) Framework is solid - bones are good; theme is consistent and applicable. Advice to Purdue is to go more in depth and provide more details to everything; ensure everything proof read. Strong start, but make sure to consult past bids
  - e) Budgets are flipped on a couple of pages. Hospitality is a little confusing to us. Why is the shuttle included at one airport and not the other. Theme connects well with the institution. Housing was a little confusing
  - f) Appreciate how prepared they are. Would like to see more specifics - what does being prepared with technology mean? Would like to see them connect sections - where is your programming in relations to their dining. Appreciated learning outcomes.
  - g) Great design; think more about the rotation for dining. Think about pre-conference philanthropy and that some institutions cannot donate or collect

money; consistent language. James Robilotta has been used a lot within the regions of NACURH. Further solidifying travel plans.

- h) Dining rotation; appreciate the broadness of the theme, but would like to see it more focused. Would like to see entertainment be more of an experience rather than a giveaway - should be more about how delegates are connecting with each other.
- i) Appreciate applicability of theme, but it can be further developed and honed in. Detailed sections, but there is always room to add more detail and clarifications. Consistent language. Astronaut training sounds awesome.
- j) Red and blue can be difficult to read. Concern of copyright with terms (i.e. Star Wars, etc.). Awesome idea with the Amazon store. Can be more focused. Very wordy, which means things get lost.
- k) Uniform tense and wording with titles; overall, the bid was well put together. Great to see how programs will be evaluated. Sustainability seems to be absent and would like to see that.
- l) Could consolidate trademarks; include more institutional initiatives that will be present at conference (i.e. recycling). Some expenses and revenue seem to be missing
- m) Work smarter not hard with transportation during Semis - be realistic. In the safety and Security, make sure to effectively communicate emergency procedures to students. Hospitality - not really anything there about socials. With sponsorship, the goal is kind of low. Consider setting a soft goal and a hard goal. Did include letter to sponsors, but may want to also include an FAQ sheet on what NACURH is so sponsors understand. Consider sponsorship tactics (i.e. sponsor x event). Philanthropy - make sure to contact hospital to ensure sick children are able to accept those items.

#### 7. Texas State

- a) We would like to see realistic goals that refer to sponsorships and other sections that are lacking within the bid itself, there are items that relate to sections but there wasn't a lot of input into the conference overall. We also offer advice to condense the room spaces to make sure you are not using facilities that may not be used during NACURH 2017. Use the specific waivers from NACURH for Semis and Pre-Conference and Conference; additionally, the lack of WiFi and technology services for the conference.
- b) Overall, we thought that with the theme they could benefit by being a little bit more professional and consistent. In terms of the conference, there are some elements that are distracting from the content itself and totally makes it difficult to understand the overall goal for certain sections. We want to see what they plan to do with socials and other gatherings. With sponsorships there should be more information on the details and backgrounds from where the funds are coming from. We would also like to see where services and resources are offered at the conference. They should develop their conference philanthropy before they focus on a pre-conference philanthropy

- c) The bid was lacking a lot of information. The ADA and overall accessibility process for the conference needs to be updated and improved. As far as some of the sections it was very vague in terms of food specifically, we want to know what will be offered not that things will be there.
- d) I would like to echo the statements from past speakers. They could also break down their data into sections and tables so it is easier to read, they should look at different types of bids from past years so they have an idea of what to expect and what other past schools have done when bidding for NACURH. We also want the theme to be more streamlined and professional.
- e) We feel that the bid is very wishy washy and it lacks a lot of specifics with what is going on for the conference.
- f) We offer feedback on the font size and color within the bid, make it more readable in the bid itself. The spacing of the bid seems to be everywhere in general so we really encourage them to focus on bid design.
- g) With Conference Staff and Entertainment options they seem very fluid, we want to see what THEY want to provide and not a conference that they think WE want to be at. We want to see more excitement to San Marco.
- h) Given the general lack of information with the bid, we encourage the school to make sure that the information is relevant to what they are putting in the bid and presenting to NACURH. With entertainment, these look like time fillers compared to quality entertainment options. In general, the theme they have presented are themes that we have seen before, we want to see the theme presented in a new way if they keep it.
- i) With the theme, be careful with the wording and puns, make sure it reflects the campus and the campus' culture compared to a select amount of individuals. The sections of the bid with sustainability and programming need to be elaborated on. We also want to see more information on Housing, with Texas State we encourage them to look at past bids to get a better idea of a NACURH Annual Conference bid. I think if they did that then the bid would change dramatically.
- j) It is about quality and not quantity, by making fonts bigger it doesn't take away from the fact that the page is lacking information. There is also a section that is talking about summer campus, but I want to see why it relates to the conference and why it is necessary. There is also a section on marketing that I wasn't too sure. Do not leave things to last minute, even if it is just planning for a conference that is a year and a half away, we encourage them to utilize the time in full. With sponsorships the \$100k goal would be hard to achieve, so possibly break it down to smaller goals and how you plan on getting sponsorship with letters, drafts, and FAQ sheet.
- k) We want to echo the sentiment of the room specifically with budget, dining, and schedule. We really want them to look at past bids and previous wrap up reports, they should understand the standard and move forward.

## 8. Western Carolina

- a) To go with the set theme, they wanted to reveal it if they obtained the bid, that makes it difficult to get the bid in the first place. They state on how Guidebook is used in many facets, they have a variety of media and marketing presences, they also have security plans. In addition, they are looking at dining options and allergies. They do not have letters of support and the budget needs to be streamlined and updated.
- b) We are also confused with the theme, they should be careful with the content that they submit in the future since some pages are blank or some sections are blank. The bid itself is at a good foundation, we want to see more personality from the conference staff.
- c) There should be page numbers for the bid, they should also consider different design elements to make sure that things are eye-catching compared to expected or basic. We would also encourage them to go back to the transportation and make it better to read.
- d) With their 100% Free Language, it is hard to focus on how to manage that. With the higher end rooms, some institutions may not be able to register depending on the needs of the school at the time. The consistency for travel information is off, some are for schools and some are for states. We also would like them to expand on philanthropy and to focus that some schools cannot fundraise. A lot of their activities for entertainment are outdoors and physically required, how does this go with ADA needs and other disabilities.
- e) In some areas there are items and words that are repetitive, if you are going to say something make sure that is consistent through the bid and it makes sense for that area and other areas. It is also very nice that their campus map is going to be in the welcome packet and will be highlighted with the used building for delegates. They could also benefit from housing options, we would like to see contingency plans just in case. There should be some type of revamping to the how schools win points for philanthropy prior to the conference since some schools cannot donate and monetary funds to fundraising.
- f) We genuinely appreciate the visual aspect of this bid. However, some of the pictures seem irrelevant to the bid itself. For some reason the dining locations for some of the regions were switched, so we would like to see more elaboration. In addition, some mass gatherings are in various locations or large locations, we want to see them focus on the audio accessibility for the spaces. We also want to see the cap they would give themselves for hosting NACURH. There were also other pieces in the transportation section that referenced a fake school that is not affiliated with NACURH.
- g) There needs to be more technology and facilities service elaboration within the bid. The banquet page was very confusing, they say they have options but I would like to see these options. With the budget I want to see it broken down into specific line items and sub line items. Additionally, the registration allows you to volunteer for the conference, how would this work, necessarily?

- h) We really appreciate the time they spent on the bid but we want a little bit more elaboration on facilities, technology, and housing. We enjoyed the focus on sustainability.
- i) There are a lot of details throughout the bid that could support other sections of the bid.
- j) The bid is very clear in terms of what they want to do with the conference, I'm sure more detail would come in later on. They have a plan to recruit volunteers but how will they train them? They also have a good platform for centralized communication location.
- k) The delegation cap is stated to be decided at Semis, this is extremely concerning. The service project is in a forest which would not be helpful with people with seasonal allergies. In addition, the alignment of chairs and advisors was a little bit confusing, also the visual cost for residence halls is a good intention but it could hurt them in the long run if something were to change at the end with unforeseen obstacles. We enjoyed the font and design but we would encourage them to keep updating and improving. Additionally, we also want them to talk about the difference between volunteers and conference staff. With sponsorships we encourage them to relook at this process to make sure that the approach these sponsors are streamlined and professional. With Ride Board, these are delegations that can arrange driving together from an app, we want to make sure that they are looking at this situation and the risk associated.

F. Annual Conference moves to recess for 20 minutes, 2nd by SA

- 1. No objections

G. NBD 16-32

- 1. PA moves to bring NBD 16-32 to the floor; 2nd by Annual Conference

- a) No objections

- 2. Proponent Speech

- a) This piece precedes 16-33 with the NAF, in consultation with the NAN we have come to the decision that OTMs are a service and benefit from NACURH affiliation. For schools that are affiliated this is a resource, benefit, and service from NACURH and NRHH. With the AD-NRHHs, in the past years we had not touched on what schools could submit and could not submit OTMs; however, this was a service to ONLY affiliated school. We want to make sure that the current level is accessible and in policy as an affiliation benefit

- 3. Q&A

- a) PA: Does this mean that you don't have to have an NRHH Chapter to submit OTMs?

- (1) A: This piece states that if you don't have an NRHH Chapter that you can still submit OTMs through the affiliation benefit, but it does encourage schools to create NRHH chapters. If NRHHs are not

existent on campus then they can submit OTMs through their RHA still, as long as they are affiliated with NACURH.

- (2) We also want to make sure that if this is a NACURH service and benefit that we brand it in that way. In addition, to give historical context there was an initiative to change the OTM Website to NRHH Website, this was passed but didn't transition. This occurred in 2008.

b) CA: When you say participation or attend programs, does that take away the ability to look at OTMs? Specifically with Alumni who may want to stay involved.

- (1) If you are at an affiliated school you can submit OTMs no matter what, we plan to keep it that way. If you are an alumni you can still view these but the idea to write any can be debated depending on the situation. Ultimately, we want to make it to where people can view it publicly, but in order to earn awards on the Regional and NACURH level are kept with the current students at the affiliated school.

c) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by NE

- (1) No objections

4. Discussion

a) SA: Feels that this piece further adds value to OTMs that are within NACURH.

b) SA moves to end Discussion; 2nd by SW

- (1) No objections

5. Vote

a) 8-0-0

b) Motion passes

H. NBD 16-33

1. GL moves to bring NBD 16-33 to the floor; 2nd by NIC

- a) No objections

2. SW moves to waive the reading; 2nd by MA

3. Proponent Speech

a) To give a little bit of perspective on the background of the piece, the last affiliation year had a group of authors that designed a piece around Bad Standing. This added a definition, a process for how to get in and out of Bad Standing, there was also an amendment to the piece for the Authors to bring the piece back and frame it around the OTM Traveling Award and OTMs.

b) Participation in the OTM Program is a benefit of the affiliated members, if you are in Bad Standing you cannot host conferences, present programs, run for positions etc. We felt that OTMs could be included in that list of limitations.

4. Q&A

a) GL moves to end Q&A; 2nd by NIC

- (1) No objections

5. Discussion

a) NE: With the other piece that is in conjunction with this piece, we feel this is a positive addition to NACURH's policy.

- b) IA calls to question.
      - (1) No objections
  - 6. Vote
    - a) 8-0-0
    - b) Motion passes
- I. NBD 16-27
  - 1. SA moves to bring NBD 16-27 to the floor; 2nd by GL
    - a) No objections
  - 2. PA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by the NSRO
    - a) No objections
  - 3. Proponent Speech
    - a) This goes in depth with the liability risks associated with NACURH and the NACURH Executives. We all were charged to look at our duties and forms that relate to risk and have come to the conclusion that we need to get on track with keeping ourselves safe. What this piece does is establishes funds to support the search for Legal Counsel, in the event that NACURH were to get sued we would no way to obtain the documents to move forward. In addition, we also have a lot of turnover with the NACURH Executives with elections being year-to-year, an attorney would help in this transition.
    - b) With publishing through the Chronicle of Higher Education, this is an approach that we would have taken with the Accountant for an example. The NACURH Executives would choose the individual and hire them, this process would be completely different.
  - 4. Q&A
    - a) SA: I don't know much about the Chronicle of Higher Education, would that be a good location?
      - (1) The ability to use the Chronicle of Higher Education allows for a broader perspective and network for the search. However, this does not limit us to other types of searches. We have also done research within the State of Oklahoma specifically. We want to find someone that matches our profile at the end of the day and understands NACURH.
    - b) NE: What sort of publication will \$500.00 buy for this search?
      - (1) A: This covers the entirety of the post until we take it down, \$500.00 is a lot to be posting on a publication so we have a lot of control.
    - c) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by MA
      - (1) No objections
  - 5. Discussion
    - a) PA: We feel that this is a huge resource to find an attorney in Oklahoma and this will benefit NACURH, we are in support of this piece.
    - b) CA moves to end discussion; 2nd by SW.
      - (1) No objections
  - 6. Vote

- a) 8-0-0
- b) Motion passes

J. NBD 16-26

1. PA moves to bring NBD 16-26 to the floor; 2nd by NE
  - a) No objections
2. SA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by the NE
3. Proponent Speech
  - a) This is another Corporate Liability piece. NACURH does have insurance that covers the corporation, we aren't covered by any school / institution. The current group that oversees us has informed us of recent changes, the group has referred us to another group in DC that can allow the services for us (the minimums). This basically approves that we transfer brokers to represent us.
4. Q&A
  - a) SA: Is this transfer going to cause any increase in finances?
    - (1) A: Right now we have a quote out with our current company, they have ensured us that the price would not be drastically different if not close to our original purchasing history.
  - b) PA: Were there other groups that you all looked at?
    - (1) A: This was the recommendation that we took to our current broker service, we have not received any feedback on the quotes we sent out. We were hoping that we would have multiple quotes back before this piece but that did not happen.
  - c) SA: When does the current policy expire?
    - (1) A: June 25th 2015 - June 25th 2016
  - d) NE: Would the new policy take place immediately after the current policy expires?
    - (1) A: Correct.
  - e) SA: Is the plan to select this quote if the piece passes or will be waiting for other quotes?
    - (1) A: Yes / No, depending on the situation as defined by the NACURH Executives.
5. Discussion
  - a) IA: The Intermountain feels that this is a step in the right direction to our corporate liabilities on track, we are appreciative that this was presented before an issue was created.
  - b) SA: This is a good move in the right direction, the South Atlantic approves.
  - c) NE: We appreciate the fiscal responsibility in finding a new broker.
  - d) PA calls to question
    - (1) No objections
6. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) Motion passes

K. NBD 16-35

1. SW moves to bring NBD 16-35 to the floor; 2nd by CA
  - a) No objections
2. SW moves to waive the reading; 2nd by the SA
3. Proponent Speech
  - a) We budget \$3,000.00 each year for the programming grant. Policy stipulates how this should be allocated. The checks were not cut until May, which impeded. This is moving \$1100.00 to this year's line so the NNB could award the full amount.
4. Q&A
  - a) NE: Is this coming out of the reserves?
    - (1) No, just the general fund.
  - b) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by MA
5. Discussion
  - a) CA: Unfair to punish schools for a financial oversight; it's a beneficial movement of funds.
  - b) PA: Hope that this is not a common trend. Given the circumstances, we are in full support.
  - c) CA calls the question; no objections
6. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) Motion passes

L. NBD 16-37

1. NE moves to bring NBD 16-37 to the floor; 2nd by CA
  - a) No objections
2. SA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by SW
  - a) No objections
3. Proponent Speech
  - a) There's two main expenses; the cost for Semis was not paid during the previous fiscal year. \$10,680.00 should have went to NDSU in the previous fiscal year. Line is over spent. The budgeted amount for Semis this past year was under-budgeted in the NACURH Budget - increases those lines.
4. Q&A
  - a) CA: Where is the money coming from?
    - (1) The general fund.
  - b) MA: What amount is in the general fund?
    - (1) \$104,000.00
  - c) SA: Is there something in policy that should have prevented this from happening?
    - (1) There should have been a little more accountability; at the end of the day, the individual didn't follow through on their job.
    - (2) SA: Should there be something in policy to ensure this happens every year?

