



NACURH INC.

2015 ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING
NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
MAY 18 - 24, 2015

Presiding Officer:

Kenneth J. Hughes
NACURH Chairperson

Minutes Prepared By:

Danielle Melidona
NACURH Associate for Administration

Parliamentarian:

Nathan Tack
Intermountain Affiliate Director

Recording Secretaries:

Andy Sokolich, Central Atlantic Affiliate AD-AF
Austin Lujan, Intermountain Affiliate AD-BA

NACURH BOARD OF DIRECTORS & NRHH NATIONAL BOARD

Central Atlantic Affiliate

Melissa Lourie - Director
Andy Sokolich - Associate Director
Coty Behanna - AD-NRHH
Matthew Zielinski - Advisor

Intermountain Affiliate

Nathan Tack - Director
Austin Lujan - Associate Director
Aaron Ringsby - AD-NRHH
Cory Shapiro & Jen O'Brien - Advisors

North East Affiliate

Nicholas Chen - Director
Zachary Perkins - RCC
Kayla Vasseur - AD-NRHH
Mary Gallivan - Advisor

South Atlantic Affiliate

Kaley Van Zile - Director
Meg Freeman - RCC
Carynne Spalding - RCC
Bonnie Brackett & Cliff Haynes - Advisors

NACURH Information Center

Ethan Schwarten - Director
Colton White - Associate Director
Benjamin Billesbach - Associate Director
Melissa Peters - Advisor

Great Lakes Affiliate

Andrew Haugen - Director
Jacob Crosetto - Associate Director
Elliott Hendrick - RCC
Abbas Hill - Advisor

Midwest Affiliate

Samuel Wagner - Director
Devin Melton - Associate Director
Kyle Wilson - AD-NRHH
Jen Kacere - Advisor

Pacific Affiliate

Dani Hall - Director
Mark Cordova - Associate Director
Gina Harrison - AD-NRHH
Russell Jones - Advisor

Southwest Affiliate

Molly McKinstry - Director
Ian Giese - Associate Director
Meaghan Shaw - AD-NRHH
EmmaLe Davis & Ty Krueger - Advisors

NACURH Services and Recognition Office

Megan Corder - Director
George Papp-McClellan - Associate Director
Breta Moore - AD-NRHH
Lindsay Marx & Allison Smith - Advisors

Annual Conference Staff

Beth Sutton - Conference Chair
Rachel Kinsel - NBD Liaison
Amanda Christianson - Finance Chair
Becky Bahe - Conference Advisor

NACURH Executive Committee

Kenneth J. Hughes - NACURH Chairperson
Danielle Melidona - NACURH Associate for Administration
Kat Roemer - NACURH Associate for Finance
Brianna Gomez - NACURH Associate for NRHH
Dan Ocampo - NACURH Advisor
Christina Aichele - Conference Resource Consultant



1. Call to order May 18, 2015 at 5:00 PM CST
2. Roll Call
3. Review Schedule for the Week
4. Approval of the Minutes
 - a. NE moves to approve the NACURH 2015 Semi-Annual Business Meeting Minutes
 - i. 2nd by MA
 - ii. No objections
5. Legislation
 - a. NE moves to bring MM 15-43 to the floor, 2nd by IA
 - i. Vote
 1. 8-0-0; motion passes
 - b. SA moves to bring MM 15-44 to the floor, 2nd by GL
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. Piece that allows the NAF to buy the new NAF laptop (PC).
 2. Was approved at Semis
 3. Will be purchasing laptop in Fargo
 - ii. Q&A
 - iii. Discussion
 1. IA feels this is necessary piece.
 2. GL: Echoes the intermountain
 3. PA: Appropriate change to align Finance officers
 4. GL calls the question
 - iv. Vote
 1. 8-0-0; motion passes
 - c. SW moves to bring MM 15-52 to the floor, 2nd by SA
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. Legislation is to improve the Leadership, Education, and Degree Program.
 2. Fix a repeat in policy
 - ii. Q&A
 1. NE moves to end Q&A
 - a. 2nd by SW
 - b. No objections
 - iii. Discussion
 1. NE: thank you for finding the discrepancy and fixing it
 2. GL calls the question
 - iv. Vote
 1. Consent calls; no objections
 2. 8-0-0; motion passes
 - d. IA moves to bring MM 15-58 to the floor, 2nd by MA
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. Very proud of COs and the work that has been done this year
 2. Solidifies policy regarding implementation of NACURH U



- ii. Q&A
 - 1. NE: How will the program be consistent?
 - a. We found a structure we like, but it's at the discretion of the NAA
- iii. Discussion
 - 1. NE: This is a wonderful piece. We fully support programming and it will provide more opportunity.
 - 2. NSRO: We would like to thank the committee. We think it's incredible.
 - 3. GL: We think this is very necessary and appreciate it.
- iv. Vote
 - 1. Consent calls; no objections
 - 2. 8-0-0; motion passes
- e. GL moves to bring MM 15-60 to the floor, 2nd by PA
 - i. Proponent speech
 - 1. The deadline is currently April 1
 - 2. We'd like to move the intent date to December
 - 3. It will provide the opportunity for the CRC to work more closely with the schools
 - ii. Q&A
 - 1. NEA: we are wondering why you chose that date specifically, instead of an exact event
 - a. We're working with what is already in policy, as far as the due date
 - 2. PA: We are curious as to how many schools usually put in a bid without a pre-bid
 - a. Last year, everyone submitted a pre-bid. This year I had 12 institutions contact me about hosting. It would have been very difficult to get schools resources right away if they didn't intent
 - 3. CAA: will an intent be required or a helpful suggestion?
 - a. It would be required, but they don't have to follow through with a bid
 - 4. __ moves to end Q&A
 - a. 2nd by __
 - b. No objections
 - iii. Discussion
 - 1. PA: We feel that this follows the logical flow of how bidding works
 - 2. SW: we think this will allow for bids to be more complete
 - 3. GL: We feel December might be too soon
 - 4. NE: Does the Annual Conference feel that this would have been too soon?
 - a. No, because we had known so early. By reading wrap-ups, it seems like they have known
 - 5. SA: We feels like this is a good step forward. It might be beneficial to add a clause that accommodates certain situations



6. NE: Since the intent is non-binding, if a school has any inkling of running, they should be able to submit an intent
 7. GL: moves to recognize the amendment
 - a. Here
 - b. No second, not entertained
 8. MA: To CRC- as this is written, you have letter received that on December 1. Would you entertain a friendly amendment for the second piece to be the 2nd?
 9. IA: What is qualified as an intent to CRC. CRC says it can be a letter format stating that they are intending for this conference.
- iv. Vote; 8-0-0; motion carries
- f. SW moves to bring MM 15-59 to the floor, 2nd by SA
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. Seeking to put practice into policy
 - ii. Q&A
 - iii. Discussion
 1. NE: We'd like to thank the authors for minimize the liability that NACURH takes on
 2. MA calls the question
 - a. No objections
 - b. Vote 8-0-0; motion carries
 - g. NE moves to bring MM 15-68 to the floor, 2nd by SW
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. One thing we as a team struggled with was the NBD Liaison description. It was implied that the NBD liaison implemented Semis, but now practice is into policy.
 - ii. Discussion
 1. SA: Thank you to the conference staff for this piece. We believe it's a great step forward in describing the roles and responsibilities of the conference team.
 2. NSRO: Will lead to better transition in the future.
 - iii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0; motion passes.
 - h. SW moves to bring MM 15-57 to the floor, 2nd by NE
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. As an office, we are the NACURH level recognition body. We value this opportunity. We did not know how to recognize the conference staff. We want to create a line in our budget to purchase conference pins.
 - ii. Q&A
 1. NE: When you say transition, this will be used for the 2016, 2017 and 2018 staffs.



2. GL: Why isn't this pin being sold to the NACURH Annual Conference Host School?
 - a. We thought about it. There are discrepancies with what is given and what is purchased. This would be an opportunity for the NSRO to recognize the conference staff.
3. NACURH 2015: Would this pin be different for every conference staff, or stay the same?
 - a. Stay the same.
- iii. Discussion
 1. PA: Have an equivalent of this pin the region gives out.
 2. IA: Moves to caucus for three minutes; 2nd by MA
 - a. No objections
 3. MA: Show of hands, which regions currently offer a
 4. GL: Have a little concern, based off of what they NSRO is there to do, based in policy (sell)
 5. IA: Had concern creating a pin without policy behind it. We also talked about it that it limits the individuality of every conference. Conference staffs are large – who receives a pin? Conference Staff? Advisors? Volunteers?
 6. SW: Why would the NSRO would be giving the recognition instead of someone like the CRC?
 - a. NSRO: We would provide it. Our thought was that this is a NACURH level pin and we would provide it.
 7. NACURH 2015: We enjoy this piece and the idea and thought. Most of them understand the pin culture. We've made sure to educate the conference staff.
 8. CA moves to table this piece back to the authors to be completed by the end of the Annual Business Meeting to address policy concerns.
 - a. 2nd by PA
 - b. No objections
 - i. Discussion
 1. MA: Agrees; the larger problem is that there is no policy behind it. Doing so will strengthen the piece.
 2. GL: Calls the question
 - ii. Vote:
 1. 8-0-0; motion tabled to authors to consider by the end of pre-conference.
- i. SW moves to bring MM 15-73 to the floor, 2nd by IA
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. Just for the budget to be in order and complete for the next NAF. Since we are in the new fiscal year, we wanted to make sure to reflect those changes.