- (a) Both of these amounts are in policy; if you wanted to eventually add something to the NAF job description, there's not a problem, but there could just be more board accountability overall.
- d) PA: Can you clarify the amounts?
  - (1) A portion of Eau Claire's excess should have been given to NDSU prior to the end of FY15; NDSU did not receive that until April which was when FY16 already began.
- e) IA: Do you think that we would need to reevaluate the process or was it just an oversight?
  - (1) This is outlined enough in policy; the NAF would be working with the CRC, so there is some accountability. This was more of a personal error than anything.
- f) SA: Was this budgeted properly?
  - (1) Yes, it's just historically overspent. The money was spent properly, it was just at the wrong time.
- g) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by MA
  - (1) No objections
- 5. Discussion
  - a) MA: We trust the NAF and his decision to rectify this oversight.
  - b) CA calls the question; no objections
- 6. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) Motion passes

M. NBD 16-29

- 1. GL moves to bring NBD 16-29 to the floor; 2nd by SA
  - a) No objections
- 2. PA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by SW
  - a) No objections
- 3. Proponent Speech
  - a) In our Policy Book we have a couple statements that relate to NACURH, these are the Delegate Disclaimer and the Drugs & Alcohol Policy. The reason we are bringing this piece to you now, with the statements that are in the Policy Books, conference hosts would just copy and paste the statements and make modifications. This would put us at risk because this supports the corporate liability initiative to make sure we are secured.
  - b) What we have done is stricken the statements from Policy and created one (1) form that will be standardized throughout NACURH. This adds a witness situation since we do have some delegates that are under the age of 18. Once we obtain legal counsel we are planning to send this to a legal counselor to get further advice and support on how to improve or change these documents. However, we still left the ability for Conference Hosts to

work with the CRC to frame these forms as they see fit, they will be used at all Regional and NACURH Annual Conference.

4. Q&A

a) Annual Conference: Does there need to be something in policy stating that if this whether can be electronic?

(1) A: We all had a lengthy conversation on that topic specifically. We added it on the top of the document that states the start date and end date of conference, this helps assist the problems or risks of travel. We are looking for opportunities for this form to be signed electronically. We will be doing a trial run with one of the No Frills conferences for this coming spring.

b) GL: We are wondering if these forms can be left out of the Policy Books and just as resources?

(1) It can definitely be a possibility but we do have a Title in our Policy Book that defines forms specifically. We believe this form will be sustainable for NACURH as a whole, but it could definitely happen.

c) GL: We just wondered what happens with the forms?

(1) As we move towards electronic documents we would like to see this process streamlined and easier but as we keep the physical binders it will be a process. We as an Executive Team recognize that we should be collecting these forms when we attend the Regional or No Frills Conference.

d) SA: By moving to an electronic system, could conference staffs have viewing abilities to these forms?

(1) Definitely - A lot of resources have databases that will create its own excel spreadsheet that you can download to see that data, we will look for a way to something similar.

e) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SW

(1) No objections

5. Discussion

a) CA: We support this piece as it streamlines our practices. This reduces the ability to put ourselves in more risky situations.

b) CA moves to end Discussion; 2nd by Annual Conference

(1) No objections

6. Vote

a) 8-0-0

b) Motion passes

N. IA moves to recess until 2:00PM for lunch; 2nd by the NIC

1. No objections

O. NBD 16-09

1. CA moves to bring NBD 16-09 to the floor; 2nd by NE

a) No objections

2. SA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by NE

### 3. Proponent Speech

- a) This is the Wix Websites piece, this discusses the issue of website security within NACURH. A lot of websites have been down since the hack occurred, what this piece does is define a policy that utilizes the Wix service in order to have their regional websites. This also caters to the one NACURH goal that we are looking at for this year and years to come.
- b) The important thing with this piece is that NACURH has a fair amount of websites, we have told everyone so far that we will not have backups for their current sites that aren't Wix. These sites cannot come back since there is not a backup that was stored, if you have a backup we encourage you to let the NIC.
- c) With almost every year we have new expectations and approaches to technology when it comes with new leadership in NACURH, regions, and offices. In order to utilize the websites in full we believe that we should focus on a streamlined platform.
- d) Another thing we looked at is that everyone most likely isn't willing to do this, conveniently enough the NIC has this in their budget to test trial this system. If you have Wix right now it will be a different transition process. The last thing that we want to add is that if you choose not to use Wix then it will be on your regions to figure out that plan. However, if you do continue with Wix then you will receive your domain address and the NIC will work to update your specific regional website.
- e) Wix also allows a lot of other options for the regions, such as finance opportunities through an online store in a way. On the NSRO side it could work to actually make the NACURH store happen. This has been an idea that has been conversed about the last couple months between myself and the NIC Director. In addition, we have a goal to have resources and other guides ready to go before No Frills conferences.

### 4. Q&A

- a) Annual Conference: What subscriptions are you using right now?
  - (1) With what is budgeted currently, with 8 regions / 2 offices / 1 annual conference. What is budgeted now is to have full subscriptions for the regions, there is also a higher subscription level that we plan to use for the NSRO, and the final stage above that is an elite platform that we would like to transition with all entities.
- b) NE: For regions that are using the free Wix website, would the existing Wix website be able to be linked?
  - (1) Correct, they would have enough transition time to make sure you are making changes in a timely and realistic manner. Another thing that we are utilizing are the apps and widgets that are available on the website. The NIC and the Executives will be working with each region and office on corporate branding.

- c) GL: We do not have a Wix website, will there be linking abilities if we do not have a Wix website?
  - (1) We pay for two separate things, the service and the hosting plan (domains, etc.) Most standard websites that meet requirements will be able to be linked. There is also a option to have streaming of other websites on Wix websites. The NIC has budgeted for everyone to have a Wix site for FY17.
- d) NSRO: Have you looked at other websites besides Wix?
  - (1) Early on with the NIC we have looked at Weebly and Google Sites. However, we found that Wix has a better package for their price. This allows us to utilize a lot of different widgets and gadgets to build upon our growing technology needs. Wix also allows for a Coporate Structure that allows NACURH to be the bigger umbrella where regions and offices fall under that NACURH umbrella. Having those qualities were valuable for us in terms of the expense. With Weebly it does not add options that we need, whereas Wix does.
- e) PA: Can you clarify what Network Connections hold?
  - (1) NACURH.ORG & NACURH.COM - We use Wild Apricot now which also serves Fortune 500 companies, this is vastly more secure than other options. This also is not a fully HTML coded website which was a problem that we looked at for the previous year. Since we moved to Wild Apricot it allowed us to start from the ground up. Originally, it was the responsibility of the regions to make sure that the regions websites were secure, same with the NIC and the NACURH websites. Having these backdoors that are open allows for more opportunities are limited.
- f) PA: With everything moving to Wix we can still design our own type of identity?
  - (1) Correct.
- g) NE moves to end Q&A; 2nd by CA
  - (1) No objections

## 5. Discussion

- a) Annual Conference: We feel that we should support this piece of legislation, using Wix as the Conference Chair it was a challenge but now we support this system.
- b) SA: This supports the brand initiative of NACURH. This also helps facilitate transition and utilizes the creation of additional resources and guides.
- c) CA: We use Wix and we absolutely love it. There are a bunch of things you can do such as utilizing it for Boardroom.
- d) GL: We don't use Wix, but we like seeing the support from the NIC and the NACURH Executives. We appreciate though we aren't a Wix website we have resources that can support the transition.
- e) NIC moves to recognize an amendment; 2nd by SA

- (1) No objections
- (2) Proponent Speech:
  - (a) Fun fact, we don't have a separate Technology Sub Line in our NIC Budget. So this just moves it where it's supposed to be.
- (3) Q&A
  - (a) PA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by GL
- (4) Discussion
  - (a) PA moves to end Discussion; 2nd by CA
- (5) Vote:
  - (a) 8-0-0; amendment carries
  - f) CA calls the question; no objections
- 6. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) Motion passes
- P. SW moves to recess until 7:50PM; 2nd by NSRO
  - 1. No objections

IV. POY 2016 Selection

- A. Review of Policies Surrounding Award
- B. SW moves to open nominations; 2nd by IA
  - 1. No objections
- C. Nominations
  - 1. PA nominates Colorado School of Mines; 2nd by NIC
  - 2. NE nominates University of Pittsburgh; 2nd by MA
  - 3. NIC nominates Centenary College; 2nd by NSRO
  - 4. SA nominates CU Boulder; 2nd by NSRO
  - 5. SW nominates George Mason; 2nd by CA
  - 6. MA nominates Maryland College Park; 2nd by IA
  - 7. CA nominates Pace University; 2nd by NIC
  - 8. IA nominates Purdue University; 2nd by NE
  - 9. NE nominates Loyola Marymount; 2nd by CA
  - 10. SW nominates Winona State University; 2nd by GL
- D. Pro / Con
  - 1. Colorado School of Mines
    - a)

PRO	CON
Focus on education	Repetitive
Goals	
Adaptability	Educational Component
Cultural diversity	Text Heavy

Marketing strategy	Originality
Evaluation tools	
Engaging presentation	Budget
On-campus partnership	
Self-care focus	
Student involvement	

- b) PA moves to end Pro / Con; 2nd by IA
  - (1) No objections

2. University of Pittsburgh

a)

PRO	CON
Goals	Evaluation Plan
Implementation	
Paperless marketing	
Mental health focus	Citation Page
Program timeline	Integration of Educational Comps.
Adaptability	
Collaboration	Accessibility
"Uniqueness"	Goals
Budget	
	ACUHO-I Relevance
Themed language	

- b) SW moves to end Pro / Con; 2nd by NIC
  - (1) No objections

3. Centenary College

a)

PRO	CON
Programming Grant Recipient	Legibility
Unique	Quantifiable Information
Goals	Marketing

Educational component	Adaptability
	Peer Evaluations
	Student Impact
History of program included	Budget
Plans for future	Formatting Issues

- b) SW moves to end Pro / Con; 2nd by MA
  - (1) No objections

4. CU Boulder

- a)

PRO	CON
Diversity education	No Letters of Support
Evaluation	Text Heavy
Budget practices	Readability
Educational	Narrow Audience
Marketing	Adaptability
	Ambiguity in Event Coordinator(s)
Community service component	Formatting
	Program Origination

- b) PA moves to end Pro / Con; 2nd by MA
  - (1) No objections

5. George Mason

- a)

PRO	CON
Unique cause	Sustainability
Social-educational mix	Missing Sections
Committee breakdown	Budget
Collaboration on campus	RHA Involvement
	Lack of Statistics
	Spelling & Grammar

	Campus Adaptation
--	-------------------

- b) SA moves to end Pro / Con; 2nd by CA
  - (1) No objections

6. Maryland College Park

a)

PRO	CON
Marketing campaign	Specificity to Residence Halls
Timeline	Conference Presentation
Campus-wide presence	Educational Component
Infographics	Student Need
Partnership	Evaluation
Campus collaboration	
Attendance	Challenges

- b) SA moves to end Pro / Con; 2nd by IA
  - (1) No objections

7. Pace University

a)

PRO	CON
Follow-up events	Budget
Collaboration with offices on campus	Formatting
Commitment from students	Evaluation
Program goals	Student Impact
Relevance	
Adaptability	

- b) 3 unanswered cons

8. Purdue University

a)

PRO	CON
Transition report	Formatting

Evaluation	Off-Campus
Infographics	Goals
	Narrow Audience
	Adaptability

- b) 3 unanswered pros
- 9. Loyola Marymount
  - a)

PRO	CON
Tradition	Educational Component
Exposure to community	Budget
Campus collaboration	Adaptability
Goals	Originality
Serves a population in need	Evaluation
"Organization list"	Citations
Timeline	
Programming model	

- b) PA moves to end Pro / Con; 2nd by NIC
  - (1) No objections
- 10. Winona State University
  - a)

PRO	CON
Faculty involvement	Formatting
Adaptability	Letters of Support
Social media	Timeline
Results	Missing Sections
Uniqueness	
Available resources	

- b) NIC moves to end Pro / Con; 2nd by GL
  - (1) No objections

E. Discussion

1. Annual Conference moves to Caucus for 3 minutes; 2nd by SA
    - a) No objections
  2. SA: Colorado School of Mines used knowledge of resident retention to aide in helping their residents both now and in the future.
  3. PA: Centenary College and Pittsburgh have strong programs but we feel that Colorado School of Mines has the best program and approach to presenting at ACUHO-I.
  4. NIC: Echoes sentiments regard Colorado School of Mines; appreciate their marketing methods. They have a diverse topic that makes it a strong educational component.
  5. SW: We appreciate Winona and Marymount looked into their community needs compared to just leaving it with just residence hall programming.
  6. NE: While the NE appreciates the structure for Purdue and CU Boulder, we feel the narrow audience targeted does not account for what a POY should stand for - Purdue felt like a hall council training and CU Boulder's was an orientation
  7. Annual Conference: We appreciate the fact that Slut Play had a really good chance to be implemented in other universities but in different ways. The whole conversation about slut shaming is crucial in campus culture. They also focused on turnover of their program team.
  8. PA: Feels Maryland did not address enough of a student need and did not contribute an educational component - would not lend itself well as a presentation at ACUHO-I or NACURH.
  9. NSRO: We appreciate Winona's history in understanding the intention of the program, they also took the program steps further than some other nominees.
  10. NIC: Appreciates the work George Mason did; however, their successes were vague; they did not provide much feedback about student impact.
  11. NE: To build off of the Annual Conference, we feel that the message of George Mason's program is a message that should be heard at all campuses, even if their bid wasn't the strongest in the bunch.
  12. PA moves to narrow the field to the top three candidates; withdrawn
  13. PA: Feels that Colorado School of Mines, Pittsburgh, and Centenary College have put forward the most comprehensive bids for this award.
  14. NSRO: We would also like to state our appreciation of Centenary's history to the event. Though we are unsure if it is a good history.
  15. CA moves to narrow the candidate pool to the top five; 2nd by NE
    - a) No objections
- F. Nominations After Narrowing Field; there was a clear divide between the top three (3) and the top eight (8); Board resolved to narrow the candidate pool to the top three (3).
1. University of Pittsburgh
  2. Pace University
  3. Colorado School of Mines
- G. Discussion Continued

1. GL: We feel that the two best bids are Colorado School of Mines and the University of Pittsburgh. We feel that the programs can be adapted into any type of institution, they look good and they sound good. We support these two bids.
2. PA: Feels Colorado School of Mines bid was the strongest of the three based on their commitment to having an educational component. believe it represents the purpose of POY well.
3. NIC: The NIC echoes the earlier statements from GL, we do like Pace's bid, but with how the budget is formatted puts it at a disadvantage.
4. NE: In favor of Colorado School of Mines - appreciate tangible outcome of the online cookbook. Impact goes beyond just the program.
5. SA: We feel that the University of Pittsburgh doesn't go into much detail of the mental health issue of their program.
6. PA: Appreciates Pace's educational and advocacy focus. Feel their program would be more difficult to adapt to other campuses
7. MA: We feel that Pace has relevant topics within their program, their bid did speak to their creativity. There was a limited involvement from their students, and it was limited to people that were in the cast. We feel that Pitt and Mines are the stronger candidates.
8. GL moves to end discussion; 2nd by PA
  - a) No objections

#### H. Vote

1. Colorado School of Mines has been selected as the 2016 NACURH/ACUHO-I Program of the Year recipient.

#### V. Legislation

##### A. NBD 16-15

1. NE moves to bring NBD 16-15 to the floor; 2nd by NIC
  - a) No objections
2. SW moves to waive the reading; 2nd by MA
  - a) No objections
3. Proponent Speech
  - a) In policy it said a bunch of stuff that the NSRO has never done in practice. We pay for the philanthropy pins in our budget under Inventory. Crossed out that we would give the pins to regions to sell, because we sell those.
4. Q&A
  - a) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by PA
    - (1) No objections
5. Discussion
  - a) GL calls the question; no objections
6. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) Motion passes

##### B. NBD 16-17

1. NIC moves to bring NBD 16-17 to the floor; 2nd by SW

- a) No objections
  - 2. NSRO moves to waive the reading; 2nd by PA
    - a) No objections
  - 3. Proponent Speech
    - a) Would always like to be able to set a reasonable price. Ensures we will never incur a cost for production of merchandise, specifically pins.
  - 4. Q&A
    - a) NIC moves to end Q&A; 2nd by CA
      - (1) No objections
  - 5. Discussion
    - a) NE: We support this practice.
    - b) SW calls the questions
  - 6. Vote
    - a) 8-0-0
    - b) Motion passes
- C. NBD 16-24
- 1. NE moves to bring NBD 16-24 to the floor; 2nd by SA
    - a) No objections
  - 2. IA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by SW
    - a) No objections
  - 3. Proponent Speech
    - a) This will hopefully urge schools to affiliate earlier. Noticed a lot of the institutions that showed up to conference hadn't affiliated yet. This is a gentle prompt to ensure member institutions get their ducks in a row
  - 4. Q&A
    - a) CA: Was there a reason why you decided for this communication to go through conferences?
      - (1) We decided to use conference communications because that is often what generates a lot of interest leading up to conference. Wanted it on that communication specifically. Conference staff will have a list of schools who are attending ahead of time. Including this reminder in conference registration is helpful.
    - b) SA: Is there a specific reason for putting the reminder in policy?
      - (1) Wanted to have specific notation to ensure all information is correct so they know exactly where to go and who to contact. It adds consistency on our end so we know what communication members have seen. Have seen some regions and conferences word things differently. Equalizing language will make it smooth across the entire process. Want nic\_affiliations email to be the point person - not necessarily the buddies assigned to those regions.
    - c) PA: What do you suggest for conferences who send their communication through the RBD?

- (1) The idea is that this information be on conference websites and sent out with conference communications to make sure our bases are covered.
  - d) MA: Would you consider an amendment so that the regional boards and conference staffs can work together?
    - (1) Yes.
  - e) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by MA
    - (1) No objections
5. Discussion
- a) CA moves to amend: "All institutions hosting regional conferences, in coordination with the regional board, will remind member institutions about the requirement to affiliate by the start of the conference in order to have full member institution rights as well as avoid the delegate fee surcharge in all conference communications." ; 2nd by NIC
    - (1) Proponent Speech
      - (a) Ensures the regional board is included in the conversation.
    - (2) Q&A
      - (a) SA: Do you feel the regional board already has the responsibility to communicate that?
        - (i) Yes, but the language of the proposed policy doesn't make that clear.
      - (b) GL moves to end Q&A; 2nd by MA
    - (3) Discussion
      - (a) PA: Feels this is a good amendment; feels the regional conference isn't privy to the same affiliation information. It's a good change, but more work may need to be done.
      - (b) IA moves calls the question; no objections
    - (4) Vote
      - (a) 5-3-0; amendment carries
  - b) CA moves to recognize an amendment; 2nd by IA
    - (1) Under Title 9 : Article 2 : Section 1 "Strike current Point 2 and add the following: "The NIC shall draft an email each year to be sent to the regional conference host site and regional boards to be distributed to the institutions within the region regarding the following: Affiliation, Voting Rights, Delegate Fee Surcharge, NIC Contact Information." by July 1st.
    - (2) Proponent Speech:
      - (a) We felt that it was important not to have a specific message since change will be enacted every single year. Having these steps compared to an exact specific message would allow for transparency and flexibility within our corporation.
    - (3) Question & Answer:
      - (a) NE moves to end Q&A; 2nd by GL

(i) No objections

(4) Discussion:

(a) NE: Feels some concern with the date of July 1st being too early since some Regionals will take place in October and November.

(b) SA moves to end Discussion; 2nd by SW

(i) No objections

(5) Vote

(a) 7-1-0; amendment carries

c) NE: Feels this piece of legislation is not necessary and adds more stress to the conference staff. We would rather continue to have the RBD send out this information.

d) PA: Feels the legislation is not necessary as boards deal with affiliation on a more regular basis. This is splitting work that is done by one group among several groups.

e) NE: Feel this does not need to be a piece of policy, but rather an expectation.

f) CA calls the question; no objections

6. Vote

a) 6-2-0

b) Motion passes

D. NBD 16-30

1. NIC moves to bring NBD 16-30 to the floor; 2nd by SW

a) No objections

2. SW moves to waive the reading; 2nd by PA

a) No objections

3. Proponent Speech

a) What 16-30 is doing is defining the conversation of what do we do to fix committees? There have been a lot of variety in committees within the NACURH level but we notice that members of committees do not last longer than a year or so. In addition, the strategic planning commission has had conversations on this topic as far as how it will form into the strategic plan.

b) The end goal of Task Forces is to have smaller groups working on smaller projects compared to having a Marketing Committee that has multiple projects with multiple people. With the Task Forces it is formed by the NACURH Executive Committee, this allows for us to dodge the bullet of a committee going one direction and the corporation going a different direction.

c) In addition, there are sections in the NACURH Policy Book that refer to committees that are different than what is being proposed now, those current policies won't be changed. This includes the NACURH Executive Committees, Ad-hoc committees, and the NACURH OTM Selection Committee.

- d) This also puts things into the NRHH Policy so things are streamlined across both books, the piece also gives the NAA the power to correct the wording in the Policy Books compared to removing the word all together.

4. Q&A

- a) PA: How do you define small?
  - (1) A: I think everyone interprets it differently. I believe this will leave it to the NACURH Executive Committee to define this limit/cap as needed.
- b) NSRO: Why does the NRHH Section state that it needs two?
  - (1) A: There was a policy in the NRHH Policy Book that stated that you need to have at least two acting Committees, we want to do the same with Task Forces so it doesn't break NRHH's policy.
- c) PA: Do you think that there is any need for requirements of an amount of task forces for a certain affiliation year?
  - (1) A: I think it would be difficult to manage that. What could be done in that year is defined by the Boards and the Executives, when the Executives come into their roles they can have that as a conversation goal in order to bring it up to the Boards. If anything, by having an example of 30 Task Forces required and not reaching that goal it would be hard to be effective.
- d) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by MA
  - (1) No objections

5. Discussion

- a) CA: We have adopted a Task Force type of model that has allowed our students to be more engaged, this allowed for many members to do work compared to the RBD. We see this as beneficial to NACURH moving forward.
- b) CA moves to end Discussion; 2nd by SW
  - (1) No objections

6. Vote

- a) 8-0-0
- b) Motion passes

E. Recess

- 1. NIC moves to recess until 6:00 PM; 2nd by NSRO
  - a) No objections

VI. Call to order at 7:00 PM

VII. Roll Call

VIII. Legislation

A. NBD 16-13

- 1. SW moves to bring NBD 16-13 to the floor; 2nd by NIC
  - a) No objections
- 2. GL moves to waive the reading; 2nd by PA
  - a) No objections
- 3. Proponent Speech

- a) Looked at the titles of all the finance officers - piece aligns all the positions to be Associate Directors for Administration and Finance. This has been a conversation the finance officers have been looking at. The regions and offices decide what the responsibilities and roles are, changes the title. Will take effect at the close of NACURH 2016.

4. Q&A

- a) SA: How did you choose ADAF?
  - (1) A few years ago it was proposed to be changed to ADFA; because the bulk of the regions (5 out of 8) it would be easiest to change. ADAF fits the responsibilities and the role well.
- b) CA: Would it be of or for?
  - (1) It would be for.
- c) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by NE
  - (1) No objections

5. Discussion

- a) GL: This is a good piece; it promotes consistency throughout the corporation.
- b) NSRO: Agree with uniformed formatting.
- c) CA: Appreciates this as it falls in line with NACURH's strategic plan.
- d) PA moves to end discussion; 2nd by NIC
  - (1) No objections

6. Vote

- a) 8-0-0
- b) Motion passes

B. NBD 16-34

- 1. PA moves to bring NBD 16-34 to the floor; 2nd by NE
  - a) No objections
- 2. GL moves to waive the reading; 2nd by IA
  - a) SA objects;
  - b) IA withdraws 2nd; GL withdraws motion
- 3. Proponent Speech
  - a) Strategic Plan called for office evaluation and potential restrusture. Taskforce determined two separate offices do not benefit the membership. The creation of one office streamlines responsibilities.
- 4. Q&A
  - a) NE: Under the adopted positions, why is the NRHH considered a CO and not an AD.
    - (1) Don't believe the offices fit in the regional mold; person in that position would report information to them. It would be up to the directorship.
  - b) NSRO: How do you foresee the NSRO covering the costs of the NIC?
    - (1) Travel costs would be cut in half; sale of merchandise would cover transfers out. The NIC's sole source of revenue comes from the NACURH budget.

- c) PA: Do you think that with the amount of responsibilities we will have trouble finding institutions to host?
  - (1) We came to the conclusion that when combining the offices, there was an overlap in responsibilities; both offices have busier parts of the year and believe it would balance out.
- d) NE: When you were looking at combining the offices, what historical data did you look at?
  - (1) About 20 years ago at Semis, they discussed moving it to one office, but decided against it. That's when the NSRO was created. It's never been reevaluated.
- e) NSRO: How will you have one person cover affiliations and sales at conferences?
  - (1) Affiliations would happen at check-in; sale of merchandise would happen later during the conference.
- f) NE: Would this new structure affect term length?
  - (1) No; it would still be three year term overall.
- g) GL: When an institution would bid for one office, what would the requirements be of the institution?
  - (1) Since there are currently no stipulations other than being in good standing with NACURH, it would just add that the institution be affiliated with NRHH.
- h) PA: How do you see this office fitting within the strategic plan?
  - (1) When authoring the strategic plan, we looked at efficiency - new schools do not understand the NIC or NSRO. Making it the NACURH Office makes it a more recognizable service and entity. Everything that is in the strategic plan for the offices is still there, it's just centralizing that.
- i) SA: With both of the offices being work intensive, what strain is going to be put on the individuals?
  - (1) The staff is bigger than the individual staffs are. Their positions are covered by something within the new team. The positions would not be more intensive than they are now. Also adds a transition structure.
- j) NE: Can you expand on the logistics of attending conference?
  - (1) The way we envisioned it working is that the NIC person is very busy with affiliation. Since affiliation ends when the gavel drops, they can spend the remainder of conference focusing on merchandise, etc. Having the NACURH Exec there who would assist with conference responsibilities will be helpful as well.
- k) NE: We've talked about the CO for NRHH, this individual will be focused on NRHH affiliations
  - (1) Since not every institution have affiliated chapters
- l) NSRO: How did the taskforce evaluate the offices?

- (1) Looked at the historical budgets overall as well as the history of the NIC moving away from paper to virtual. When the structure was two there was a lot more paper sharing. By combining them with modern technologies it doesn't make sense to have them operate separately.
- m) NE: If we combine them to one host site,
  - (1) It would be a variation of the NACURH Corporate Office
- n) GL: With the entire size, is it feasible to have the staff have access to Bank of America processes
  - (1) Yes, several individuals will have access to be signatories
- o) CA: Can you further clarify the NRHH requirement?
  - (1) Office would need to have an affiliated NRHH Chapter in order to host the office.
- p) NSRO: Who would be attending what conference during the transition year?
  - (1) Would envision it as keeping a similar structure as of right now. Merging duties and presentation responsibilities. Without evaluating the No Frills conferences; gives the offices the opportunity to transition and dual mindset of how these processes work together. Two people
- q) NAN: What is your thought process to changing the AD-NRHH to a CO?
  - (1) In trying to move away from the tradition directorship structure - the offices have been pushed into a regional board mold, which isn't necessarily maximizing what the offices were meant to do.
  - (2) Follow-Up: Have you done research into policy implications?
    - (a) Since the transition team is set-up with time to explore th
- r) SA: What does the CO for NRHH look like?
  - (1) The Exec Team and Office would decide. Four members of the Office would attend Semis and
- s) NE: If they are converging into one office, what is the necessity for two directors and two finance officers?
  - (1) That is just for the transition, list is in the Appendix.
- t) SA: What would the impact on finances be if the offices were combined?
  - (1) Cutting travel in half; with a functioning online store, revenue will be significantly greater. A 20% mark up is also coming that would account for the exact amount needed to run the NIC based on current sales. In talking with the entire committee, we think this is feasible. We are not adding additional duties. We are taking the best from both offices and putting it into one.
- u) CA: What would the line of succession be within the office?
  - (1) Would be determined by the committee; there is no real rhyme or reason. I don't feel comfortable ranking the positions because they are equally important.
- v) PA: Can you expand on the CO for Resources and Development position?