- ii. Q&A
 - 1. NE: When was the check written?
 - a. This was for Semis. The conference staff will send the NAF their receipts. Occurred during the email shutdown and some miscommunication occurred. Receipts were received right before the end of the fiscal year. There is only so much that we are able to do in this situation.
 - iii. Discussion
 - 1. PA: Feels adding these funds to the line item is appropriate.
 - 2. SA: Due to certain circumstances, this was inevitable. Believe this is the best way to fix this.
 - iv. Vote
 - 1. 8-0-0
- j. PA moves to bring MM 15-46 to the floor, 2nd by SA
- i. Proponent speech
 - 1. We've taken a look at the current individuals we contract with. In policy, there is no standard for evaluating those relationships. We created guidelines for an every other year review to look at the specific criteria. We left the criteria open
 - ii. Discussion
 - 1. SA: This holds both NACURH and the contractors accountable where standards will be set for the future.
 - iii. Vote
 - 1. 8-0-0; motion passes
- k. SW moves to bring MM 15-51 to the floor, 2nd by MA
- i. Proponent speech
 - 1. There is an on-campus living requirements for NBD
 - 2. We wanted to include other members besides just NBD
 - ii. Q&A
 - 1. MA: Since we are working on clarifying, would there be any thought on conference staff?
 - a. That would be a clarification that would need further examination
 - iii. Discussion
 - 1. IA: Living on campus is an important part of our organization
 - 2. NEA: It is important for on-campus living but there are RHAs that serve on-campus and off-campus
 - iv. Vote
 - 1. 8-0-0; motion carries
- l. NE moves to bring MM 15-49 to the floor, 2nd by SW
- i. Proponent speech
 - 1. Had a long conversation about who is included in these numbers. Ultimately, this is what we came up with. It gives conference staff more



concrete numbers to work with. Logistically, accuracy is important. Overall, it equates to the same number of people for the every day of conference.

2. There are no targets or definitions for what a conference staff is comprised of. This creates a target when planning these items. Didn't want to include assumptions.

ii. Q&A

1. SW: How did y'all come up with the numbers
 - a. Took original numbers in policy and went day by day to determine the most accurate numbers we could.

iii. Discussion

1. MA: Appreciates the time and effort put into writing this policy. They invoked math. I agree with the authors that it is strange to include assumptions, but this piece provides clarity.
2. IA: CRC, how have past conference hosts used this section of policy?
 - a. I don't know that I've seen it carry, but yes.
 - b. Authors: The amounts are fluid, if they don't use them at Semis, they will at Pre-Conference.
3. NACURH 2015: How did you use this section; would the updates be helpful?
 - a. When I was creating the budget, I had to read this section several times. The numbers they gave us for totals, we included in the budget just in case – we did the maximum with the hopes that we weren't going to need it. The clarification does help.

iv. Vote

1. 8-0-0; motion passes

6. Recess

- a. MA moves to recess for 10 minutes
 - i. 2nd by SW
 - ii. No objections

7. Call to order at 6:33PM CST

8. Legislation

- a. SW moves to bring MM 15-54 to the floor, 2nd by NE
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. Needs a new charger. Requesting \$100.00 for a new charger.
 - ii. Discussion
 1. MA: It is evident there is a need for a charger. There is no reason to not give them the funds to purchase a new one.
 - iii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0; motion passes
- b. GL moves to bring MM 15-55 to the floor, 2nd by MA
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. Reflecting expenses from FY15 in FY16.



- ii. Discussion
 - 1. CA: This makes sense.
 - 2. GL calls the question
- iii. Vote
 - 1. 8-0-0; motion passes
- c. GL moves to bring MM 15-56 to the floor, 2nd by MA
 - i. Proponent speech
 - 1. Approving funds to purchase a new ADAF laptop.
 - ii. Q&A
 - 1. NE: Why are you not looking at a business grade laptop?
 - a. It fits our needs; a business grade laptop would be more expensive.
 - iii. Discussion
 - 1. SW: Good idea to approve the funds to purchase a new laptop
 - 2. GL: Just concerned that this is really cheap. We would be in support of a better laptop so we are not faced with a similar situation in two years.
 - 3. GL moves to table this piece back to the authors to consider a better quality computer by the end of Pre-Conference.
 - a. 2nd by NE
 - i. GL we just think this would be better to invest in a laptop and provide better support for QuickBooks software.
 - ii. PA: We would encourage the NSRO to ask the regions about what has worked well for them in purchasing PCs.
 - iii. NE: Money was just approved to purchase an NAF laptop, should follow suit.
 - b. Vote
 - i. 8-0-0; motion is tabled – will consider it before the end of Pre-Conference
 - iv. Vote
 - 1. 8-0-0; motion passes
- d. GL moves to bring MM 15-65 to the floor, 2nd by SA
 - i. Proponent speech
 - 1. In looking at the wrap-up report requirements, we felt there were a lot of areas that were lacking as to what was expected. We tried to keep it broad – we want to ensure the Wrap-Up is as complete as possible. Including examples is important to helping conferences understand what has been done in the past.
 - ii. Discussion
 - 1. CA: I think we can all agree how important Wrap-Up reports are and giving them as much resources as possible is important.



2. NACURH 2015: It could be annoying to do a bi-monthly report, but this way, it just helps you as a conference to be making sure you are making the report as thorough as possible.
3. NE calls the question
- iii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0; motion passes.
- e. SW moves to bring MM 15-66 to the floor, 2nd by NE
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. Puts into policy what the outgoing conference host sends to the incoming host.
 - ii. Q&A
 1. CA: What is the Annual Conference Notebook?
 - a. Friendly amendment to change that the Annual Conference Booklet?
 2. MA: Right now it says the new host in 120 days, can we fix that?
 - a. Yes
 3. MA: Are there two history books?
 - a. Yes
 4. NACURH 2015: Can the CRC provide clarification on point 5?
 - a. 120 days would apply to the first four, but point five would be at 120 days since it takes that long to close out finances.
 5. SA: Friendly amendment to change title to Annual Conference Materials
 - iii. Discussion
 1. NE moves to recognize the amendment
 - a. 2nd by CA
 - i. Discussion
 1. NE: we practice this as well, expect it's 60 rather than 120. We believe it should be accounted for in policy.
 2. GL calls the question
 - ii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0; amendment passes
 2. SA moves to recognize the motion
 - a. 2nd by PA
 - i. Discussion
 1. SA: This would be a good change to grammatically clarify what we are putting into policy
 - ii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0; amendment passes
 3. PA calls the question
 - a. No objections
 - iv. Vote



1. 8-0-0; motion passes
- f. NE moves to bring MM 15-67 to the floor, 2nd by SW
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. Replacing the Annual Conference Banner in policy with the Regional Banners. This will better outline practice for use by future conference hosts.
 - ii. Discussion
 1. GL feels this piece is good; it puts practice into policy.
 2. NE calls the question
 - iii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0; motion passes
- g. SW moves to bring MM 15-69 to the floor, 2nd by PA
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. Adds the Annual Conference Staff Transition into policy for annual conference staffs. Outlines process for scheduling meetings for the incoming and outgoing staffs. Hope this is a springboard to a formalized retreat in the future.
 - ii. Discussion
 1. NE: likes that this mimics the process the offices go through. Would be beneficial for the future.
 2. SW calls the question
 - iii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0; motion passes
- h. SA moves to bring MM 15-70 to the floor, 2nd by SW
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. Clarifies timeline for when the Annual Conference fee needs to be finalized. Set-up time in between Semis and when registration opens for when that fee will be publicized.
 - ii. Discussion
 1. PA: Keeps international institutions in mind.
 - iii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0; motion passes
- i. GL moves to bring MM 15-71 to the floor, 2nd by NE
 - i. Proponent speech
 1. This area of policy only includes a fee refund. Our conference staff has really struggled with cancellations. We wanted to make it 100% clear as to what canceling means. We added that after the closing of registration, cancellations should be prohibited.
 - ii. Q&A
 1. MA: Why do you also include late registration?
 - a. Half of our delegates registered during late registration.
 2. PA: Thank you for the legislation. How would you take into account emergency cancellations?



- a. As of right now, they still need to pay. It's difficult.
- 3. PA: Is there a date by which swaps and ghost delegates are considered?
 - a. We cut off gender swaps by May 1st and we needed ghost delegates completed by April 30th.
- 4. GL: Since late registration is not required by policy, would you be open to removing that section and leaving it up to the discretion of the conference staff?
 - a. Can we make that a friendly amendment?
 - i. No objections
- iii. Discussion
 - 1. NE: Appreciates this and it gives us the opportunity to mirror it in our own regional policy. Believe it should also be included on all future communication.
 - 2. CA: We operate on a similar policy. It would be beneficial to adopt on the NACURH –level as well.
 - 3. PA moves to recognize the amendment adding a date for swaps and ghost delegates need to be defined.
 - a. 2nd by SW
 - i. Discussion
 - 1. PA: With consideration of everything that has been said. Offering the ability to replace delegates is done in practice, and should be reflected in policy.
 - 2. NE calls the question
 - ii. Vote
 - 1. 8-0-0; amendment passes
 - 4. NE calls the question
- iv. Vote
 - 1. 8-0-0; motion passes

9. Recess

- a. IA moves to recess until 8:16 PM CST
 - i. 2nd by MA
 - ii. No objections

10. Call to order May 18, 2015 at 8:16 PM CST

11. Roll Call

12. Legislation

- a. NE moves to bring MM 15-33 to the floor, 2nd by SW
 - i. Discussion
 - 1. NIC: Going off what may have been misinterpreted, I specifically dealt with similar responsibilities the regional AD-NRHH's fulfill. With the position of Outreach now, I do receive random emails, it would make a lot more sense for the AD-Outreach to be changed to AD-NRHH.



Without having a school that is affiliated, I would have found it difficult to answer the questions I did. I do believe it is important that a chapter is on-campus.

2. SW: This is an important piece of legislation. Just as the NSRO is affiliated, the NIC should also have an affiliated chapter. It is important to align that position with the
3. NSRO: We feel this will help unify the offices with the regions. We play a large role into the NRHH experience.
4. GL: We are still torn on this piece. The discussion at pre-conference limits the schools by having to have an NRHH chapter on campus in order to bid for the office Just because the NSRO has an AD-NRHH that's ok, but we're limiting schools. We would still like evaluation to take place.
5. NE: We feel that while this is in a way limiting, establishing an NRHH chapter is not difficult and is important to NACURH. The office that is serving all of NACURH should have an affiliated chapter.
6. IA: Still views this as more than a name change, this will change the structure. We are singling out institutions that do not have a chapter affiliated. We would like to hear more discussion on potential options.
7. CA: Could a school a school that only has an NRHH chapter bid?
 - a. Yes
8. PA: The question of whether the NIC needs to be hosted at a school is outside the spirit of this piece. By changing the name, we are not doing anything to change the job description. If that's a major concern, the way we are currently set-up, we could change the NRHH of the policy to say that only voting members of the NNB need to be hosted at institutions with affiliated chapters.
9. MA: We've been doing a lot of talking about it limiting those who do not have affiliated NRHH chapters.
10. NSRO: At Semis, there was discussion that institutions needed to recommend. We would not have bid for this office had we not have an NRHH Chapter affiliated. If we were to change the expectations of the hosts, great, but concerns are outside the spirit of this piece.
11. GL: We feel that PA brought up good options with things that need to be addressed. We feel those issues need to be brought up first before we vote on this piece.
12. CA: Both offices should be equal. If the concern is that we're going to limit schools from bidding for the NIC, the same should be same for the NSRO.
13. IA: Do these restrictions fall under NACURH Policy or NRHH Policy?
 - a. NACURH Policy
14. NE: We forget that the people in this room have varying experiences. People in this room are experienced to speak on a variety of things.



- Even if someone doesn't have NRHH experience, but they can speak on that, we feel it should be heard.
15. MA: As a general reminder, it had a twin piece that was presented to change the title in the bylaws.
 16. CA: If we don't pass this, does that mean that the Bylaws also
 17. PA: The NRHH Policy Book is unclear. If we look at it at face value, the issue already stands that the NSRO be hosted at a school with an NRHH. A piece could be presented in NRHH Boardroom to remedy this.
 18. IA moves to caucus for five minutes
 - a. 2nd by SW
 - b. No objections
 19. NIC: 385 total affiliated schools, 280 have an NRHH chapter affiliated.
 20. GL: I'm not sure the argument of changing – Get point from JACOB.
 21. SW: In looking at the NRHH Bylaws, it does just mention those who are selected by their respective regions. If that is the concern, a piece could be passed in the future that would amend that article. That would allow for the offices to not be required to have an NRHH Chapters.
 22. IA: Although we passed the Bylaws piece, we may want to reconsider that. In looking at corporate structure of NACURH, the offices serve as a liaison of their respective offices as a liaison, offices are different than regions. The job descriptions do not match. As a Board, we feel the Bylaws piece needs to be reconsidered. It's not just a name change, it's changing corporate structure.
 23. CA: No matter how we're spinning this, there is no way for us to appropriately make a decision.
 24. PA: We echo CA and IA, this calls for a larger discussion on corporate structure.
 25. SW moves to table to a committee, consisting of two members from each office and two members from each region, chaired by the NAN with an answer returned by the 2016 Semi-Annual Business Meeting.
 - a. 2nd by PA
 - i. Discussion
 1. SA: Feels that tabling to a committee is great, but having two representatives from every region may be too many. Make it one representative and add the NAA.
 2. NE agrees the committee seems a little large. It seems off to have the NAN chairing it. It would be beneficial to include the NAA.
 3. SW amends their motion to one representative from each region, with at least two AD-NRHHs represented on the committee, two members from each office, one representative from the



Annual Conference Staff, co-chaired by the NAA and NAN to return an answer by the end of the 2016 Semi-Annual Business Meeting.

a. 2nd by GL

i. Discussion on Amendment

ii. PA: We demonstrated that this is a conversation that needs to happen. By tabling this to a committee, we ensure this will happen.

iii. Vote

1. 7-1-0; amendment passes

26. IA: The tabling of this piece will allow the committee to include all of the necessary changes the original piece is speaking to.

27. SW: That was our original intent; we want the committee to look at this holistically.

28. NE: This is a good committee to discuss everything. This is very important that it is presented that way to the committee. It's not only a name change. Members of the committee need to understand the greater importance of this.

29. SA: We would like to amend this to restrict it to those serving on the Regional Board

a. 2nd by PA

i. Discussion

1. SA: Members from the boards fully understand the impact and have the knowledge to make this change. It would not be as efficient to have general members serve in this capacity.

ii. Vote on Amendment

1. 7-0-1; amendment passes

30. GL calls the question

a. No objections

ii. Vote

1. 7-0-1; piece is tabled

b. IA moves to reconsider MM 15-32; 2nd by CA

i. Vote

1. 8-0-0; motion will be reconsidered

ii. IA moves to table MM 15-32 to the committee that is reviewing MM 15-33

1. 2nd by SW

a. Discussion

i. PA: It seems like a good idea

ii. MA calls the question

1. No objections



b. Vote

- i. 8-0-0; motion has been tabled to committee reviewing MM 15-33

13. Executive Expectations Setting

- a. Refer to Spreadsheet

14. Legislation

- a. MA moves to bring MM 64 to the floor, 2nd by SA

i. Proponent speech

1. We are a national association that is internationally friendly. The strategic plan has an emphasis on improving services for member schools, focusing on who we have right now, which is currently international affiliates. NACURH has grown this year and will continue to grow in the future. The NACURH Name Change Commission has developed options and pros and cons about the possibility of changing the name of NACURH and a survey was sent out to gauge interest from the boards. The best consensus was to build plurality over the Network and Association of College and University residence Halls, which would allow us to retain our current name and brand. The next affiliation year would be a transition to the new name. We have the option to just drop the acronym and create the word NACURH, but that isn't sustainable for the future. This change will work for our benefit.

ii. Q&A

1. NE: How do you believe this name change fits into the current and new mission and vision statements?
- a. It currently fits into the current mission and vision statements, and fits even better with the purpose of the new statements.
2. MA: Could you quickly run down the legal process of changing our name?
- a. We would file a "Doing Business As" certificate with the IRS; National Association would only be listed on our Articles of Incorporation.
3. CA: Why did the task force not sign off on the change?
- a. We had an interesting working method virtually through email chains, so it was hard to meet a consensus. Regardless, there would not be a consensus from everyone. At the end, the commission was given the decision to sign off or not
4. PA: What considerations were given to NRHH and other entities with "National" in the title?
- a. NRHH is its own entity as an independent honorary, so we did not look at that specifically at this point. Other entities (i.e. NCC) would not be changing at this point but are something to consider.



5. MA: Yield to ADFR: This was a plurality, but what were the other options presented within the commission and survey?
 - a. Network and Association received approximately 30% and the next was significantly lower. The belief was to not stay NACURH as we stand but also to not change to NACURH as a word.
 6. MA: How many surveys were completed?
 - a. Approximately 80.
 7. NSRO: How did you whittle the decisions down?
 - a. Through the varying surveys.
 8. SA: Did you look at Networking Association?
 - a. Network AND Association represents us better.
 9. SW moves to end Q&A
 - a. 2nd by MA
 - b. No objections
- iii. Discussion
1. CA moves to caucus for five minutes, seconded by SA. No objections.
 2. CA: Would the Chair yield to a question?
 - a. Yes.
 - i. Could you release the survey results to us so we can see the open-ended responses?
 1. Yes.
 3. NSRO: We would argue that we need to make sure that this name change is a good financial decision, especially for us with our branding. We need to make sure that this reflects the organization, yet is inclusive of the students we serve. The NSRO is transparent in that there is a lot of merchandise with National, but we can move past that. We don't have an opinion, but we do want to ensure that our member schools do, including our international affiliates to ensure that they feel included with the programs and services offered.
 4. IA: We have come to the conclusion that we don't have an objection to the word "Network" but we aren't sure how our member schools actually feel supported and this is putting a band-aid on a larger issue. There are other options that can be done to promote programs to schools outside of the United States and we don't necessarily support those schools we currently affiliate. We don't have anyone in this room from an international affiliate and that is indicate of this larger problem.
 5. MA: Agrees with IA that this is part of a larger problem. Not opposed to Network, but feel it is important to keep NACURH. The questions we need to ask are, "IS this change actually moving the organization forward with new practices? Or are we changing the name for the sake of changing the name?"
 6. NE: Stripping international away from the discussion, we have a very set way with how we build relationships within this organization. We attend



conferences and work with people and they become a network and support system. Getting to a space where we can support international conversations would explode with other services. Going back to the simplest fact of how this organization retains members goes back to how we form relationships.

7. PA: We want to echo NE in that Network needs to be more than just a suitable word, but a representation. We do operate as a network, especially with this digital tie and attempt to connect beyond conferences. Although we don't have an international student in the room today, PA has a Director from BC.
8. CA: When looking internationally we need to look at the bigger picture. We can't just change the name and expect to be inclusive. We don't have strong opinions about the name change, but we hesitate to support a name that was the result of a survey that only had 36 respondents and 32 of which were NACURH leadership.
9. SA: This piece leaves autonomy for the future of NRHH because it doesn't state that NRHH has anything to do with this piece. This change would implement some of the things that do need to be changed with autonomy still allowed.
10. PA: This change of name can continue the momentum of growth and discussion of our ideas and propels us toward a greater sense of practice.
11. IA: This is concerning because we don't have a plan to roll out a name change at this time.
12. CA: Agree with IA regarding timelines and roll out plans, NCC and NRHH, but now we're going to change the name and run in the other direction. We need to put more thought into our actions and not just change things to hope it works out later.
13. NSRO: We feel as if the name change is the result of a strategic plan. But we want to have a more detailed plan to tell us how to move forward. We do have a high turnover in this organization and we should have an action plan that people can be held accountable to.
14. PA: We have resources out there. Several corporations have done that in the past and I would guess that they just didn't make a decision; there had to be planning involved and we should use these resources
15. CA calls the question. IA seconds. PA objects on grounds of wanting a caucus.
16. MA moves to caucus for five minutes, seconded by PA. No objections.
17. Advisor: 36/380 is not a statistically significant number when discussing change. We kind of use South Africa as our international affiliate in addition to our Canadian schools, but South Africa is not intending to be part of NACURH in the future. South Africa is attending conferences to learn about student affairs and NACURH to take back to their own



- campuses to build a similar organization in their home country. We should not conflate this with an international influx of institutions, but I am fully on board with creating a more inclusive environment. I do wonder: if an international school bid for an annual conference, would we truly consider that school given the impact to the remainder of our domestic schools? Vote your conscience, but there are other things we should be considering at this point.
18. CA: We work a lot with Qatar and Abu Dhabi. They want to be involved with our organization and but they won't bid for anything or attend anything other than NACURH. The other thing to consider is that we're only sending this to Corporate. We think that we would be doing ourselves a disservice if we sent this to the representatives without giving them a plan or resources they need to make an educated decision.
 19. MA moves to table this piece to a committee to be reintroduced again at Semis 2016. It shall be chaired by the NACURH Chairperson and composed of members from each region at the discretion of the chair, but no less than three individuals from each region and office, tasked with re-polling the organization and laying a strategic plan for the implementation of the name. No second.
 20. PA: Yield
 21. GL: Call the question. Seconded by IA. NE objects with an amendment. GL does not withdraw. Vote to call the question: 3-4-1, fails.
 22. SA: If the NBD is having such a hard time making a decision, how do you think the NCCs, whether returning or not, will be able to make an informed decision?
 23. NE: Move to recognize an amendment stating that the name change does not take effect until the close of NACURH 2016, the NSRO discontinues sales of merchandise with "National" over the course of a year, the NACURH Chairperson appoints a committee chair and committee to discuss the name change of NCC, and the NAN Appoints a committee to evaluate the name of NRHH. No second.
 24. GL: Call the question. Seconded by CA. MA objects because they do not want this conversation to end, which will likely happen if we fail this motion. CA does not withdraw. Vote to call the question: 3-5-0, fails.
 25. IA: We have a giant strategic plan about to be released and this is part of that plan. More details can be presented within the strategic plan as a solution to this current issue as the NACURH plan, regional plans, and NRHH plan. Killing the motion is the best option right now.
 26. Time has elapsed. SA moves to extend by 5 minutes. Seconded by SW. No objections.
 27. CA: We're going back and forth about voting right now, rather than the piece itself. We need to come to a consensus and vote.