- (1) They would serve as the resource for the office; similar to the NAA; tasked with record keeping and transition requirements to archive historical context for the future.
- (2) Follow-Up: Would LEAD fit under there?
  - (a) Haven't found the best place for that; want to put LEAD under a position that would understand and effectively implement it.
- w) SA: Considering the NSRO Store will be up and running, have you thought about how much time it takes to fill those orders?
  - (1) Through the year following the transition year that would be something that to be looked at. We envision it being all hands on deck - everyone will know all of the processes.
  - (2) Follow-up: Did you consult with the NSRO with how long it takes to fill?
    - (a) No, but both offices are represented as members of the taskforce that authored this piece.
- x) PA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by NE
  - (1) No objections

#### 6. Discussion

- a) CA: Cannot speak on behalf of the offices, their processes, and what makes sense for moving forward; if the offices were both members of the taskforce, we would have liked to have seen them present.
  - (1) Point of Information: The taskforce agreed on who would be the ones to speak on behalf of the piece.
- b) IA moves to caucus for three (3) minutes; 2nd by SA
  - (1) No objections
- c) NAN: Appreciate time the office taskforce has taken to develop the ideas for what this proposed structure could look like.
- d) GL: Need to trust taskforce and what they think is best moving forward; with the finances, by numbers, it fiscally looks better and allows us to remain financially solvent. We need to trust them with the transition period to put everything into place. This falls in line with the strategic plan. This is the best timing for our corporation.
- e) Point of Information: NSRO bidding process office; strategic plan, etc.
- f) NSRO moves to caucus with advisors for fifteen (15) minutes; 2nd by NE
  - (1) No objections
- g) CA: Point of Clarification: Why three years?
  - (1) Because the NSRO will be granted a three year term; the strategic plan gave
- h) SW: Who is on the transition taskforce?
  - (1) Everyone listed was a part of writing it except the NAA, the four COs, and advisors.
- i) PA: Feels that combining the offices into one corporate office modernizes our corporation and instead of being a hurdle for new schools, makes sense.

- Having all of our services in one place makes sense and allows us to grow as a corporation. We feel this is a step into the future and the right direction.
- j) NE: Our biggest concern is the stress placed on the offices along with the size of the proposed staff; as student leaders, our academics come first, could be detrimental
  - k) NAN: Would like to have the NRHH voice more involved in shifting structure since we are developing our strategic plan.
  - l) PA: Our major trepidation is the stress of finding an institution to take this on. Having a corporate office go under would not be great. Don't feel that is enough to not move forward, but is something that should be addressed. We want to be cognizant of recruitment practices in the future.
  - m) CA: We feel that we are a student organization and that we empower, motivate, and equip residence hall leaders by providing them with skills and resources in order for them to excel and positively impact their campus communities. It was said "more people" but it is truly is going from 14 staff members to 9 staff members, effectively cutting 5 student leadership roles. A concern was stated of turnover and paring down positions will add more undue stress on individuals holding these roles. We wish there had been more time and careful thought put into this piece beyond just a month as it is such a large piece of legislation.
  - n) NSRO: Would like to say we are not necessarily in favor; do have concerns about everything, but see it as a solid proposal. A lot of the time in our offices, the people we get on our staff have not been to conferences.
  - o) NIC: While there are many pros and cons, we are in support of this because moving forward, this was identified in our strategic plan. Coming together as one NACURH, this restructure encompasses that vision. Yes, there will be challenges, but the transition time allows us the opportunity to further develop what this looks like for the future.
  - p) NE: Concerned about the transition from AD-NRHH to CO for NRHH and what the loss of a voice on the NNB will do.
  - q) SW: Something that keeps getting brought up is stressors. We think it's better to think of it as a consolidation. We are in support of creating a CO for NRHH because their role in the corporation will be different.
  - r) GL: Echo what the SW has said; as the authors pointed out the office should not have to fit in with the Directorship model since they have different roles; the office would still be represented on the NNB. It is a transition that is necessary.
  - s) Annual Conference; In support; with big changes there will always be pros and cons. It's always about how thought out these changes are and how we can move forward. It's not necessarily about rejecting the cons; there are both and we need to work on both. Recognize the stressors, but from our point of view, we have a staff of 22 and have not had trouble to find an institution to

fill those roles since this is about leadership. This is possible. We've been proving that for 62 years.

- t) SA: Feels that while there has been justification; feel this is rushed. None of this was communicated to us ahead of time. Only three of eight regions are represented.
- u) IA: If we look at the strategic plan you could pull a lot of lines as to what the plan calls for; it takes a large step forward. We are willing to take that risk in order to move the corporation forward.
- v) CA: Echo points NE made; the NNB does work closely with both offices. Taking away a consistent individual is not necessarily beneficial to our members.
- w) SA: Feels there hasn't been enough representation. With less than half the regions involved, there hasn't been a broad enough audience discussed with prior to this proposal. If we could bring this back later in the week that would be best.
- x) PA: Feels as though this isn't something happened over the last month; this started with the planning of the strategic plan. We feel comfortable saying the work put in to this was the work that needed to be done to move the corporation forward. We have struggled with moving it forward in the past. If we are to evolve as a corporation, we need to look past everyone's voice being heard, rather what needs to be done to make our corporation better.
- y) PA: From our understanding the NSRO AD-NRHH position is different, we don't feel much concern in changing
- z) NSRO: Our AD-NRHH serves a different role. Moving to a CO role would be ok because the role is different.
- aa) NIC: Second NSRO; assist in serving NRHH affiliations; serving in a CO role would not be much different.
- bb) NSRO: Feels the inclusion of all the regions isn't an issue; feel the question the board needs to address
- cc) CA: Stated earlier that the strategic plan is a fluid document. We think that taking away selling time
- dd) NAN: In speaking from an NRHH perspective. Yes, the relationships are different. Concerned about losing a consistent voice. Would like to see that taken into consideration.
- ee) NIC: Echo PA and IA; NACURH is at a critical point. Being an office is up for bid, yes we can take it slow, but we will need to re-open the bid process at the close of this conference. Need to be cognizant of this as
- ff) NE: One year of transition may not be enough to effectively transition the offices.
- gg) MA moves to amend: "Create a plan for evaluation of the office and its long-term success"; 2nd by PA; no objections

(1) Proponent

- (a) Need to make sure from now and when it actually takes effect that voices are heard. We don't know that evaluation will be important three years down the road. The way this NBD is operating may be different in the future. We think the amendment strengthens the piece as a whole.
- (2) Q&A
  - (a) GL moves to end Q&A; 2nd by CA
    - (i) No objections
- (3) Discussion
  - (a) IA: Feels this adds something that what lacking
  - (b) CA moves to end discussion; 2nd by NIC
- (4) Vote
  - (a) 8-0-0; amendment carries
- hh) CA moves to amend: "Therefore, let it be further resolved that the CO for NRHH of the 2016 - 2017 transition team shall serve as an ex-officio member of the NNB for the 2016 - 2017 affiliation year and shall attend the Semi Annual Business Meeting 2017 and NACURH Pre-Conference 2017."; 2nd by NIC
  - (1) Proponent
    - (a) CA: There are some AD-NRHH's who have voiced concerns about losing an NRHH voice from the office to the NNB.
  - (2) Q&A
    - (a) PA: Does this buy time?
      - (i) This just changes the transition team's CO for NRHH.
    - (b) NIC moves to end Q&A; 2nd by IA
  - (3) Discussion
    - (a) SA: May overload the CO for NRHH with dual responsibilities.
    - (b) NAN: Whoever is the CO for NRHH, would work to include that individual as much as possible in the work of the NNB.
    - (c) NAA: We have been working the last couple of years to empower the CO position. The NAA will be able to support that CO in navigating that extra involvement. I understand the concern for overloading them but that is where the transition team, the NAA, and NAN come in for additional support.
    - (d) PA: Feels the amendment pinpoints points of contention regarding the office voice on the NNB; having this individual serve as a member of the NNB will help to determine where this individual may serve in the future. With the understanding, the transition team, the NAA will take the necessary steps to ensuring that individual does not feel overwhelmed.
    - (e) GL moves to end discussion; 2nd by SW
      - (i) No objections
  - (4) Vote

- (a) 8-0-0; amendment carries
- ii) GL moves to end discussion; 2nd by IA
  - (1) No objections

7. Vote

- a) 6-2-0
- b) Motion passes

IX. Recess

- A. Annual Conference moves to recess; 2nd by NSRO

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 5TH, 2016

I. Call to Order at 9:50 AM

II. Roll Call

III. Accountant Presentation

- A. NIC moves to bring the Accountant Presentation to the floor; 2nd by CA

- 1. No objections

- B. Presentation

- C. Q&A

- 1. IA: You mentioned on the last slide if we are paying somebody more than \$600.00 we have to do
  - a) Anytime you pay someone more than \$600.00 for services provided (i.e. an Independent Contractor) you should be filing a 10-90 and get a W-9 from them.
- 2. Annual Conference: Does the same benchmark apply for the Annual Conference?
  - a) No, it's really more of you paying for services they provide you. If you hired someone for \$1,000.00 to do something for your region (i.e. redo your website).
- 3. SA: With the conference finance being separated from regions, would we need to file for anything?
  - a) Anything that is paid for by NACURH funds will need to be filed.
- 4. MA: Now that you've been in office for four years, how do you see the changes impacting future terms?
  - a) It makes things more efficient. For example, getting the fiscal year closed prior to pre-conference to ensure returns are given in a timely manner. If you have a good accounting base, you can move on to other issues that need to be addressed such as inventory management. It's not really correct as it stands. By fixing some of the base things, we can continue to improve our practices. If you don't have good tracking, you can't make money. You need to be business minded as a corporation.
- 5. PA: Where do you see your role now that we have an investment policy?
  - a) That is at the discretion of the NAF and Advisor. I serve in an advisory role whenever advice is needed. A lot of the work is going to be ensuring we are following those policies and reallocating the accounts it calls for.

6. MA: Do you have any plans for how to best support future NAFs?
  - a) When the NAF transition happens, it's after tax season. So I have more time to provide support. In the past, when the NAFs have been elected, there is usually a phone conference to determine what is needed. It's at the discretion of the individual. I am available for anything, but it's ultimately at their discretion.
7. CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by Annual Conference
  - a) No objections

D. Pro/Con

1. P: Goals
2. C:
3. P: Experience
4. C:
5. P: Support
6. C:

E. Discussion

1. GL: Feels with Tom's experience and knowledge of the position and the corporation and the changes he has helped us make during his last term will be beneficial to continue.
2. NE: He knows everything we need to do to be successful moving forward.
3. CA calls the question; no objections

F. Vote

1. Tom Gorczynki has been re-appointed as the NACURH Accountant for affiliation years 2016-2020.

IV. FY17 Budgets

A. NACURH FY16 Budget Update

1. Presentation
2. Q&A
  - a) PA: Will bank charges will remain higher because of our use of Clover?
    - (1) Yes; additionally, the NIC found checks that had not been deposited
  - b) Accountant: Where are you putting merchant account fees?
    - (1) Right now under bank charges.

B. NACURH FY17 Budget

1. IA moves to bring the NACURH FY17 Budget to the floor; 2nd by NE
  - a) No objections
2. Presentation
3. Q&A
  - a) CA: In the expenses for the CPA line, there was \$500.00, but we paid \$1,000.00, can you explain that?
    - (1) That was a mental note to complete that transaction.
  - b) PA: You said there was some extenuating circumstances for the recognition line item. Can you explain that?

- (1) The line is indiscernible for what it can be used for. In all reality, we are under budget in reality, but have the ability
- c) OCM: On the \$2,400.00 we give, is that included?
  - (1) It will be, but I didn't want to include it until after this weekend.
- d) OCM: For the STARS, only three were distributed of the four, can you explain that?
  - (1) Individual had won the NACURH honorarium, but their host institution paid for
- e) Annual Conference: With the registration software, what is the timeline for that?
  - (1) At some point we want to try something out. The line will probably not be used if we do not move forward with that.
- f) NE: Can you explain why we are not budgeting for the NIC Site visit?
  - (1) You only complete the site visit during the second year of the office's terms.
- g) MA: How does this impact the office restructuring?
  - (1) Would imagine that numbers may change; could hold off until they are actually merged.
- h) CA: Why did you pick the \$16.00 add-on fee instead?
  - (1) \$17 would be too much, \$15.00 wouldn't be enough; it was to help us balance the budget.
- i) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by IA
  - (1) No objections
- 4. Discussion
  - a) NE: We have a gain which is incredible to be able to take out miscellaneous expenses and balance our budget. it's commendable.
  - b) SA: This budget is what NACURH needs because we shouldn't be budgeting for a deficit.
  - c) MA: This is a good budget.
  - d) CA calls the questions; no objections
- 5. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) NACURH FY17 Budget is approved.

## V. Legislation

### A. NBD 16-20

- 1. CA moves to bring NBD 16-20 to the floor; 2nd by SW
  - a) No objections
- 2. PA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by MA
  - a) No objections
- 3. Proponent Speech
  - a) This was a culture shift in budgeting for the regions, this allows for the regions to assess where their expenses and revenue streams are at and how they can effectively manage the finances. This piece will give the Finance

Officers a foundation expectation to make sure that the budgets are not in a deficit.