- 28. GL: Yield.
- 29. SW: Echoes CA. By delaying a vote we are coming to a consensus that we don't support it.
- 30. SA: 36 responses, 32 of which are NACURH leadership, are not an accurate reflection of the over 385 affiliates. We should add a step to next year's affiliation process to include questions about a name change.
- 31. PA: Rather than send it back to committee, we need to have more of an idea about where we're going before we make a decision. Additionally, we should look at being North American as a reflection of who we are.
- 32. NE: MA brings up the point that we aren't saying no to the idea, just to the name at this time. While this isn't a great practice to table to a committee, it's the best for the lifetime of this piece because we shouldn't get in the habit of rejecting something just to bring it up again in the future; we need to be seeing pieces through to completion.
- 33. Time has elapsed. MA moves to extend by 5 minutes. Seconded by SA. CA objects because the conversation isn't progressing. MA does not withdraw and NE provides an additional second. Vote on extending time: 2-6-0.
- 34. PA moves to exhaust speaker's list. NE seconds. No objections.
- 35. CA: Yield
- 36. PA: Yield

iv. Vote: 1-6-1, motion fails

15. Recess

- a. PA moves to recess until 8:00 AM on May 19th, 2015
 - i. 2nd by NE
 - ii. No objections

16. Call to order May 19, 2015 at 8:00 AM CST

17. Roll Call

18. Appointment of Elections Teller

19. Election Protocol Overview

20. Chairperson Election

- a. Announcement of Intent(s)
- b. Nominations
 - i. Megan Corder
 - 1. 2nd by NEA
 - 2. No objections
 - ii. Nathan Tack
 - 1. 2nd by SA
 - 2. No objections
- c. Candidate 1 – Megan Corder
 - i. Presentation
 - ii. Q&A



1. NEA: How do you plan on working with the NAF to continue financial support
 - a. Autonomy. I want to question practices though, and I want to consult the NAF in this. I would want to set expectations.
2. PA: How do you practice self-care?
 - a. I knit. I like crafts and to keep myself occupied. I also like to run, and watch TV, as well as walk. I Do things like that to help me to not be burnt out. I have a life outside of NACURH
3. CA: Can you talk about how you plan to hold committees accountable
 - a. I like to have a checklist. We mutually agree on these expectations so that we can follow up on it. I think we need to follow with the person, so that they will be more likely to come the next time
4. SW: If selected as chairperson, how do you make it a safe place?
 - a. We have to have some self-disclose. It is important to be well-versed and looking into accommodations and doing research to do so. We also need to make changes if we talk about it. We also need to be on top of it. If someone hasn't raised their placard, we need to figure out what the issues are
5. MA: NRHH is currently in a state of change. What is your approach?
 - a. They know their roles. IT would be important to sit down with the NAN. It would be important to talk to the boards as well. WE need to have experiences where NRHH reps need to be interacting with others.
6. NAN: How do you plan to support the NAN?
 - a. It would start with a long conversation with the NAN about their goals and sacking the question, what do you need from me? I understand a lot of the components that are confusing to the organization. It really falls back on that conversation.
 - b. Follow up: How do you plan to support the NAN in relaying information?
 - i. I will send back the info to the NAN to make sure that everything they want passed along is.
7. NAA: As a first year graduate student, how do you plan on balancing the academics with NACURH?
 - a. One of the expectations of the grad process is writing a thesis. I have already written. I also like this kind of stuff so I know what I'm doing
8. SA: You mentioned NACURH feedback, what is your plan for communication?
 - a. The chair sets expectations with the rest of the boards. Through setting these expectations, we can follow through. I want to get to know the regions to better support the regions.

9. IA: What do you believe are some changes that need to happen?
 - a. We have great conferences and experiences. As a board, we questions things which I think is amazing. I want to know how we can maintain these practices. I think we should reevaluate follow through and planning.
 10. NIC: How do you plan to make offices and conference staff feel involved?
 - a. I was part of the NIC transition, which I know now about the process. I want to get to know the conference better and have better transition materials. I want policy and practice to match. I want to make everyone feel valued
 11. GL: What do you think the biggest issues with implementing the SPC will be?
 - a. It will be getting people to understand the long-term success of the plan. It may be having people talk about it, perhaps making a video. It will be important to hold people accountable. We need to agree on what is going to happen next year
 12. NE: We were wondering given your experience, what is your vision for NACURH 5 or 10 years down the line?
 - a. We need to reevaluate our practices. How are we preparing our leaders for the future. How are we preparing you to be successful? We need to act in a way that we want others to emulate. We should reevaluate our decisions
 13. SW: What is your plan for NACURH buddies?
 - a. The buddy system would be to give people who have transferable skills together and have them connect. We have to have an open dialogue. WE want to have open conversations
 14. PA: How will you use your NSRO position?
 - a. You have to lose the bias for where you came from. As an NRSO director, we have to think about the big picture. I have the experience of having a NACURH wide experience
 15. __ moves to end Q&A
 - a. 2nd by __
 - b. No objections
- d. Candidate 2 – Nathan Tack
- i. Presentation
 - ii. Q&A
 1. NE: Having chaired committees, what were the accomplishments of these?
 - a. IT has varied on different levels. AS an organization, with marketing, we didn't know exactly where we were going. We were waiting for NACURH rebranding. IN other examples, I served on the corporate development. I learned a lot from that



experience, working under two directors. I've worked on the recognition committee for IACURH. Spirit and traditions are the crazy things we do in IACURH. For recognition, we went through every bid in the region before moving onto the NA level. They were twice a month to once a month

2. NAA: As an incoming graduate student, how do you plan on managing your time?
 - a. I love time management and being able to figure out how to allocate my time correctly.
3. PA: How do you practice self-care?
 - a. I think self-care is important. It is a struggle for student leaders. One of the biggest things is recognizing being tired. I take time each week and that helps. I tend to take Sundays off. It was important for me time. In general, it's different for everyone and part of the advisor role to help.
4. NAN: NRHH is a period of transition. How do you plan on supporting the NAN?
 - a. Making sure that the needs of the NNB are met within the organization. I want to help in these steps moving forward. The outreach program will be very essential in explaining the change and making changes as needed.
 - i. Follow-up: How do you plan on supporting the NAN?
 1. Bridging the gap starts day one. I want to establish the bond. I liked last year's fake region activity. It goes a long way in establishing friendships.
5. MA: Throughout the affiliation year, you see drops in attendance. What can you do to help prevent burnout?
 - a. Getting students excited about NACURH. If we have burnout, we can provide new and exciting things throughout the year. If we establish that there's a need for a new task force, we can utilize that throughout the year.
6. CA: You have a lot of titles. Which experience has been the most impactful?
 - a. Tie. I loved RHA president, getting to know all the different areas and to lead. Working with students that did so many different things. We just had their banquet and I was blown away at all the different programs they put on. I look at the freshmen and if it wasn't for the programs, they wouldn't be around in leadership. I've loved my regional experience. I've had a similar experience as director with my exec board
7. SW: Which of the changes do you feel is a top priority?



- a. There are a lot of changes outlined in the strategic plan. We'll have to work next year with the boards to think which ones are the most important. I would look at the networking and partner changes the most.
- 8. SA: With aligning documents and creating NACURH vision, would this trickle down with the regions strategic plans?
 - a. Aligning documents is just making sure resources are available and in the same place so that they can be found. Hopefully this will also be seen on a regional level. We want to be one organization. I think some of the most important communication tactics are getting things out into NACURH. I want to make sharing info clear to our directors.
- 9. NIC: How do you plan to make office and conference staffs are part of the NBD?
 - a. I want to implement them to make sure they are include in everything. I want us to respect what the offices have to say about the conversations we have. I want to make sure that the conference' needs are met
- 10. PA: How have you followed through on a past goal?
 - a. AS RHA president, we transitioned our RHA budget from a reslife to a direct student allocation. That took a lot of time and it was getting things done without stopping. In IACURH, we've been talking about winter summit for quite some time, and this year we had a trial run this year. We showed the region tangible steps and it passed at No Frills.
- 11. SW: What is your approach on members that have not expectations?
 - a. I think one of the hardest things for us is that we all experience some lack of motivation. As chair, it would be important to engage people at where they are at and engaging them individually. I can establish what motivates individuals. Communicate directly.
- 12. NEA: What have you learned from the swaps you've attended?
 - a. NACURH is multi-faceted. At CA, I learned about transitioning into my director role. I want to taker those experiences and apply them to strategic planning. After visiting GL, we thought about a transitioning retreat, which we've started to implement. You get to see a whole different world. There's large secrecy within knowing other regions and it has helped me to be open minded of the other regions
- 13. NAN: Why do you want to be chair?
 - a. The passion comes from serving students that live in residence halls. It's the same passion that drove me to run before. It blows me away that we are student run corporation. I want to work with

an incredible group of students from across the globe to come together to meet the needs of the students. We collectively can do so many things as an organization and I'd want to push the organization forward.

14. CA: How do you plan on completing goals outside of the basic responsibilities?

a. It's hard to know if you'll meet all of the goals. A lot of these goals are contingent on working with others to carry them forward.

e. Discussion

i. CA: I think we've see two very different candidates. I think it is important for us to have this forward thinking. But I'm torn because how are we going to move forward without perfecting what we have?

ii. MA: I feel that we have two great presentations. I feel that regardless of the result, we have a strong leadership either way.

iii. NEA: Comparing the question and answer, I felt that Megan gave concrete steps, and I felt that was a better understanding of how she leads a team. Given the large strategic planning task, it may be better knowing exactly how they're going to do that plan

iv. PA: I think they're both qualified in experiences. I don't think we should discount having an office perspective.

v. MA: I looked at it as Megan was more of a hands-off approach. SHE thinks everyone knows what they do. Nate has the vision and he wants everyone to see his vision. I loved his ideas. Honestly, I was wowed by his ideas, but I am worried that perhaps it's too many ideas. HE has been ideas and then gets them implemented

vi. CA: a common theme has been NRHH. I really liked how Megan had specific goals about NRHH Relationships. I didn't see that from Nate, it's just a different focus. WE need some concrete ideas about this.

vii. CA Moves to caucus for 5 minutes

viii. NAN: Throw out that goals are not a binding contract, just an open-ended vision of where they want the organization to go. Goals are I would like this to happen, not necessarily binding

ix. SW: In regards to a previous point, we believe that candidates are something that candidates will focus on. We would like to make a point of how we've had discussions of how the halls have made changes and we've done similar things and we need to look at how we can make changes to meet those changes.

x. GL: Feels as though Nathan has much that goes into his goals. Megan would succeed in the position, but NACURH Would be complacent. WITH the necessity of the SP, we need someone with strong regional understanding

xi. NSRO: Nathan was not clear of how he would support the offices.

xii. IA: We have two very different candidates. We appreciate Megan and her passion. We believe Nathan will move this position forward.



- xiii.CA: We need to consider what we want as an organization because we had two extremely different candidates. We need to think about which experience we want to see.
- xiv.NE: We would like to point out that Megan engaged the room in a great way. The approachable leader is something that we need to emphasize. We feel that Megan provided examples of how she has engaged. She included ideas of how to engage alumni, conference experience. She can build relationships with the regions. She creates relationships. Additionally, Megan states for many NRHH specific goals. We feel that she means the words she says
- xv.GL: Nate's bid on page 14 brings up support for offices. In regards to supporting NRHH, there is a distinct difference between the organizations.
- xvi.PA: POI: Do we have the expectations document we came up with last night? We've talked a lot about their vision. They both have shown strong ties to SP. Let's consider that.
- xvii.SW: We'd like to echo GL about letting the NAN lead NRHH in the direction they'd like to go. Nate stated he would refer to the NAN. He has the strategic abilities to benefit the region.
- xviii.CA: We think that Nate's approach would be here is what needs to be done so let's do it, Megan's would work on it together.
- xix.PA: Feels that both candidates are qualified, now is really a time that Megan encompasses the direction that this organization is going in.
- xx.CA moves to caucus for 5 minutes
- xxi.GL: We are worried that the letters that are in her bid are completely from the office. She doesn't have regional experience. Additionally, there seems to be a plethora of worries that Nate's goals are lofty and his own. Many of his goals are related to the Strategic Plan and he clearly is informed.
- xxii.NIC: Megan shows experience within the office. Nate also does. Megan showed more of a team oriented plan, and Nate focused on pushing organization forward
- xxiii.SW: We are tending to discuss how this person will interact with this board. We just want to make sure that we keep in mind that this person will be working with the next year
- xxiv.CA: Could we bring candidates back in for questions? CA moves to go back into Q&A with candidates going in separately for 15 minutes each, in the order they presented in with allowing 5 minutes to prepare questions.

f. Q&A - Megan

- i. How will you move from your office or regional identity...?
 - 1. I will clearly understand the expectations of the role. I had transitioned in the past, and I would take that same approach. I will sit down piece by piece and see if I have any questions. It's expanding my range of understanding
- ii. Could you describe how you would lead?



1. I believe in communication in terms of clear expectations. I Have group expectations as a unit. I want to be a support system. I have a balance of what you need from me. BY understanding the needs, I will deliver. I will listen to your feedback. Meetings will have an agenda. WE want to make these meetings engaging.
- iii. Past chair people?
 1. I spoke with Lydia Bachelor and Kenneth. I reached out to other executive. I reached out to former board members. I was able to see the transition through the eyes of very many people.
- iv. Equitable and inclusive experience?
 1. Getting to know every person individually. We've had to get to know people. In terms of equitability, I can't serve unless I have that dialogue. You will feel like you can talk.
- v. Team dynamics
 1. As chair, the goals that we set are the overarching needs of the board and the expectations of the board. Working as a team to listen to what the board actually wants. Sometimes the way that we think things will turn out is not always how they turn out. It doesn't matter how we get there, it matters where we are going. Hierarchies is for resource sharing. We have an equal expression of what NACURH needs
- vi. Goal
 1. I think it's the communication piece because that covers everything. It is so important because we need to talk through things and evaluate things. We always have to seek thought and change.
- vii. Specific goals
 1. In my bid, I outlined the three outlines of goals—committees and communication. I just want to make sure we are all in sync. Let's see how we can function overall. The biggest goal is the communication. I know that the committee checklist has been implemented before and worked. I think it's important to know how things function and how to fix things. The last is the strategic plan. I think if a group has ownership, that is the best way.
- viii. How would you support offices?
 1. Translating my experience with the offices?
- ix. How do goals tie in with your vision of NACURH?
 1. WE need to reevaluate our policy.
- x. Greatest challenge
 1. One of my biggest challenges is that I get too excited. I can't operate under setting my own expectations onto other people. I've realized this and let my staff shine.
- xi. How will you support incoming directors?
 1. I want to look at the director bids. I want to understand the regions, conferences, and staff. WE had a clear understanding of all of the roles.



I've been in a lot of regions and I understand how things operate differently.

xii. Direct involvement in SPC?

1. I oversee choose and see NACURH. I helped to create the presentation for the Minis. I also sent Kenneth one page strategic plans.

g. Q&A – Nate

i. How do you put your regional identity aside?

1. In working on the strategic plan for the last year, I think it would be a relatively smooth transition. Shedding regional identity

ii. NBD/NNB

1. I wouldn't make any serious changes within working with NBD. I could approach it in a similar way. We are a team working towards a common goal. It is communication with people.

iii. Prior chairpersons

1. I've talked to Zack Walden and Lydia. I talked to her about where NACURH has been going. I got to know Zack pretty personally well before this and talked about how I could better develop myself and working with other regions

iv. Equitable

1. In terms of making it equitable, it starts by making sure everyone's opinions are heard. We have set structures in place with how placards are given out, and I think we need to recognize the finance officers and NNB as well as conference staff and office. We need to make sure everyone has their opinions heard.

v. Team dynamic

1. The chairperson is one of the largest team building responsibilities. One of the huge parts is facilitating the goals of the other execs as well. The SPC was looking at teamwork at its finest. It was gathering information from many different sources. The four executives and two advisors should be a very consecutive group and I'd want to get all of their info.

vi. Biggest goal

1. Supporting the directors, offices, and conference staff. We need strong leaders to carry out everything

vii. Specific details of goals

1. I want to work directly with the directors to implement their strategic plans and I would want to utilize the outline of the NACURH strategic plans to help directors implement their own

viii. Support offices

1. Meeting with the offices on a regular basis. Within the upcoming term, the NIC visit is important.

ix. Goals tie in

1. Carrying NACURH Forward. Residence Halls are changing, college is changing.



- x. Greatest challenge
 - 1. Serving as an RHA President and recognizing that the organization is more than I thought before—recognizing and making sure all the moving parts are working together at one time.
- xi. Directly support incoming directors
 - 1. It looks a lot like what is currently—reaching out and having 1-1s and also asking about the conferences, etc., and relaying the information to the NACURH executives.
- h. NE moves to extend discussion by 20 minutes
 - i. 2nd by CA
- i. NE: Megan is focused is focused on teamwork. She understands the importance of communication. Megan remains honest and consistent. She has provided exact examples. Megan plans on reading the bids of the incoming directors. Megan has a comprehensive view of what offices need. Additionally, she said she would create an equitable process for NACURH offices. Megan took the time to reach out to many prior offices. It is apparent that she truly believes in her bid
- j. SW: We really appreciated what Megan said about the offices and necessary changes but we are concerned that when asked to elaborate on her other goals, her main was communication
- k. NAN: Communication is an expectation, not a goal. The word supervision was used and we should not be supervised because I didn't appreciate that language
- l. PA: I think we're at a point where one candidate represents that we are ready for change, and the other is at a point where they're looking at focusing in on perfecting us as an organization before we move forward.
- m. MA: The credit load of both candidates have not been talked about. I don't have a well-versed knowledge of credits, but I think that should be considered. We are still student leaders.
- n. NIC: While both candidates, one of them has to be selected. Megan would fulfill all duties. She is dedicated to all respected regions.
- o. NE: I think we need to ask ourselves how many people actually come to NCC chats, how many of you have been able to fill your boards. Optimizing what we have now is the way to make ourselves more attractive.
- p. Chair: The NACURH Execs and members of the SPC worked hard on the strategic plan, and I'm trying to understand the idea of staying in the same place. I really want to challenge you all in how you're approaching this idea of the Chair.
- q. SA: It was explicitly stated that Nate has experience in leading boardroom, which is a large responsibility of the Chair.
- r. GL: We invested a lot of money into SPC and we're wondering why our ideals are changing.
- s. PA: Both candidates have a vision for NACURH. I think it's more of a question of where their priorities lie right off the bat. One of the candidates wants team building is prioritized.
- t. SW: I feel that Nate's goals are going to move NACURH forward. He is most equipped.



- u. NAN: NACURH has a vision for NACURH. The SPC has already elected the vision for NACURH. A group of people has already created the vision, so now it's just picking who is going to carry it out
- v. NE: There is a weird elephant in the room. I feel uncomfortable picking the Chair, when I haven't read the document. There's not enough time to do so.
- w. GL calls the question
 - i. No objections
- x. Vote
 - i. Nathan Tack has been elected the 2015-2016 NACURH Chairperson

21. NAA Election

- a. Announcement of Intent(s)
- b. Nominations
 - i. Mark Cordova
 - 1. 2nd by NIC
 - 2. No objections
 - ii. Danielle Melidona
 - 1. 2nd by SA
 - 2. No objections
 - iii. Andrew Haugen
 - 1. 2nd by SW
 - 2. No objections
- c. Candidate 1 - Mark Cordova
 - i. Presentation
 - ii. Q&A
 - 1. GL: Having served as an RCC in the past, what was the largest challenge you faced?
 - a. Identifying the same goals over the cross of the regions. Having the small groups focused around positions will help build connections
 - 2. NSRO: What are your plans for incorporating office staff?
 - a. I think that there is a conversation at NACURH where I can find out what they need from me. I am flexible as far as moving those things around.
 - 3. PA: Based on the policy review committee, what areas would you updateS?
 - a. We have a spreadsheet that we have that would outline what pieces of policy need to be fixed. I would want to go in and evaluate those again so that we can finalize those policies.
 - 4. NEA: Many of your goals are extensions of current. What new goals do you have?
 - a. I think that incorporating LEAD will be a huge challenge in itself. In addition to that, I plan on incorporating the strategic plan and helping the plan go forward.