#### 4. Q&A

- a) PA: Moving forward, if there were a year where a deficit would produce growth and development for our region / office, would it be allowed?
  - (1) A: This is something that we brought up with the piece itself. This would be an approval of the majority decision of the NBD, it would look strange if just the NAF approved since we are a Board of Directors.
- b) NSRO: Can you clarify the chance for the deficit in budgets?
  - (1) A: If a deficit is absolutely necessary for the upcoming FY then you would have to put it towards the NBD for approval.
- c) CA: From the budgets that you've seen so far, does this seem feasible to work towards out-of-balance budgets?
  - (1) A: About 80% of the regions / offices are not having deficits, I have been very impressed with what people are willing to do. There was also the conversation of finding revenue to raise the add-on fees.
- d) GL: YIELD
- e) PA: My question specifically is for Section 15: Subsection 4, so if the NBD does not approve a budget then you can't bring it to the region?
  - (1) A: So basically you can present a budget to the NBD, if there is a deficit then the NBD would provide suggestions. You could not provide a deficit budget to your region.
- f) PA: Earlier it was mentioned that the NBD as a whole would have to approve the deficit, can you elaborate?
  - (1) A: Oh I understand, I would accept it as a friendly amendment. You can present a deficit budget to the NBD and get approval, and if you get the approval then you can then present the budget to your region.
- g) SA: With this year we are really pushing to present their budgets by Semis, is this something you want to continue with future Semis, if so would this be included in this piece?
  - (1) A: It wouldn't be in this piece, this piece is all about budgets. Regions do not pay attention to the budget presentations, so having Finance Officers to work with the rest of the NBD to get their feedback would be a lot more feasible and effective with moving budgets forward.
- h) SA moves to end Question & Answer; 2nd by MA
  - (1) No objections

#### 5. Discussion

- a) SA: We feel that this is vital for the corporation. Due to miscommunication it can put a region in a bad situation if it is not corrected.

- b) SW: We support the piece because it allows us to budget effectively and not rely on our conference excesses, we do not want massive conference excesses.
- c) IA: We appreciate this piece, we are a little bit concerned if a region consistently presents an out-of-balance budget three years in a row, what would we do then?
- d) PA: The Pacific appreciate the direction that the piece is going. Our region is growing and we believe that a deficit must be incurred within a specific year. With that the Pacific feels that this allows for more financial stability.
- e) CA moves to exhaust the Speaker's List; 2nd by NE
  - (1) No objections
- f) Accountant: When regions keep budgeted deficits that will eat into the capital for NACURH. With NACURH moving forward with new projects and initiatives, we need to make sure that our regional affiliates are meeting NACURH half way by also keeping their budgets intact. This is a great piece because it allows for more stability and support.

6. Vote

- a) 8-0-0
- b) Motion passes

B. NBD 16-40

- 1. CA moves to bring NBD 15-40 to the floor; 2nd by NIC
  - a) No objections
- 2. Proponent Speech
  - a) So these are already in the budgets, I just forgot to send this piece earlier prior to the budgets being made.
- 3. Q&A
  - a) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SW
    - (1) Withdrawn
  - b) NE: The formula is derived from the BEPs, what is that formula?
    - (1) A: Per the agreement from Guidebook, it is an allocation to the regions. We take the conference BEP, average the totals and then find a number that is affiliated with each individual region.
  - c) CA moves to end Question & Answer; 2nd by SW
    - (1) No objections
- 4. Discussion
  - a) GL calls the question
    - (1) No objections
- 5. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) Motion passes

C. NBD 16-04

- 1. SA moves to bring NBD 16-04 to the floor; 2nd by CA
  - a) No objections

2. NIC moves to waive the reading; 2nd by GL
3. Proponent Speech
  - a) This is raising the affiliation dues to adjust for inflation over time. It is our understanding that the fees haven't been raised since 1986. This piece will adjust it from 2007 when small school affiliation was changed. We took the current membership and used the consumer price. To pay the same amount today, we would need to raise it to \$130.00 for NACURH membership and \$45.00 for Associate Membership. This gives a rationale for use in the future. Having a set number in Bylaws is dangerous because it requires it be passed by the corporation. To prevent us gauging member institutions, it include guidelines for how to approach raising fees in the future. We wanted to point out that we will be distributing a financial memo prior to corporate to help these individuals better understand the justification behind the change. It promotes more transparency on our end. Will take

4. Q&A

- a) PA: Do we have any protections in place for changing the currency exchange rate?
  - (1) No; we put it in our budget that those fees are adjusted. As of now if the NIC gets a check and they don't pay it online, NACURH
  - (2) Accountant: It's the reality of international change rates since they fluctuate every year. Some years it will be beneficial, some years it won't be.
- b) GL: With the international bank fees, are those reflected in the NACURH budget?
  - (1) It's not a charge, it's an adjustment. It would just be a decrease
- c) SA moves to end discussion; 2nd by NE
  - (1) No objections

5. Discussion

- a) SA: Feels it is necessary that as a corporation we adjust for time and inflation. Considering the fact that we already had conversations about losing the small/large school divide, this is a good change.
- b) NE: Echoing SA, the process by which the rates change is fair to our membership to allow for time to prepare for changes
- c) IA calls the question; no objections

6. Vote

- a) 8-0-0
- b) Motion passes

D. Legislation

1. NBD 16-22

- a) CA moves to bring NBD 16-22 to the floor; 2nd by NE
  - (1) No objections
- b) MA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by NIC
- c) Proponent Speech

- (1) With host school affiliation this year, we felt it was important to address some information. Institutions process checks differently. In this case, my host institution check got lost, so I would have been removed. It's something we cannot control. It's something we should not be penalized for this.

d) Q&A

- (1) SA: Is putting this in policy going to be in conflict with what currently stands?
  - (a) No; when we use a proof of payment; it's more of a lack of policy.
- (2) MA: Where would the cap be when this check needs to be done.
  - (a) If they have the proof of payment, it would be on the onness of the NIC to recognize that they have a check missing. We recognize that being hosted by an institution is difficult. We try to be lenient and flexible in these processes. With the equity statement it's somewhat covered, but we wanted it to be explicitly clear.
- (3) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by NIC

e) Discussion

- (1) CA moves to amend: "If payment has not been received at the opening of the respective regional conference, the NIC will accept proof of payment, as deemed appropriate by the NACURH Chairperson in consultation with the Regional Directorship, and the NACURH officer will be permitted to conduct or participate in all NACURH-related business." ; 2nd by NE
  - (a) Proponent Speech
    - (i) CA: Mirrors a piece passed earlier this year; allows the Directorship to be included in the process.
  - (b) Q&A
    - (i) NIC moves to end Q&A; 2nd by IA - no objections
  - (d) Discussion
    - (i) GL calls the questions; no objections
  - (e) Vote
    - (i) 8-0-0; amendment carries
- (2) NE: Currently experiencing this; important for this stipulation to be placed in policy so we do not need to ask members to step down and cause problems down the road. We echo the MA from Q&A that a stipulation about when
- (3) NIC: Appreciates this piece.
- (4) GL: Adding the date stipulation could inhibit an individual if an
- (5) NAF: What is the current process with out of date payment?
  - (a) NIC: October 1st is the deadline for payment or proof of payment. Otherwise, the NACURH Chairperson has the ability

to request and extension. Next deadline would be the regional conference where they have a promissory note. Outside the regional conference, they have 30 days.

(6) CA: If an institution were to have a proof of payment on October 1st, would you just wait for the check?

(a) As long as we have verification that the check was sent within 30 days, yes.

(8) CA calls the question; no objections

f) Vote

(1) 8-0-0

(2) Motion passes

VI. SW moves to groove for eight (8) minutes; 2nd by CA

A. No objections

VII. Call to order at 11:45 AM

VIII. FY17 Office Budgets

A. NIC FY17 Budget

1. SW moves to bring the NIC FY17 Budget to the floor; 2nd by SA

a) No objections

2. Presentation

3. Q&A

a) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by the Annual Conference

(1) NSRO object

b) NSRO: Wondering why the Annual Conference expense was budgeted for this year.

(1) We drove all of our staff last year; our host institution covered our travel since we were close.

c) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd

4. Discussion

a) NAF: You'll notice the transfer in from NACURH is not what I indicated in my budget. I didn't feel comfortable making that difference until the end of the fiscal year.

b) CA: The NIC was mindful in their budgeting and spending.

c) CA calls the question; no objections

5. Vote

a) 8-0-0

b) NIC FY17 Budget has been approved.

B. NSRO FY17 Budget

1. GL moves to bring the NSRO FY17 Budget to the floor; 2nd by MA

a) No objections

2. Presentation

3. Q&A

a) SA: In your opinion, do you feel like with the advent of Clover, you won't be selling items at the regions anymore.

- (1) We've been the first school to do so. It depends on what the regions would like to do. We are always willing to sell.
- b) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by GL
- 4. Discussion
  - a) CA: Appreciates the work on the budget; it shows they were mindful of spending.
  - b) MA: Echoes CA; appreciate the increase in funds to help with transition.
  - c) CA calls the question; no objections
- 5. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) NSRO FY17 Budget has been approved.

## IX. Legislation

### A. NBD 16-28

- 1. GL moves to bring NBD 16-28 to the floor; 2nd by NIC
  - a) No objections
- 2. CA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by PA
- 3. Proponent Speech
  - a) Whenever we do our POY reimbursements for the recipient, none of that is in policy. This piece puts practice into policy.
- 4. Q&A
  - a) PA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by MA
- 5. Discussion
  - a) IA: NACURH values putting practice into policy; appreciate this piece.
  - b) CA calls the question; no objections
- 6. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) Motion passes

### B. NBD 16-31

- 1. NE moves to bring NBD 16-31 to the floor; 2nd by GL
  - a) No objections
- 2. MA moves to waive the reading; 2nd by PA
- 3. Proponent Speech
  - a) The CRC laptop is sad. It's not functioning where it should be. We tried to replace the battery, but that hasn't really helped. The CRC has needed to use her personal laptop to complete her work. Proposing some of the remaining equipment line item to purchase a new laptop and any necessary software.
- 4. Q&A
  - a) PA: What kind of computer does the CRC have now?
    - (1) Macbook Pro
  - b) NE: Was there any consideration to purchasing a laptop other than a MacBook?
    - (1) Because of the file structure and software, we were comfortable with keeping an Apple product. Wanted to keep files consistent.

- c) PA: What does the CRC primarily use the laptop for?
  - (1) It's the basics that are listed in this piece. Checking email, reading through POY bids, filing and sending resource, budget templates, etc.
- d) GL: When you receive those POY bids, would you need a special
  - (1) The bid itself is in PDF form. Need some software. Looking to transfer the software.
- e) SA: By Adobe Pro you mean Acrobat, right?
  - (1) Yes.
- f) GL moves to end Q&A; 2nd by MA

5. Discussion

- a) GL: This is a necessary purchase for the CRC laptop to fulfill their positional responsibilities. We feel that we should go through with the purchase and if need be, re-purchase the necessary software even if we cannot transfer licenses.
- b) NE moves to end discussion; 2nd by SA

6. Vote

- a) 8-0-0
- b) Motion passes

X. Recess

- A. CA moves to recess for fifteen (15) minutes; 2nd by PA

1. No objections

XI. Call to order at 12:35 PM

XII. Regional Budget Presentations

A. Great Lakes

1. Q&A

- a) NAF: Moving forward, what do you feel will be the biggest struggle to maintain the budget for FY17, what is your plan?
  - (1) Since we've increased our add-on fees so much, I do not think balancing the budget will be a problem. Making sure that inventory is being sold for a profit.
- b) GL: Can you explain your process for paying for RBD apparel?
  - (1) The region pays for it, but every member purchases their own.
- c) PA: Can you clarify the Technology add-on fee
  - (1) We have a technology add-on fee if the Technology Fund falls below \$2,000.00. We have to have it again at our No Frills since we did not make \$2,000.00. We transfer from the fund to purchase technology.
- d) PA: How do you absorb bank charges for those who pay by credit card?
  - (1) Right now we absorb those costs, but in the future, can look at re-evaluating where those come from.
- e) MA: You originally accounted for an advisor to attend Semis. Would you consider zeroing that line item, or are you going to keep it?
  - (1) It depends on when we're told because the CCs need to approve those funds.

f) MA moves to end Q&A: 2nd by PA

2. Feedback

- a) PA: Go in order of line items; talk about revenues and expenses separately.
- b) NAF: Great job and keep it up!
- c) SA: Your budget looks really good! When it converts from Excel to Google several errors show up.
- d) IA: Appreciated your tone in presenting; you were confident yet not intimidating. It makes people want to pay attention.
- e) GL: Coming from the GL as a former Regional Advisor, I am impressed by this.

B. Intermountain

1. Q&A

- a) CA: Is there a reason you do not budget money for your COs to travel?
  - (1) There is no way we could sustain our COs for travel. IA pays for registration for regional conferences, but they are encouraged to get
  - (2) Follow-Up: Have you thought about ways to increase revenue to cover them?
    - (a) We're looking at changing the add-on fees to guarantee all conferences are paid for.
- b) NAF: Given that you're budgeting a gain, how do you plan to maintain this while also finding new sources of revenue?
  - (1) Something I learned is that it's not always about making money, but balancing out. A lot of things are coming from our strategic plan with how we will navigate new revenue.
- c) SA: Can you go more in depth about what is considered supplies?
  - (1) For the Directorship, supplies are items we use at conferences, site visits, summits. For COs, its recognition items for representatives they work with, etc.
- d) NSRO: On miscellaneous revenue, the number says 0, but in the other budget
- e) Accountant: I see on your revenue you have membership dues for revenue and transfers in are different, can you explain?
  - (1) Also includes LASI; it's a \$50.00 donation to IA; can purchase a \$10.00 pin as well.
- f) NSRO: Wondering about the Transfers Out for NSRO?
  - (1) That was changed because of the RHA pins that just came out. Depending on conversations with Directorships, it may also increase at No Frills.
    - (a) NSRO: We brought your pins
- g) PA: For the miscellaneous revenue, what were those miscellaneous revenues?
  - (1) Items that didn't make sense in other lines. An institution forgot to pay for a conference from 2 or 3 years ago and they decided to pay us back.

2. Feedback

- a) PA: Great presentation; you're really thorough and clear.
- b) NAF: Want to commend you; you've grown a lot since last year. I'm very proud of you.

XIII. Recess

A. SW moves to recess until 2:05 PM; 2nd by NE

1. No objections

XIV. Call to order at 2:40 PM

XV. Roll Call

XVI. Regional Budget Presentations

A. Pacific

1. Q&A

- a) NAF: Moving forward since you are at a loss for addressing that for your region?
  - (1) Plan to increase the add-on fee; has wording that doesn't allow it to change as it stands. Plan to bring it up during the next regional chat. Those bidding for the next conference can factor that into their bids.
- b) CA: What is your current add-on fee?
  - (1) \$14.00
- c) GL: Why are there are only five of the eight regions listed on Transfers In/ Transfers Out?
  - (1) Alphabetical order.
- d) CA: Have you thought about raising your add-on fee to reduce your deficit?
  - (1) That will also be taken care of in the piece we plan to move forward at our next regional chat.
- e) CA moves to end Q&A; no objections

2. Feedback

- a) NAF: Good job so far! It makes a lot of sense with revenue. There's a huge cut in expenses! Keep up the great work.
- b) CA: When you go to write legislation, you should be able to raise it to \$16.00 to balance out.
- c) IA: We ran into merchandise problems in the past. It may be beneficial to reassess the price for merchandise to make more of a profit.