5. PA: Could you elaborate on the emergency elections process?
 - a. In PACURH, we do a bids process online. As we continue to look for online, I want to work with each region to develop a similar process for their own regions where they can learn how to do this virtually, so that they can have a good transition
6. GL: Have you reached out to past NAAs to see how you can grow the position?
 - a. I had a conversation with Danielle about my goals. I did request former bids and minutes from her.
7. CA: In your bid, you say that the NAA is the next logical step. Why do you want to do it?
 - a. Ever since my first conference, PACURH has felt like home to me. I feel like dedicating my work to this organization would be appropriate. It's my turn to pass that onto someone else.
8. IA: How do you plan on supporting the other execs?
 - a. That is why my goals are fairly CO focused. As the other executives delegate work, I can say I'll help with that. It will vary based on those conversations.
9. NEA: What is your minute taking philosophy?
 - a. I definitely like to paraphrase will help maintain fluency. Also, in experience I am the minute taker for PACURH currently.
10. SA: What has been your greatest challenge and what have you learned from that experience?
 - a. I think my biggest struggle was that I did not get a chance to attend NACURH when I took office as an RCC.
11. NIC: How do you plan on keeping Cos excited about their positions?
 - a. Those small group meetings will be crucial for that. It will be solidified as to who to talk to. I would like more virtual conferences as well.
12. SA: Can you expand on time commitments you have?
 - a. I am going to be a residence assistant for the next year. I came in as a hire mid-year this year. It was the hardest transition I've ever had to go through. I already know what my host school expectations are and I read through the past bids to really understand. Academic success for me is at least a 3.0. I will be at the minimum full-time, which is 15 credits a semester. I am a TA in the sign language class. I think that will be beneficial. I pretty much have Tuesday/Thursday open for self-care
13. SA: This year there were issues with RCCs, how do you plan on addressing that issue?
 - a. I think the first step is having RCCs attend virtually and having a Facebook group for the big news to be posted. It will also be good to have the small groups for 1-1s every week.



14. Parli-pro experience?
 - a. When I got to my host institution, we use Bob's rule of order. After conferences, my parli-pro has vastly improved. I have a fairly functional knowledge of it, if needed.
15. CA moves to end Q&A
 - a. 2nd by SW
 - b. No objections
- d. Candidate 2 - Danielle Melidona
 - i. Presentation
 - ii. Q&A
 1. NE: What was your biggest challenge this year?
 - a. I had to overcome recognizing that in my role, I serve as an advocate for the COs. I didn't necessarily agree with everything, but I acted as an advocate and represented them.
 2. SA: How do you plan on making sure you're keeping every RCC accountable?
 - a. For me, the CO monthlies are going to help to better connect the NAA to the COs. I thrive on relationships and I've tried to get to know every CO. I've taken the time to check on people if I hadn't heard from them. I followed up with them to see what was going on.
 3. GL: Having served as an RCC, what was the largest challenge you faced and what would you do to prevent in the future?
 - a. It was getting to know the other RCCs. I didn't feel connected on the NACURH level. It is all about those relationships. Building those relationships now so that the RCCs can grow. It was exciting to know that 7 of the 10 directors next year were COs this year. Relationships are crucial.
 4. PA: Which areas of policy would you prioritize?
 - a. I think that there's a lot. Specifically, the bylaws need to be reviewed. The bylaws don't include the COs. Award bidding we need to look at, corporate structure. Looking to see what fits best where. Taking policy and translating it to the NACURH website is also going to be important.
 5. MA: Though our policies and bylaws grow, there remains multiple grey areas. What is your approach to grey areas?
 - a. I first look at it as how I would interpret it on face value. If it was super grey, I would consult the NACURH Advisor. Precedent doesn't equal policy. We can't leave policy up for interpretation.
 6. NE: What are your minute taking philosophies and how will you sustain this time?
 - a. I love taking minutes. For me, it's a part of the job, and something I find a lot of joy in because it's important for our



members. I also think it's an incredible opportunity for the recording secretaries

7. GL: Past NAAs you spoke to?
 - a. Julie Rizzolo and Ashley Richey. Ashley wrote me a letter in my bid and we had a conversation about what I've done. A lot of these goals are outside of the scope of the NAA position - I want to take the position to the next level.
8. NSRO: How will you continue to support the office staffs?
 - a. I'd like to include them in all of our chats and I would continue to have those relationships with the office staffs. With the catalyst program, we will have them involved as well.
9. NEA: Going into the position for your second year. What is the biggest thing that you want to accomplish?
 - a. After developing a strategic plan, I want to be able to implement it. That is definitely something I'm hoping to gain. I hope to gain as much knowledge with the implementation. I look forward to learning more if selected
10. NEA: What do you think CO monthlies will include?
 - a. I would want to include what projects and tasks the COs are currently working on, and updates about how they are doing in the position. I want to ask exactly what they need from me. Maybe at the halfway point, we can go back and tell them what they've done so far
11. CA: Based on your bid, you have a lot of experience. What will you do to prevent burnout?
 - a. For me, I love NACURH. This is what I'm passionate about. This is what I love to do. Self-care is important to me. I find joy in doing this. I'm excited about everything. Being here with all of you is wonderful. Talking to the COs gives me so much joy. I think it would be my final year and I want to give back to the organization
12. NE: You said you have a vision for the NAA, please share.
 - a. The NAA role can often be pigeon-holed into the role of babysitting of the RCCs. The CO involvement is the amazing part of the position. The NAA doesn't just take minutes. I see the NAA as the operational component of the executive team. I'd like to see them take on more than their basic responsibilities.
13. CA: Could you give examples of precedent doesn't equal policy?
 - a. I think even just processes in general. One that needs to be fixed is the award submission policies. The precedent in the past has been set, but that's not what policy says. When we operate outside of policy, we need to step back. Whether we agree with it or not, we need to uphold it. Let's follow the guidelines.



14. SW moves to end Q&A
 - a. 2nd by GL
 - b. No objections
- e. Candidate 3 - Andrew Haugen
 - i. Presentation
 - ii. Q&A
 1. NSRO: Could you talk about how you plan to support offices?
 - a. One thing that I think could be improved is the acknowledgement of the difference of the different pieces of NACURH. I'd like to create a clarification page about the different pieces of NACURH as a resource.
 2. MA: There has been trend of a division between directors and the RCCs. What do you think can be done to help bridge the gap?
 - a. That is something I experienced. Coming into the directorship role, I tried to make sure that didn't occur. We remained very transparent. Cos don't necessarily have the opportunity to go to Semis, so we want to include them in every aspect. We want to give them the opportunity to write legislation
 3. GL: Having served as an RCC, what was the largest challenge you faced?
 - a. One of the most difficult things was the self-motivation aspect. It is really hard to stay on top of things. I want them to have the opportunity to get involved on committees. I want to find ways to engage the COs.
 4. NEA: What are your minutes taking philosophies
 - a. One of my cons is minute taking, but I have prepared myself for my role. I've taken minutes at chats to try and gain experience. At our No Frills, I was able to take minutes while other leaders chaired. It is very important to get the jist of what people are talking about. I have done things to prepare myself for this role. Additionally, I think it's important to use our recording secretaries.
 5. SA: Do you have any specific ideas for taking NACURH-U as an initiative?
 - a. NACURH-U has done an outstanding job alone. I'd like to model what they have done and having templates for individuals to model if they don't exactly know what they want to talk about.
 6. PA: How do you plan on making committees better next year?
 - a. Meeting with the committees is something I want to do. Sometimes, they're not exactly sure how to run a committee. I want to brainstorm with them. I will create charges so they know what direction to go in for their committees
 7. NE:



- a. This is the first year that GLACURH had a CO run legislation. So that was how I really engaged the Cos in the position. I talk to a lot of my Cos on a daily basis, and have created a personal relationship with them. One of our goals was to include the Cos in our decisions. We would inform the RCCs
- 8. GL: Have you reached out to the past NAAs on how to can take this position
 - a. I met with Danielle a lot. Any question that I asked her, I know she would be open and honest with me. Last year, Ashley was our swap buddy. I was able to compare the advise from the two
- 9. SA: What do you believe is your most innovative goal?
 - a. I'd like to finalize the aesthetics of NACURH. We are standardizing all of our guides on a regional level and I'd like to continue that on a NACURH level. I want everything to look unified. I have an art background, so I think that will help in marketing.
- 10. MA: You clearly have a great ability for time management, but with this potential position, how are you going to ensure no burn out. I
 - a. I love this. I spend so much time dedicated to NACURH. I'm excited to do it. I'm not worried I'm going to get burnt out. I hate procrastination, so I like to do things way in advance. I love this. I love student affairs. I love this organization. I don't perceive burn out
- 11. PA: What areas of policy would you focus on revamping?
 - a. I would like to focus on the affiliation process. I would like to distinguish the large and small schools. Dealing with the whole affiliation process and revamping i
- 12. SW moves to end Q&A
 - a. 2nd by MA
 - b. No objections

f. Discussion

- i. CA: Based on bids and presentations, it seemed like Mark's was built on years past, Danielle offered new experiences for the future
- ii. NSRO: We feel that Danielle was the only candidate that put any thought into the office.
- iii. SW: We appreciate Mark's explanation of the chats, depending on what is going to benefit the CO the best so each of them are getting individualized info
- iv. MA: We really appreciated Mark and Danielle's continued NACURH-U info.
- v. SA: We feel as though there's been a lot of change. Both Danielle and Mark are wanting to change things. We would like to get some feedback to from COs.