B. Central Atlantic

1. Q&A

- a) IA: Can you touch on the sponsorship you give your conferences in the revenue?
  - (1) That's if there is a conference excess; our policy distributes it to outlined areas.
- b) MA: Do you have a technology fund?
  - (1) Yes; we haven't needed to touch it, so we do not budget for it right now.
- c) CA: Where are Clover and bank fees going?

- (1) We don't have Clover yet,
- (2) Follow-Up: Are you planning on selling merchandise through Clover?
  - (a) Yes.
- d) NAF: Can you talk about your textbook scholarship?
  - (1) \$1.00 per add-on fee per delegate goes to a textbook scholarship fund to provide scholarships to members.
- e) NSRO: Curious about postage and freight - what's going on there?
  - (1) Shipping transition materials costed more than anticipated.
- f) Chair: You budget \$56.00 but it should only cost \$32.00
  - (1) Budgeted what was done last year
- g) MA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by PA

## 2. Feedback

- a) SW: Appreciates textbook scholarship to benefit members
- b) NAF: Want to commend Tommy; CA's template is used for all regions. Great work!
- c) IA: Appreciate detail about conference sponsorship your region provides.

## C. South Atlantic

### 1. Q&A

- a) NSRO: For transfers out for NSRO, what are you planning to do for pins and induction certificates -what are your plans?
  - (1) We don't record them under transfers out - we currently record them in inventory.
- b) NAF: Curious on interest income with Vanguard; why is that in there?
- c) PA: Wanted to clarify; you are not eating the fee for Clover, right?
  - (1) Correct.
- d) IA: Can you talk about your regional pin revenue and how it is so much?
  - (1) We sold a lot of pins at NACURH, created a new pin, and sold a lot of those at SAACURH 2015.
- e) CA: What's your mark-up on your pins?
  - (1) \$5.00 - paid around \$3.00 for production
- f) Chairperson: You said you put your NSRO pins under inventory and that is currently budgeted at zero, is Meg not awarding them?
  - (1) Somehow have enough for the remainder of the year.
- g) IA: Here
  - (1) Not all of that is affiliated with regional merchandise; some of that goes to pins.
- h) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by IA

### 2. Feedback

- a) NAF: Much gratitude for saving your region from what could have been a bad situation. Moving forward SA is in a good place!
- b) NIC: Echo NAF; great work in turning around a gain from your previous issues.

- c) PA: Since you do have some of those confusing pieces, make sure to be transparent about those when presenting.

#### D. Region

##### 1. Q&A

- a) CA: You need to update your CPA fees
  - (1) Thanks!
- b) NAF: For the awards, what exactly is it used for?
  - (1) When we select those awards, we award the recipient a scholarship in that amount.
- c) NSRO: Wondering what RBD pins was under recognition?
  - (1) The bar pins;
- d) NAF: Could you let everyone know who you pay for?
  - (1) With the exception of Semis and NACURH, we only pay for the advisor for \$0.30 for every mile; cover partial travel and registration
- e) NAF: Have you considered lowering \_\_\_ to save money or subsidize travel costs?
  - (1) Anticipate lowering it more.
- f) SA: Is there a reason why there is a general fund and general recognition line?
  - (1) We only have one; it's just the template.
- g) CA: Could you go into explaining what your recognition goes to?
  - (1) Recognize the RBD; because we are frilly we will purchase trinkets such as play-doh to our boardroom representatives.
  - (2) Follow-Up: Have you considered cutting that?
    - (a) The \$600.00 is current, not anticipated. Could actually double.
- h) CA: Do you pay travel for your swaps?
  - (1) We will pay up to \$350.00 for the fall and the Spring swap
- i) GL: Wouldn't it be more beneficial to put swap travel
- j) PA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by the Annual Conference

##### 2. Feedback

- a) NSRO: Commends NE for decreasing expenses; appreciate time to reevaluate expenses to help with financial solvency in the future.
- b) Tom: I think NE needs to do some emergency surgery on the budget. It's still a five digit deficit. You need to reassess fundamental operation because it's not sustainable to rely on excess. It's great that you're working on it, but something more radical needs to happen.
- c) MA: Recommend with your sponsorships you do to cutting that.
- d) NAF: Wants to commend Zach because his thinking is much different than previous finance officers. In the past the mentality was budgeting a deficit because that's the NE way.
- e) CA: Increasing your add-on fee like you proposed will definitely get you on the right track.

#### E. Midwest

1. Q&A
  - a) NSRO: You have \$30.00 budgeted for pins, but it should be \$32
  - b) CA: For you regional conference, you
    - (1) We rotate our fees
  - c) IA: What does your MOU look like with your professional association?
    - (1) We don't have one. We just pay for it.
  - d) CA: What's your add-on fee?
    - (1) Regionals: \$20.00; No Frills: \$10.00 - were passed last year.
  - e) NSRO: On postage and freight you increased it to \$75.00
    - (1) We've been overspending on this line lately and just want to be proactive.

2. Feedback
  - a) NAF: Great job! The amount you've saved is impressive. It puts MACURH on a good place for the next few years. Appreciate you increasing revenue as well.

XVII. MA moves to recess

A. 2nd SW

XVIII. Call to order at 7:30 PM

XIX. Roll Call

XX. Regional Presentations

A. Central Atlantic

1. IA: Can you talk about your summits structure?
  - a) CA: We have a summer summit for the board to come together to figure out what their doing. We have one in the fall at the conference host site to complete a site visit. Have a winter summit, but did not end up doing that this year. Will be doing a virtual summit.
2. PA: How do you approach transitioning in those students?
  - a) Took from NACURH 2015 to the regional conference to get contact information for individuals. Wanted to learn who they are as a person and what they do as NCCs. NCCs serve diverse roles in our region.
3. SA: Can you go more in depth with what you want to do with Build the Bridge?
  - a) RBD has buddies - AD-NRHH works closely with RHA Relations CO. Worked to better integrate the two to help them in moving their organizations forward.
4. PA: Can you discuss your virtual roundtables?
  - a) We call them Campbell Call-In Chats. Their hosted via Zoom and they are always on a Sunday. 2-3PM is RHA 3-4PM is NRHH. We've covered a variety of topics. RBD takes turns leading them.
5. GL: What kind of attendance do you have at those chats and how do you promote them?
  - a) Attendance started very well; has trickled off as the semester went on. Looking at timing for the future.
6. IA: For your transitional retreat, where is that hosted?

- a) We wanted to pick a site early on in the year. We're finding it's not realistic. Need a space to eat, meet, and sleep.

7. NE moves to end Q&A; 2nd by GL

B. Intermountain

1. Q&A

- a) CA: How much does it cost for your alumni association?
  - (1) Right now it's \$50.00; you'll receive a plaque and IA publications; another option is \$10.00 donation where you receive a pin.
- b) PA: Can you talk about the liaison program?
  - (1) Board members are assigned to member institutions and communicate important information.
- c) CA: What does NRHH alumni relations look like in IA?
  - (1) We created an alumni luncheon last year.
- d) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SA
  - (1) No objections

XXI. Recess

A. SW moves to recess for five minutes; 2nd by SA

1. No objections

XXII. Call to order at 9:25PM

XXIII. Roll

XXIV. Legislation

A. NBD 16-36

- 1. NIC moves to bring NBD 16-36 to the floor; 2nd by GL
  - a) No objections
- 2. Proponent Speech
  - a) Bulk of the money that comes in are transfers from the board. Similar to ACUHO-I, we created levels of recognition for those who donate to NACURH. In naming this, we had considered foundation and other titles, but those had legal implications. Having this in policy will ensure that notification is sent to those who are donating because it is a charitable contribution.
- 3. Q&A
  - a) NE: Under levels of support and recognition; should it be 49 or 50?
    - (1) It should be 49.
  - b) MA: How do you intend regional alumni associations fit in with this?
  - c) CA:
  - d) NE: What is the difference between the two pins?
    - (1) The NACURH Word Cloud Pin starts at the \$10.00; the Advancement Society Pin starts at the \$50.00.
  - e) PA: Is there any annual donations planned?
    - (1) This is when people donate on your behalf or if you want to buy into the program.
    - (2) Follow-Up: So we still have the AAFN
      - (a) AAFN still exists at the \$100.00 level

- f) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SW
  - (1) No objections
- g) \_\_ moves to end Q&A; 2nd by \_\_
- 4. Discussion
  - a) SA: Gives more opportunities for people to contribute to the corporation and help create more opportunities for student recognition.
  - b) PA: Great way to make our corporation more financially sustainable by creating an avenue for more people to donate.
  - c) NIC: Echoes SA and PA; it's a way to better develop our resources and aligns with the NACURH Strategic Plan.
  - d) Annual Conference: The tiered system is really effective.
  - e) CA calls the question; no objections
- 5. Vote
  - a) 8-0-0
  - b) Motion passes/is tabled/fails

## XXV. Regional Presentations

### A. Pacific

1. SA: Did the two northern/southern relations work with RHA or NRHH?
  - a) They worked primarily with the NCCs, but that would be an interesting thing to look at.
2. CA: You talked about buddy challenges, can you explain that a little more?
  - a) Started before the regional conference; form asks about strengths and weaknesses in their role; matched those individuals from there. Worked to identify like strengths and weaknesses - also served as their boardroom buddy there. The December Challenge was to learn one recognition and one service program their buddy's institution does.
3. MA: Can you talk more about the RBD Accountability Committee?
  - a) Committee run by an RHA/NRHH Advisor selected by the Regional Advisor. One professional is the chair. Up to 10 students are chosen for the committee. It exists to hold the Regional Board of Directors accountable. If a student has a concern, they bring it to the committee.
4. IA: Can you talk more about the role of Presidents in your region?
  - a) They network with each other about how to develop their RHA's (compensation, structure, relationship with NRHH and student government, etc.). A lot of it is discussion and development. They vote on First-Time Delegate's scholarships and go from there. At No Frills they vote on a few awards. Since they serve as the figurehead of their organization, that's a good
5. SA: Going back to the accountability committee; can the pro-staff member be only a Chair?
  - a) A student is a chair; the pro-staff member advises. It's supposed to be three or four presidents, three or four NRHH Reps three or four NCCs who hold the board accountable
6. NSRO: How many issues does it see? How active is it?

- a) An example is hypothetically, an issue with plagiarism on a bid that went through an appeal process through boardroom and the Director, ended up being sent to the RBD Accountability Committee; maybe meets once or twice a year. Moving towards a focus on statistics and evaluation as well to help us improve how we operate and serve our region.
- 7. SW: In our region, our presidents get frustrated they cannot vote on legislation - how do you address this and value those individuals?
  - a) When you go into a conference, it's the NCCs job to vote and be in charge of the delegation. In boardroom, they can caucus to speak to their RHA President or NRHH Representative. When it comes to electing the ADP, the NCCs can technically vote, but everyone mass yields to those individuals.
- 8. CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SA

XXVI. Recess

- A. CA moves to recess until 9:30 AM; 2nd by SW
  - 1. No objections

**WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 6TH, 2016**

I. Call to order at 9:42 AM

II. Roll Call

III. Annual Conference Budget

A. Presentation

B. Q&A

- 1. CA: In looking at the volunteers section, 75 isn't carried through. Can you explain?
  - a) Not all of our volunteers are staying throughout the duration of conference.
- 2. SA: Will you be including the NRHH Advisor in the compensation?
  - a) Not all of our volunteers are staying throughout the duration of conference.
- 3. NE: Can you expand on the various costs associated with Philanthropy?
  - a) That costs is going to go towards our service project during pre-conference and we don't have the exact break-down for that yet.
- 4. NE: You talked about the additional costs such as water bottles - can you explain?
  - a) Right now water bottles are an add-on because we want to keep costs low; we are hoping to get that sponsored.
- 5. NE moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SW
  - a) No objections

C. Discussion

- 1. CA moves to caucus for three (3) minutes; 2nd by SA
  - a) No objections
- 2. Annual Conference: The exact delegate cost we propose is \$246.00.
- 3. GL: Feels the Annual Conference has done a great job of acquiring sponsorship. We believe the \$246.00 is the best price to set.

4. SW: Agrees with GL; appreciate that they've already secured over \$60,000.00 in sponsorship. Appreciate the Annual Conference working to keep costs low without reducing quality.
5. CA moves to set the maximum cost at \$246.00; 2nd by IA
  - a) No objections

D. Vote

1. 8-0-0
2. Annual Conference maximum cost has been set at \$246.00.

IV. Regional Presentations

A. North East

1. Q&A

a) GL:

(1) Right now it isn't in policy, because it's still so new. We are working on implementing this in policy and determining how much we will contribute to the foundation.

b) CA: Could you go over current recognition and future recognition plans?

(1) When OTMs are written and won we send that out to the region. When it's your birthday, Marty Moose posts on your wall. At conference we do Shining Stars for people to recognize each other. We give gifts to all of our boardroom representatives. Some we've been discussing include ways to expand upon recognizing RBD buddy schools including attending a virtual meeting.

c) PA: For your philanthropy pin, are you not donating 100% of the profits?

(1) That is the plan

d) SA:

(1) Sub-regional meetings are optional; it's a preparation meeting. We want to get students who have never been in boardroom there. It's informational. They have constructive roundtables to discuss issues and initiatives through their organizations.

(2) Follow-Up: Do you

(a) That has been a conversation in the past since attendance can be low depending on where the meeting is hosted. It's an option, but we are afraid that no one would participate at in-person meetings.

e) PA: For ADPR, how much do they work with conference staff?

(1) Completely oversees conference programming in conjunction with the track from development of tracks to submission, program acceptance, and implementation. They develop conference case studies as well.

f) SA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by CA

(1) No objections

V. Recess

A. SW moves to recess until 11:15 AM; 2nd by PA

1. No objections

- VI. Call to order at 11:30 AM
- VII. Director & Finance Officer Breakout
- VIII. Regional Policy Audit
- IX. Recess
  - A. SW moves to recess until 2:00 PM; 2nd by NSRO
    - 1. No objections
- X. Call to order at 2:00 PM
- XI. Roll Call
- XII. OCM Presentation
- XIII. Hot Seat
  - A. SA moves to hot seat; 2nd by CA
    - 1. No objections
- XIV. Regional Presentation
  - A. Midwest
    - 1. Q&A
      - a) GL: Is you parliamentarian a part of the board?
        - (1) A third party, active at conferences.
      - b) CA: Can you clarify the one bed, one bed policy?
        - (1) Notify conference staff if you would rather have your own bed, notifying the conference staff ahead of time.
      - c) SA: Can you elaborate more on how you are pursuing gender neutral housing?
        - (1) We are actively working towards it.
      - d) PA: Can you discuss more about your Director being elected at the regional conference?
        - (1) Suggested it be tabled which has been tabled to a committee. Thought process behind it is that someone who fills the Director role has a lot of experience in MACURH. Gives individual more time to begin preparing for elections of next board and planning.
      - e) GL: What was the feedback on the piece for electing the Director at the regional conference?
        - (1) Haven't received a lot of feedback; for transition reasons we believe it is the right choice.
      - f) CA: What does the bid review taskforce do?
        - (1) Enacted January 1 and works until the No Frills Conference. They complete bid review and send feedback.
      - g) GL: With OTMs and Recognition combined, do you believe that works or is it overwhelming?
        - (1) Something we have looked at. Looked at expanding it to members to be involved. At times they do tell me they are overwhelmed, but work with them. We do not have enough interest for both committees.
      - h) SA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SW
        - (1) No objections

B. Southwest

1. Q&A

- a) GL: What does unlimited ChickFilA mean?
- b) CA: How is your CO-RN position going?
  - (1) Going well! She's made the position her own. Felt like NRHH needed a second person for support on the RBD; weren't great at providing bidding resources, so that position has taken that out. The only cons to it are that bidding resources have been wanted for so long, they have a lot of high expectations. People are a little confused at the differentiation between the AD-NRHH and CO-RN.
- c) MA: How long is your NRHH Advisor's term?
  - (1) 2 years
- d) PA: Can you explain how the award room stuff will work?
  - (1) Rooms will be chaired by Director, AD-NRHH and CO for Presidents. Awards will be distributed and representatives will be able to go to the room they want to when they vote on awards. Everyone gets an equal say in each room.
  - (2) Follow-Up: What if a school doesn't have an NRHH Chapter?
    - (a) That's the beauty of it. They can vote on awards that they wouldn't get the opportunity to. Will have one NRHH bid per session.
- e) PA: Is it required for a school to send someone to that room?
  - (1) No; there is only a stipulation of a maximum of one per room and at least one is voting every session.
- f) NE: Do you have a minimum requirement of schools represented for each bid?
  - (1) If it winds up that there are an exorbitant amount of people in one room and not the other, we will be working to make sure to divide those equally.
- g) GL: What's your plan to reach quorum?
- h) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by NE
  - (1) No objections

XV. Recess

- A. NIC moves to recess until 6:00 PM; 2nd by NSRO
  - 1. No objections

XVI. RA OTM Task Force Overview (NNB 16-03)

A. Discussion

- 1. PA moves to Caucus for 5 minutes; 2nd by CA
  - a) No objections
- 2. GL AD-NRHH: I am in favor of the options given, I feel that option 4 is the best solution that creates the least amount of issues. With option 2 it would create too many discussion, and option 1 would be way too broad in this sense. Overall, we are in favor of option 4, Res. Life / Student Staff is the easiest and equal to transition to

at this current time. Though it may be broad there are other categories that have those broad possibilities such as Spotlight and Residential Professional Staff, this will allow AD-NRHHs and their OTM Committee to make those filtering discussions.

3. NSRO Finance: The NSRO ADAF feels that we are not in favor of option 1 because it says RA instead of an inclusive term. We are more in favor of option 4, echoing the Great Lakes, this puts people on the same people. This allows people to differentiate between the different student staff titles. We have no real concerns with option 4.
4. NSRO AD-NRHH: The NSRO AD-NRHH believe that option 4 is the best option. We look at professional staff on the same playing field when you look at the variety in professional positions on the professional level.
5. CA AD-NRHH: The CA AD-NRHH feel that we are overwhelmingly in favor of option 1 after talking to many of our reps. We are more in favor of this option because both do very different jobs. Furthermore, we feel that this is in a larger conversation within the strategic plan while moving forward.
6. GL Finance: The GL Finance is more in favor of option 4. For option 2 it is more confusing when submitting an OTM for this particular category. Option 4 is the best option in the GL ADAF's opinion, it is extremely inclusive.
7. NE AD-NRHH: We are strongly in favor of option 1, we echo the Central Atlantic. We feel that both RAs and student staff do very different jobs and shouldn't be compared to each other. The Res. Life Student Staff title would have confusion with figuring out where the RAs fall.
8. PA Director: The PA Director feels that the option 4 is the most consistent with the task system, but it will also provide the most clarity for the current direction of NRHH. We believe that in order to be more inclusive we are in favor of this option.
9. NIC Finance: The NIC feel that based off the survey data we feel more in favor of option 1. Based off the data 80% or more of the results show that RA titles are more relevant. However, the student staff category was the most requested change.
10. MA NRHH: We feel that though option 1 is the best category based off the definitions and descriptions on the OTM website. I feel that we could do more education on what could be submitted below an RA category before we limit it to just RAs, many schools have other students that work in residence life. We feel in favor of option 1.
11. NIC Director: Option 1 is the best option, the position of the RA position is the current lead in any other student staff position based off the results.
12. SA Finance: We feel that option 1 is the best option to choose, though RA may not be inclusive it is a well enough term to where their position can probably fit into that category in some way.
13. CA Director: I would like to say that with option 1, 80% have agreed to this. These people have expressed that this is their wanting.
14. PA NRHH: We are in support of option 1, option 2 is too confusing. Option 4 would be too inclusive and create a lot of strain on the OTM submissions. We do want to point that there is an advisor category that could also be considered in the

professional staff category. Additionally, with the three options, we believe option 1 is the best.

15. PA Finance: RAs serve in different ways compared to desk assistants. RAs provide more direct support to their halls and their community. I feel that what students provide to other students is different than what professional staff provide for students. We agree with MA AD-NRHH with educating more.
16. NE Director: The Northeast Director would like to echo many if not all the sentiments for option 1, it is the best option to present to NACURH. I have concerns that RAs and Res. Life student staff may have overshadowing possibilities of the other res. life positions.
17. NE Finance: The NE ADAF echoes on option 1. It just is best to compare RAs amongst themselves. Option 4 is too broad and would be completely unfair, to address the inclusivity concerns of option 4, NACURH also recognizes RHAs only.
18. Annual Conference: Would like to echo is the most equitable with RAs since RAs serve in different roles compared to the other res. life staff. An important component piece that we want to point out is the educational piece of recognition and how it would be put in place.
19. CA AD-NRHH: YIELD
20. MA Finance: We are in favor of option 1.
21. MA AD-NRHH: We want to point out that with NRHH, one of the values is through recognition. Expanding the two categories allows us to recognize more individuals. Also, with educating students on what could be included in the resident assistant category. This would assist with the OTM submissions.
22. GL AD-NRHH: While 80% of the data said they had RAs, there are only 20% that do not call them RAs. Additionally, we feel that RAs are a part of student staff, this would allow us to move students along. There are positions that are the same with RAs but differ in titles.
23. NSRO AD-NRHH [Question to NAA]: Was Option 2 a option that was considered in the task force or survey?
  - a) A: These were the options for discussion for the task force.
24. NE AD-NRHH: The Northeast does not feel that the exclusive of the RA title would be a problem because we believe that with proper education on the different categories. Some categories overlap but we haven't addressed those.
25. IA Finance: I feel that option 1 is the best option based off the sentiments from the Central Atlantic. The data and the results backs up the questions based from the task force and it also aligns with the strategic plan with NNB. I trust the NNB to move forward on this piece and trust that they will execute the strategic plan with sections relating to OTMs.
26. NSRO Director: We would like to point out that with option 1 there could be double submissions, with option 4 there could be an opportunity to expand '
27. CA AD-NRHH: The CA NRHH would like to state that there are a lot of confusion in the submissions of OTM categories, so regardless there would have to be more education on the piece itself.

28. CA Director: NACURH moved to adopt a RHA President and NRHH President NACURH award, by removing RAs from the res. life student staff it would help bring recognition forward.
29. PA Director: We would like to state that the PA Director have made decisions on what to suggest to moving forward. We encourage a decision to be made.
30. SA AD-NRHH: The South Atlantic as a whole appreciates the work of the task force, we feel that we should take a different approach to this topic. The NNB has had conversations on this topic and should be focused on the direction of how to solve this idea. My idea is to wipe the categories and then come up with new categories.
31. GL Director: The Great Lakes Director feels that there are a lot of good discussion. Nobody has talked about option 2, so let's talk about it. With option 4, yes it is quite broad and we have also talked about the 80-20 differences. Speaking from differing perspectives we feel that option 4, we should consider all aspects of inclusivity.
32. SA Director: The South Atlantic Director feels like there was a lot of communication and consideration to this piece, but this puts a lot of members up in the air. For people that don't care for NRHH, option 2 wouldn't be the best option.
33. CA AD-NRHH: We shouldn't get stuck on strides that organization is making, there are a group of students who are not represented but we can still make changes in the future.
34. SA Finance: Complete inclusivity is not possible but we could make changes.
35. Annual Conference NBD Liaison: We want to be very inclusive but we want to be equitable, however when we are passing out recognition how is it okay when we exclude RAs who do a lot of work are working towards the same categories or other students.
36. SA AD-NRHH: With option 2, something I talked about with option 2... With the wording of some of the options can be confusing for other students who work as desk assistants but don't live on campus.
37. MA AD-NRHH: We have a couple points, having two categories there will be OTMs. This may take more time however this would increase the recognition. It is a part of the strategic plan. Having option 1, we can still educate them.
38. Annual Conference Chair: YIELD
39. CA AD-NRHH: We feel that option 2 is confusing because we have schools that those desk assistants are required to live in the building where they work.
40. NSRO AD-NRHH: OTMs should be evaluated on who went above and beyond, not what job is harder.
41. IA Director: We are in support of option 1 with the presented options. I appreciate the survey results and the time that was given to the task force. This aligns with the strategic plan of NACURH and the strategic efforts of NRHH and NNB.
42. PA AD-NRHH moves to exhaust the Speaker's List
  - a) Dissent by CA
    - (1) 2nd WITHDRAWN
    - (2) MM WITHDRAWN
44. SW AD-NRHH: We are in support of option 1, and agree with the many points.

45. CA AD-NRHH calls to question

- a) No objections

B. Vote

1. SA moves to vote by secret ballot; 2nd by Annual Conference
  - a) No objections
  - b) Option 1 - Recommendation from Discussion
2. NIC moves to caucus for 5 minutes; 2nd by SA
  - a) No objections
3. The RA OTM legislation will be redrafted by the NAN.

XVII. Office Presentations

A. NSRO

1. Q&A

- a) Annual Conference: What are turtle pins?
  - (1) Something the Execs give out to recognize individuals who have supported them during their term.

B. NIC

1. Q&A

- a) CA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by SW
  - (1) No objections

XVIII. NRHM

A. General Information:

1. Chair and NAA implement; planning to create the marketing and distribute that out to the regions. This will be occurring on the same dates that were on February 2015. What we looked at were items that were lacking with NRHM, and that were ideas and projects that come from regions to support NRHM. We see NRHM is valuable to what we are as NACURH and to all the students that represent their affiliated institution. We would like to use this opportunity for what regions could be doing, as Nate mentioned we are creating new marketing materials for this project but would like to get the general feedback from the Boards.

B. Suggestions from the Boards:

1. NSRO: Promoting LEAD.
2. CA: I have a question, can you give us a background on why the change was from April to February?
  - a) A [NAA]: The purpose to changing it from April to February was because April was a busy month for RHAs and NRHHs when they were going through finals. We wanted to push it to earlier this semester so there was more freedom and flexibility to execute the program as a whole. Moving it to February allowed us for a bigger audience and better impact.
  - b) A [NAA]: During this time we avoid any finals, closing, or elections from RHA / NRHH / Residence Life.

3. SW: I am wondering what your expectations are for us is, do you want us to be promoting campuses that relate with the week's topics or do you want us to be hosting virtual things. We know it exists and what happens but what is the expectation from NACURH?
  - a) A [Chair]: It is a little bit of both. We want you to encourage NRHM on your levels but we also want you to come up with projects that relate to the topics as a whole. Think of goals that are obtainable on the regional level, make sure that your member institutions are participating on a campus level as well as the regional / NACURH level.
4. GL: I believe getting information on NRHM out before February starts would be important. The RHA / NRHH Executives are having their start of the year meetings as well as their planning for the semester and they are using this time to plan the events and initiatives for February. Utilize social media and not just share what is happening from the NACURH accounts, this could be through passive marketing / programming,
5. PA: A couple things that we will do for NRHM is to adopt a way to integrate a social media plan for NRHM, this could be absorbed into the weeks so they are themed for NRHM. On top of that, we could also put together spirit point challenges so people will participate in the event. Because our No Frills 2016 conference falls on NRHM we will utilize the conference as well.
6. MA: It seems to me that OCM / Region hashtag has had a lot of success in the past year as well as the NSRO hashtag. Maybe promoting a challenge / engagement that allows people to be involved in a very minimalistic level. This could be tied to both the regions and NACURH.
7. Annual Conference: We are concerned that February may not be the best month.
  - a) A [NAN]: There was a very large chat regarding these chats, we evaluated every month within the Spring semesters.
    - (1) January would not work because some schools are coming back from breaks. March typically has Spring Break. April would have items that relate to RHA / NRHH transition.
8. NE: The Northeast likes the idea of a hashtag. We would suggest that OCM and [INSERT REGION] hashtag be mimicked with NRHM.
9. Annual Conference: Possibly include a resource for schools that can't do NRHM within the traditional time of February. I understand that when UD was doing their own we had to do it in April, but had no resources so made a lot of things up.
10. CA: We would like to say looking back at the month select, not saying this relates to the conversation but providing context.
11. NE: Another type of marketing that has been successful so far would be memorable. This would be cool to see people sharing their experiences and ways to create positive experiences for NRHM.
12. CA moves to end Discussion; 2nd by Annual Conference
  - a) No objections

XIX. Recess

- A. NE moves to recess until 9:30AM; 2nd by NSRO
  - 1. No objections

## **THURSDAY, JANUARY 7TH, 2016**

- I. Call to order at 0:00 AM
- II. Roll Call
- III. Advancement Society Inductions
  - A. Nominations