- vi. NEA: We appreciate that Danielle and Mark were in the ADFa role, as they have both experienced minute taking as it is a key aspect. We recognize they have both been to many regions conferences and have interacted with many different COs.
- vii.PA: Just to touch on each candidate, we appreciate Andrew’s transparency. We appreciate the plans in Mark and Danielle’s bids that covers all areas of the organization
- viii.Annual Conference: I really love that Danielle incorporates members of the offices into her plans.
- ix.IA: Having a returner to the Executive Board, we believe that this will provide strategy. When you look at the broad aspect, this is a huge for NACURH because it gives us some for sure direction.
- x.NIC: We appreciate how much drive and passion Danielle put in her bid, and how much passion she has for working with COs. We support her for next year.
- xi. MA: We appreciate Andrew and his principle reason for running for NAA stemming from the bad experience he had as an RCC, and wanting to better the organization.
- xii. SA: Mark has an intentional plan, and we appreciate his wanting to incorporate LEAD into his role.
 - 1. CA calls the question
 - a. No objections

g. Vote

- i. Danielle Melidona has been elected the 2015-2016 NACURH Associate for Administration

22. NAF Election

- a. Announcement of Intent(s)
- b. Nominations
 - i. Jacob Crosetto nominated by Midwest.
 - 1. 2nd by Intermountain.
 - 2. No objections..
- c. Candidate 1 - Jacob Crosetto
 - i. Presentation
 - ii.Q&A
 - 1. PA: Could you speak to your ability to educate on QuickBooks?
 - a. I can create guides. Having been around QuickBooks for the last two years, I feel very comfortable. It can be daunting, but it is the little things that matter. Pulling reports on a monthly basis can be hard, so I would hope to implement a FAQ for finance officers. I hope the current finance officers could help me start that.
 - 2. CA: How would you hold outgoing and incoming finance officers to the intense transition standards that were put into place at semis?
 - a. Starting as early as possible is very important. Speaking personally, not everyone has the time to meet one on one with



their incoming, and that is really difficult. I think we are all adults in these roles, so I think we all need to be accountable for ourselves and the other finance officers. Maybe there will be someone who just doesn't get it. It can be a struggle if you are not a finance major. I relied a lot on other finance officers, and learned from them. I think that will help.

3. MA: Of your 38 hours of free time, how do you plan to distress?
 - a. I think the majority of time I don't spend on NACURH Related work is spent talking to NACURH People. When I am dedicated to something and I like to do it, it doesn't stress me it. The course-load of my MBA program can be tough, but when you love something you make time for it. I do not get stressed by little things. Burnout hasn't really happened for me. My job is also really supportive and flexible of providing me with the time that I need. Maybe I will binge watch Survivor. I haven't really had any conflicts with my job and the NACURH Position.
4. SA: WE have had some issues this year with turnover. How would you support a board with a positional vacancy and training someone else midyear?
 - a. I would hope to compile resources at the beginning of the year to utilize throughout. I will be understanding of the learning curve and making sure those resources are there. It really is on a case-by-case basis. I really expect the officers to let me know what they need.
5. SW: How would you support office and conference staff?
 - a. I have been on a conference staff, so I feel like I would be able to connect with conference staff. Understanding that the annual conference budget is larger is important. I feel like I've reached out to the other offices to learn about the little intricacies of the offices as well. I would like to meet more regularly with office staff, CRC, and annual conference staff to understand what I haven't experienced.
6. CA: You mentioned potentially increasing the add on fees. What would it be used for?
 - a. AN example would be the strategic planning retreat. Anything from scholarships, grants, speaker subsidies, and making sure our budget is balanced is what is important to me. I want to make sure we are not going to run a deficit.
7. NE: You have a lot of great goals. How are you going to prioritize and implement them throughout the year?
 - a. Finding out where they fall into the strategic plan is where I start. I hope none of my goals seemed pushy. I want feedback from finance officers. I may have a whole bid full of goals, but I Want



to know what the finance officers will need. I will prioritize the ones that are placed high priority within the strategic plan. We will be evaluating our partnership with OCM, and I find that to be very important.

8. CA moves to end Q&A
 - a. 2nd by IA.
 - b. No objections.

d. Discussion

- i. MA: Jacob's presentation and bid really shows that he would be amazing at this job. He has plenty of experience in the position and with money in general. He has seen many facets of the organization. I can't think of a negative thing to say. He fits this position so well. This position was made for Jacob.
- ii. NIC: Jacob seems like the best fit for this. I like that he is forward thinking and wants to improve our financial stability. It shows that he is dedicated to this position.
- iii. PA: We would like to point out that he waited to bid for this position to get a better understanding to best serve finance officers.
- iv. NSRO: WE are in full support of Jacob. HE understands the organization really well. There is a bit of a lack of knowledge of the NSRO, but we are willing to work with him on that.
- v. SW: We appreciate the initiatives, such as the appendix he put forth. We like that he encouraged outgoing officers to talk to incoming finance officers.
- vi. NE: We really appreciate Jacob's direction for the AAFN fund. Bringing in alumni speakers and allowing for that engagement of alumni overall to help support that fund is really valuable. Having served on the board for 2 years, AAFN fund discussion has been ongoing, and we think that it's an excellent idea of what to do with the money in that account.
- vii. CA: I really appreciate the appendix documents, however in looking through the investment policy book, but for those who are finance officers or invested in the investments, there is a bit of a lack of education. I would like to see some more education about our policies and practices, and why he wants to do what he wants to do and how he plans to do it.
- viii. IA: When he talked about Tom the accountant, I really appreciate that he wants to make those connections between finance officers and Tom in advance. Jacob is extremely qualified for this position and will take the SPC plans and move forward.
 1. PA calls the question.
 - a. No objections

e. Vote

- i. Jacob Crosetto has been elected the 2015-2016 NACURH Associate for Finance

23. NAN Election

- a. Announcement of Intent(s)
- b. Nominations



- i. Coty Behanna
 - 1. 2nd by NSRO
 - 2. No objections
- c. Candidate 1 - Coty Behanna
 - i. Presentation
 - ii. Q&A
 - 1. MA: My question is two fold, how do you plan to uphold the pillars to values change and implement the vision and mission
 - a. These are conversations that need to happen during affiliation. Talking about how the pillars will still be represented in the constitution. With mission and vision, that will also happen during affiliation.
 - 2. NE: We only meet in persona few times a year. Do you have any plans to keep the NNB motivated?
 - a. I would really like to have a time established for each NNB member every two weeks. I would like to talk to members once a month, but reserve extra time for board members to keep them engaged
 - 3. SW: Out of all of your goals, which would you prioritize first?
 - a. Strategic planning is really important. NRHH needed more time and resources during SPC. The NNB thinks term to term. Having a living and breathing document is important to transition from year to year.
 - 4. NSRO: The NSRO AD-NRHH works closely with the NAN. How will you work with the office ADs
 - a. Equity vs. equality. Recognizing each AD-NRHH has different responsibilities. Understanding that is paramount. Assisting office ADs in executing their goals.
 - 5. PA: You said earlier that NRHH is different than NACURH as a whole – how will you differentiate this?
 - a. NRHH is a sub organization of NACURH with a relatively focused task of administrating chapters. By nature of design, NRHH would or should look different than NACURH.
 - 6. CA: NRHH and specifically the NRHH positions are autonomous. How do you see yourselves working with the Executives.
 - a. We each have different strengths and challenges. There's a lot more chance for collaboration among the Execs. The other three have different skill sets and perspectives that could be beneficial to the development of NRHH.
 - 7. SA: Who will be apart of the planning process for the NRHH Strategic Plan?
 - a. Phase one will be each NNB member, the offices, and a conference team member. My plan in my bid has a lot of



- opportunities for feedback from chapters. Their input will be used to cross checking to make sure we are on the right track.
8. SW: How would you work towards your goal of NRHH autonomy during affiliations?
 - a. It's difficult – some want structure, some don't. We should bring together differences and move forward with a unified vision. Giving NRHH Reps their own login would be important.
 9. NE: How would you maintain collaborative nature for next year?
 - a. Get in touch with them prior to HEART training. I would like to learn about their goals. That way, we can start collaboration before we leave this conference. I would also like to do something similar during Semis.
 10. IA: What is your plan for chats and special projects in light of the strategic plan?
 - a. It will look like what the incoming NNB wants to do. Their passions will guide it. As far as meeting structure, we've made our time effective this year. If we get some kind of technology to meet face to face, that will be beneficial.
 11. MA: You talked about making NRHH one cohesive organization. From that, service is important. What do you think is the role of service within chapters?
 - a. Chapters will do what service means to them – whether community service, professional development, etc. They will dictate what this looks like.
 12. NSRO: NRHH is going through a lot of changes. How will you make sure the offices understands these changes to better serve member schools?
 - a. I would maintain communication with the offices. Concise and clear communication will also be really important. Additionally, ensuring the Ads are engaged and involved.
 13. SW: What is your leadership style and how do you see it in transitioning into the role of NAN.
 - a. I am collaborative. If the person leading the room cannot empower the voices in the room, we won't get far.
 14. MA: Communication and commitment have been an issue this year. How will you improve this?
 - a. We'll need to plan for it ahead of time. We will need to set expectations with understanding there are difficult times throughout the year and recognize when those are.
 15. SA: Recognition is important to our State Affiliates. How do you see yourself interacting with state recognition reps and incorporate them?
 - a. I'm fascinated by State Associations. I would like to communicate and understand what they are doing. I would help



them focus their resources to ensure they align with their regions, NACURH, and NRHH.