- 1. SA moves to open nominations; 2nd by GL
  - a) No objections
- 2. NIC nominates Molly McKinstry; 2nd by IA
- 3. IA nominates Nathan Tack; 2nd by SA
- 4. NE nominates Justin Schwendeman; 2nd by NIC
- 5. CA nominates Tommy Brown; 2nd by NSRO
- 6. NIC nominates Elliott Hendrick; 2nd by SW
- 7. PA nominates Mason Margotta; 2nd by MA
- 8. NE nominates Elizabeth Sutton; 2nd by MA
- 9. GL nominates Ethan Schwarten; 2nd
- 10. CA nominates Rachel Zolotarsky; 2nd by IA
- 11. NIC nominates Melissa Peters; 2nd by SA
- 12. SA nominates Taylor Hanley; 2nd by PA
- 13. PA nominates Melissa Williams; 2nd by SW
- 14. Annual Conference nominates Matt Hermenau; 2nd by NSRO
- 15. NIC nominates Lauren Scanlan; 2nd by PA
- 16. Annual Conference nominates Meghan Clements; 2nd by CA
- 17. NE nominates Breta Moore; 2nd by MA
- 18. GL moves to end nominations; 2nd by SW
  - a) No objections

- B. Discussion

- 1. NIC: Worked with Molly in the past; she does good work, has been involved quite a while.
- 2. IA: Has served in several roles. Served as a Director, RCC, on his campus, is now Chairperson.
- 3. NE: We know he's been such an integral part to his region. We know he has done a lot to improve his region. He has worked with NE and helped give us new insights. He was on the strategic planning committee. We feel he is a genuine nominee.
- 4. CA: Tommy has been crucial to our operations in helping us to stay fiscally responsible. His campus NRHH chapter had no budget at all before him.
- 5. GL: He has done phenomenal work with GL and has been involved
- 6. PA: Mason has served on the regional board for several years. He was also an NCC. He has made several strides by moving the PA forward and leading through a transition. He supported the RBD when we had resignations

7. NE: Elizabeth Sutton poured her heart and soul into the Annual Conference. She swapped to several regions. She was a huge asset to us last year and a great source of support.
8. GL: Ethan has done a phenomenal job to get our emails updated and working to get our websites back up. He's a huge support to all of us.
9. CA: Rachel has been involved for several years. She took over the RHA President role when someone stepped down. She is chairing the conference.
10. NIC: Melissa has been an advisor for the NIC and UNL for several years. She is transitioning into a new role as the AD for Student Leadership. She is an incredible resource and source of support.
11. SA: Taylor has served throughout RHA and NRHH in several roles throughout her careers. She completely re-branded and re-structured her RHA in the role of President. She has been involved on both the regional and NACURH levels. Has a commitment to the honorarium. Wants to ensure the organization moves forward.
12. PA: Melissa served as the PA Director several years ago, she is our incoming advisor. She's passionate about PACURH and NACURH. Always striving to learn more.
13. NSRO: Matt is always passionate about NACURH; he's here to support us and improve our experience.
14. NIC: Lauren has been involved in campus since her freshman year. She excitedly took over as our Outreach person; she has stepped up and has done whatever we need her to do this year.
15. CA: Meghan has been doing a great job as the technology chair. She has stepped up to serve in the Finance role while here.
16. NE: Breta has been an integral part of the NSRO and Kent State. She is so passionate about the NSRO. She has done a lot of good work for them.
17. CA: Speaking on Matt, he has served NACURH since 2012; he's been an NCC twice. He is now the RHA President. He is very active in our region.
18. NIC: Speaking on Ethan, he has been NCC, Chief of Staff, NRHH Treasurer, this semester he is stepping up to help RHA. He took over when we had Directorship issues last year.
19. NSRO: Speaking on Breta; her commitment to the NSRO, NACURH, etc. She is always constantly thinking about the role of the office and wanting to move it forward. She is passionate about supporting everyone.
20. SW: Speaking on Molly, she is currently the Director. She came into this role right after she was elected. She served as our 2014 Regional Conference Chair. NRHH Chapter's VP.
21. GL: Speaking on Elliott; he has been a phenomenal Director for our region. He doesn't like recognition, but we believe he is more than deserving of this honor. He has a clear vision and passion for our region and NACURH. Continues to lead GL through Strategic Planning.
22. MA: Speaking on Melissa Peters; on top of being the advisor for the NIC, she is the RHA and NRHH advisor. She has been the advisor for several conferences. She is there to help students grow as people and leaders.

23. CA: Speaking on Justin; he has served NACURH for 6 years. He was a conference team member, RHA Present, NRHH President, RCC for Bidding, Regional Director; his impact goes far. He was on the strategic planning commission. He has worked hard within our region.
24. PA: Speaking to Breta's dedication, her passion for the NSRO shines through.
25. SA: Speaking on Ethan, Ethan as an RCC was incredibly involved. He was a huge part of revamping NACURH U. He has taken the NIC to new heights. He is trying to push the office forward to make it the best it can be.
26. GL: Elliott has made us the most cohesive board in a while. We are also in support of Nathan Tack as he has done incredible things on all levels of NACURH. Rachel has done a great job preparing for conference and has been an incredible asset.
27. NE: Speaking on behalf of Mason, he has a lot of passion for PACURH. Embodies what a servant leader is and should be.
28. GL moves to narrow the list to seven; 2nd by IA
  - a) Withdrawn
29. GL moves to narrow the list to ten; 2nd by IA
  - a) No objections
30. NE moves to keep the top eight; 2nd by SA
  - a) No objections

#### C. Nominations

1. Nathan Tack
2. Justin Schwendeman
3. Mason Margotta
4. Ethan Schwarten
5. Rachel Zolotarsky
6. Melissa Peters
7. Matt Hermenau
8. Breta Moore

#### D. Discussion

1. SA: Feels Nathan has served in almost every role within NACURH. His dedication to NACURH goes above and beyond.
2. IA: Speaking on Ethan; the changes we've seen in Ethan in his time in NACURH. He helped to make NACURH U a sustainable initiative. This year he has continued to push NACURH forward.
3. CA: Speaking on Justin; he had an integral part in the NACURH mission statement redraft. He has rewrote our bidding off the floor and created bidding resources. He was chosen as an RCC of the Year last year. He does a great job
4. NSRO: Speaking on Breta; she was a rep at large for RHA, she held a Diversity and Advocacy role for two years; was AD-NRHH for the NSRO. Has always advocated on behalf of the office.
5. MA: Those on this list from the offices have been crucial to NACURH's function. It's important to recognize them for the work they have done. They do not have a region to get recognition from since they represent all of NACURH.

6. NE: Speaking on Melissa, we feel it is very admirable to see how she has created. She is very deserving of this recognition.
7. NE: Speaking further on Breta, we understand a lot has already been said, but want to emphasize the innovation she has put forth. She not only focuses on her office but every member school. She feels so strongly for each region. She is
8. GL moves to narrow the field to six (6); 2nd by CA
  - a) PA objects
  - b) Withdrawn
9. PA: Would like to speak on Mason's dedication to the RBD; he moved from an RHA position to now a regional and NACURH position. He has given great guidance. He has empowered us to take ownership. He is dedicated to international inclusivity. He is passionate about it.
10. GL: Speaking on Rachel and Matt, they have both done incredible work on preparing for conference and represent themselves well.
11. SA moves to narrow to top four (4); 2nd by PA
  - a) No objections

#### E. Vote

1. The 2015-2016 Advancement Society Inductees are:
  - a) Breta Moore
  - b) Ethan Schwarten
  - c) Nathan Tack
  - d) Rachel Zolotarsky

#### IV. Campus Tour

#### V. Annual Conference Presentation

##### A. Q&A

1. CA: What happens if someone loses a fob?
  - a) They will have to pay; if they take the fob with them they will need to mail it back. Can pay after the fact. It's \$35.00 for the fob; \$70.00 for the key.
2. GL: You said each individual will check-out, what will this look like?
  - a) They just need to return the key and the fob. Should be quick.
3. NE: What is the bathroom structure in your halls?
  - a) They are communal bathrooms; for females and males; there are a couple that are single sex.
  - b) What is the capacity?
    - (1) Every hall varies; never less than four shower stalls.
4. PA: Regarding wifi, will it be the same as this weekend?
  - a) We're creating a full wifi network for the conference with one password for everyone to use.
5. SW: When you were talking about the bracelet for meal tickets, what does this look like?
  - a) It's going to be a plastic wristband; the tab or flap will be removed after use. If one is lost, delegates can come to conference headquarters for more.
6. NE: What allergy considerations are you making towards airborne allergies?

- a) We don't know what those are yet, but are working to be aware of what is on our menus and communicating that information ahead of time.
- 7. NSRO: Which halls have air conditioning?
  - a) Redding, Gilbert, Kent, and Caesar Rodney, Sussix, and Squire. They majority are air conditioned.
- 8. IA: You stated for the last night of banquet that rounds will be set-up, how will this affect occupancy.
  - a) It will not affect occupancy.
- 9. NE: Will you be requiring delegates to sign additional waivers for ice skating?
  - a) No - we will have staff there to watch the space and make sure everyone is safe.
- 10. PA: I love the idea of the flashmob. Are you working with B+?
  - a) They are being great - they helped us come up with the idea. There is a liaison between them and us.
- 11. NE: How does someone's \$2.50 offset carbon emissions?
  - a) Working with Native Energy; they calculated the total metric number of carbon emissions which is turned into credits. Those credits go towards special sustainability projects through Native Energy.
- 12. PA: Surrounding dining, what is going on when people are not in dining season?
  - a) Will instead have time to relax, visit the NSRO store, riding the pony, etc. With NACURH, it always feels like we're going from one thing to another - this will allow people to take a break.
- 13. OCM: Can you remind us what night socials are?
  - a) Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Advisors social is Sunday.
- 14. SA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by CA
  - a) No objections

#### VI. Recess

- A. SW moves to recess for ten (10) minutes; 2nd by CA
  - 1. No objections

#### VII. RFI/Affiliations

- A. What are the benefits of affiliating with NACURH?
  - 1. PA: Ability for students to connect with other students to learn from one another; personal development. On a school-wide level, it helps schools to match best practices
  - 2. NE: Resources we provide as a corporation to member affiliates. Can apply to organization and individuals
  - 3. IA: Networking and how that gives us ability to determine the impact of student culture on NACURH
  - 4. SA: Recognition resources, OTM database, NSRO
  - 5. PA: Something in the future we could be offering is an access to educational materials for student leaders and student leadership development. Offering these components would be beneficial.
  - 6. PA: Access to RFI as a way to find new programs.

7. CA: Good job offering professional development resources; how do we apply skills learned in NACURH to outside student affairs?
  8. SA: Promotes standardization across NACURH RHA's - access to NRHH. Gives students a place to go.
  9. NSRO: How we address campuses and ways we can provide resources to support rebuilding RHAs.
  10. NIC: We've done a lot better at providing educational opportunities this year. More about the RFI.
  11. PA: Opportunities for involvement beyond the campus level.
  12. PA: Recognition facilitated by NACURH - it means a lot
  13. GL: Conferences in and of themselves are a great benefit. Both planning them and attending.
  14. NSRO: Leadership positions
- B. What do you believe the purpose of the RFI is?
1. SW: Provide members access to ideas without having to contact other institutions.
  2. PA: A database with different ideas to learn from other schools; it was hard to offer that to the rest of our council since only one email was associated with it. Opening up accessibility.
  3. PA: Increasing access is important; navigating what the database looks like.
  4. SA: Gives another perspective as to what goes on on the campus level. In the future I would like more items being submitted each year - not limiting institutions to one.
  5. GL: One of the best ways to connect members to other members. Know what they are doing and being able to implement those. Would love to see the RFI move towards the virtual nature of our corporation.
  6. CA: It could be a great accountability tool to make sure institutions are bringing something to the table for us to use. Moving forward, agree with the GL, would like to see other formats - such as a video, etc.
  7. NE: The RFI is not about displaying accomplishments, but keeping a historical context. Hopefully institutions are already retaining this information. Ensuring that schools are submitting something new or different every year.
  8. NIC: Think of the RFI as a Pinterest for NACURH - making it more user friendly.
  9. MA: Would like to see the integration of NACURH responsibilities and utilizing the RFI more in how we operate.
  10. PA: We are a non-profit, but that doesn't mean we don't provide a service. All regional resources should be going in there. Anything that is a marketable resource should be in there.
  11. CA: Would like to see more inclusive language (not only referring to it as RHA). Getting NCCs to understand this is not something they need to take on themselves.
  12. PA: See it as a unique way of what they've submitted. It is something they have to fill out, hopefully they will keep track of it. Gives structure.
  13. SW: Echo CA, it shouldn't be something the NCC has to take on by themselves. It should be a representation of where the institution is at.

14. CA: Ease of access to the RFI is important moving forward. Allowing more access on the institutional level. It would make it more feasible.
15. NE: Providing all the resources all the regional affiliates create as well as creating an
16. NAN: From an NRHH perspective, I would like to see a database that complements what we already do as a corporation - access and increasing OTMs, etc.
17. Chair: After the site visit with the NIC, they are working on finding ways to temporarily restore access. Another thing we discussed was that we haven't really re-evaluated the RFI. The RFI took six years to digitize. The next step is creating an effective tagging system. It's a large undertaking - share with your regional affiliates what we are doing and get their feedback on what they want to see.
  - a) CA: So having someone submit five tags that are associated with the RFI they are submitting.

#### VIII. Recess

- A. SW moves to recess until after we escape rooms; 2nd by CA
  1. No objections

#### IX. Dinner

#### X. OCM Social Outing

#### XI. Paper Plate Awards & Boardroom Buddies

#### XII. Recess

- A. CA moves to recess until after breakfast tomorrow; 2nd by NE
  1. No objections

### FRIDAY, JANUARY 8TH, 2016

#### I. Call to order at 9:30 AM

#### II. Roll Call

#### III. NNB Strategic Planning Update

##### A. Q&A

1. NSRO: On the CO-NRHH role, do you have any ideas of what you want from that role?
  - a) The NAN will be a huge part of that conversation in working with the transition committee. Will have discussions to determine what is needed to best support the corporate office moving forward.
2. SA: Are y'all looking into standardization across chapters to promote unity?
  - a) The first point is assessing what Chapters are doing - we have no idea what they are doing or what they need. Want to assess Chapter practices to develop benchmarks or best practices for NRHH. What is confusing for members is their ability to define their own membership for life standards - that can be confusing across all Chapters.
3. CA: Have you thought about the idea of the membership removal policy in terms of membership for life?

- a) That's a greater conversation. Currently, once the chapters submit their constitution they are not frequently revisited throughout the year. That is not something that is currently utilized in how we work.
- 4. CA: Would you be looking to push up the due date for affiliation?
  - a) The first thing is to create a streamlined process for the AD-NRHHs to better improve their ability to process affiliation. W
- 5. SA moves to end Q&A; 2nd by CA
  - a) No objections.

#### IV. Adjournment

- A. CA moves to adjourn until the 2016 Annual Business Meeting; 2nd by Annual Conference
  - 1. No objections
  - 2. Meeting adjourned at 10:24 AM