16. SW: In your bid and presentation you talked about base standards for NRHH. Can you expand this?

a. This will be reflected in the constitution checklist.

d. Discussion

i. IA: Feel Coty is great for the position. The intermountain feels as if Coty is a great candidate for the NAN position. Not only does he have specific goals to help advance NRHH, but he is also is open to changing/modifying his goals after interacting with the incoming NNB. We believe that Coty will help lay a foundation for NRHH to asses what the honorary is, where it is, and where we want it to go.

ii. NE: Coty has had the opportunity to interact with the members and have different experiences. We are in full support.

iii. SW: We appreciate Coty is committed to creating an NRHH identity. We are looking forward to the creation of the NRHH Strategic Plan.

iv. PA: We are in full support of Coty. We echo everyone's statements. He already has a vision for training.

v. NIC: We appreciate Coty's dedication to NRHH and his willingness to work with the offices

vi. NSRO: Full support. He has shown his commitment to communication.

vii. SA: We are in full support of Coty and his passion for NRHH. We appreciate his knowledge of where NRHH is at and the unique experiences he brings to the role.

viii. NIC calls the question; MA objects

1. Question not called

ix. MA: We feel Coty did great; we are concerned about the lack of mention of the transition from pillars to values.

x. SW calls the question;

1. No objections

e. Vote

i. Coty Behanna has been elected the 2015-2016 NACURH Associate for NRHH

24. Recess

a. SW moves to recess until whenever we get called back by the chair

i. 2nd by Annual Conference

25. No objections

26. Legislation

a. SA moves to bring MM 15-75 to the floor, 2nd by PA

i. Chairperson READ MM 15-75.

ii. Proponent Speech

1. The legislation speaks for itself. It is a formality; this is in terms of flight reimbursement for the Executives to NACURH Semis 2015. Overall, there was not enough funds in the budget that allowed for these



expenses. There were situations that caused Emergency Expenses due to travel / weather issues, this was an unforeseen event that forced our group to make personal purchases in order to attend NACURH Semis 2015. In addition to other expenses such as: Rental Car, Gas, and Parking Expenses.

iii. Q&A

1. PA: Is there any policy written that outlines us paying for the extra expenses such as the Emergency Expenses?

a. A: It is one of those situations that are more of a "takes precedent". There was also a situation that happened last year to where NACURH also paid for emergency expenses for the Executives or individuals that were facing these types of problems. It is a hard area to navigate since it surrounds the topic of travel and unplanned weather / technical problems that would delay the travel plans for the individuals.

iv. Discussion

1. PA: We feel that this is appropriate since we expect these individuals to attend Semis. We support them in all facets, even those that revolve the unforeseen travel issues.

2. MA: We appreciate the efforts of the NAF, and how she brought it to the Boards in such an ethical manner. Very much appreciated.

v. Vote

1. 8-0-0

2. Motion Carries.

27. Recess

a. SA moves to recess until Chairperson calls everyone back.

i. 2nd by SW

ii. No objections, recessed at 5:54PM.

28. Call to order May 20, 2015 at 9:33 AM CST

29. Roll Call

30. RHA Building Block Selection

a. SA moves to bring nominations to the floor; 2nd by GL

b. PA nominates Colorado School of Mines; 2nd SW

c. NIC nominates Portland State; 2nd by SA

d. CA nominates IUP; 2nd by NSRO

e. GL nominates Toledo; 2nd by Annual Conference

f. SA nominates Central Arkansas; 2nd by SW

g. IA nominates UCF; 2nd by NE

h. SW nominates Michigan; 2nd by SA

i. PA nominates Webster; 2nd by MA

j. NIC nominates Missouri; 2nd by SA

k. SW moves to close the floor for nominates



- i. 2nd by IA
 - ii.No objections
- I. Pro/Con
- m. Discussion
 - i. NE: A lot of the bids were amazing. When we look at BB bids, we look for transformation of what their struggles were and how they fixed that. Based on that, we eliminated a lot of them. Through reading, we felt Portland State identified their challenges and worked to fix them.
 - ii.GL: Echo what NE said about Portland. Want to discuss the regional and NACURH involvement of Colorado State. For Central Arkansas, they did a great job of describing the strategies they used to improve their RHA. Their supporting documents were also helpful.
 - iii.PA: Echo what NE said earlier. We also look for schools to plan continued growth. Believe Central Arkansas, Michigan, and Colorado School of Mines should be recognized for that.
 - iv.NIC: Appreciate Michigan's detail of goals and partnerships. Unfortunate they gave up on NRHH, but their bid still shows other avenues for success.
 - v. CA: Looking at UCF's bid, they did not provide a lot of detail of progress and what they hope to accomplish in the future
 - vi.SW: Appreciate UCF's RHA/NRHH collaboration; appreciate what has already been said about the Colorado School of Mines
 - vii.SA: Michigan did not have an NRHH; Webster and Mizzou did not mention NRHH.
 - viii.GL: Speaking on Webster, overall their bid was good. The letter from their President was impactful. Overall, lack NACURH involvement. It's a good start, but not
 - ix.PA: In addition of growing in house, organizations should strive to Michigan, Toledo, Colorado School of Mines, Portland, Mizzou
 - x.MA: Wanted to highlight Webster and Arkansas. Echo what the NE said before about what we look for. With Arkansas we saw how they reworked their mission statement to better serve their students. Webster saw several problems to corporate structure. They addressed that, and restructured everything to what it should be.
 - xi.NE: Regarding IUP, we appreciate their involvement in conference programming as well as taking time to identify weaknesses and update documents. With their bid lacking a budget and organizational program details; we struggled to get a picture of what they have actually accomplished. Feel like these details missing pulls them out of this award.
 - xii.SA: Since this award is predominately about growth, we appreciate how IUP and Michigan compared their growth from previous years
 - xiii.CA: In speaking on IUP, appreciated comparison of growth and this is one of the first bids they've submitted in a few years.



- xiv.IA: Speaking on RHA BB, we look at this award on the local level as it could be a resource to other RHAs. While budget is a resource, it differs between organizations. How the local level translates to others is important.
- xv.IA moves to narrow the list down to four nominees after a three minute caucus; 2nd by MA
1. No objections
- xvi.NE moves to narrow the list down to the top three nominees; 2nd by SW
- xvii. The field has been narrowed to the following nominees:
1. Colorado School of Mines
 2. University of Michigan
 3. University of Central Arkansas
- xviii.SW: We really appreciate Michigan's commitment to their campus, but are concerned about giving up on their NRHH.
- xix.PA: Arkansas focused on developing the campus level, but also showed what they brought back from the regional and NACURH level
- xx.CA: Referring to Michigan and them getting rid of NRHH, I appreciate them more for recognizing something that wasn't successful.
- xxi.MA: Also going off of Michigan, this is the RHA BB award. While NRHH is important, it's not pertinent to this award.
- xxii.IA: Feel Central Arkansas does not meet the prescribed criteria with percentages. Bid lacks depth.
- xxiii.CA: Appreciate the monthly programming by CS Mines and the impact on the students
- xxiv. SA: Appreciate how CSM mentioned program evaluation
- xxv. IA: Central Arkansas, their bid had the space to add more content.
- xxvi. GL: Speaking on CSM, we really liked the development of their mission statement and how it guided them through the entire year. CSM has the campus focus and regional and NACURH involvement to fit the award criteria. We were impressed with the detail put into their budget and the growth and changes put into their budgeting practices.
- xxvii. PA: Echo the GL sentiments. CSM shows the growth of differences and how they have built everything. They eloquently present the changes they've gone through to better themselves as an organization.
- xxviii. SA: Appreciate how Michigan works with other campus organizations. Want to highlight that they have made new partnerships for growth in the future.
- xxix. CA: Would like to highlight Michigan's committee structure. They also detailed their use of regional services.
- xxx. NSRO: Appreciate CSM. Show how they have improved students' experiences overall.
- xxxi. NE: Speaking to Michigan, when thinking of building block, it's concerning to see how underutilized their budget is. Because this is an award based on growth, we would have liked to see that
- xxxii. IA moves to vote; 2nd by CA



1. PA objects
 2. 4-4-0; fails
- xxxiii. PA: CSM utilized quotes from participants at their programs to show the impact their services provide to students.
- xxxiv. IA: Feel Michigan lacked previous growth and how they have implemented changes to improve the needs of members.
- xxxv. CA moves to extend time by five minutes; 2nd by IA
1. No objections
- xxxvi. SA: CSM and Michigan describe their advocacy efforts, Arkansas did not.
- xxxvii. CA: In regards to Michigan, while they did have money left over, they very easily could have left out parts of their budget and just told us what they spent; appreciate their honesty.
- xxxviii. MA: As it stands, the RHA BB should also serve as an example to other RHAs that are being built up. Budgeting is important. With Michigan's bid, they have great comparisons from previous year's that could be beneficial to member institutions.
- xxxix. SA: Even though CSM could not afford to travel to No Frills, they utilized the regional services and still submitted bids.
- xl. IA: We feel that while Michigan focuses more on regional and NACURH involvement, they do not have as much impact on the campus level seeing the nature of the criteria
- xli. CA moves to vote; 2nd by GL
1. No objections
- n. Vote
- i. The University of Michigan has been selected as the 2015 NACURH RHA Building Block Award recipient.
31. Recess
- a. SW moves to recess for ten minutes
 - i. 2nd by NSRO
 - ii. No objections
32. Call to Order
33. School of the Year
- a. NIC moves to bring nominations to the floor; 2nd by SW
 - b. SA nominates ASU-Tempe; 2nd by GL
 - c. MA nominates Washington; 2nd by GL
 - d. NIC nominates CSU; 2nd by SA
 - e. CA nominates GW; 2nd by SW
 - f. PA nominates CU Boulder; 2nd by SW
 - g. SW nominates NDSU; 2nd by Annual Conference
 - h. NIC nominates OSU; 2nd by IA
 - i. NE nominates UNC Chapel Hill; 2nd by SA
 - j. SW moves to close the floor for nominates
 - i. 2nd by IA



- ii. No objections
- k. Pro/Con
- l. Discussion
 - i. MA: For the criteria of this award; 55% is based on Regional and NACURH involvement. There were several bids that did not mention much involvement on these levels. It's important to think beyond the campus level.
 - ii. GL: ASU-Tempe and NDSU did a fantastic job of representing all of the criteria.
 - iii. NE moves to caucus for five minutes; 2nd by SA
 - 1. No objections
 - iv. PA: On behalf of Washington's regional and NACURH involvement, they have committee involvement, award submissions, and legislations
 - v. NE: Disappointed with GW's bid overall; nonexistent RHA and NRHH relations, there was a lack of scope of goals; 20% of their budget went to the President's stipend
 - vi. CA: Speaking on UNC-Chapel Hill, we really appreciate how they spoke about the issues they have faced; intense summer sessions. GW had specific goals and focused on advocacy and had very diverse training and leadership development.
 - vii. MA: On Chapel Hill, they do not really speak to their regional and NACURH involvement. Since 55% of the criteria is NACURH and regional involvement, they do not really fit that.
 - viii. SA: UNC has state level involvement, which is not recognized on the NACURH level.
 - ix. IA: If we look at other state involvement, we need to also consider ASU-Tempe and their state involvement with Arizona and CU Boulder and CSU with their involvement in Colorado.
 - x. CA: Also speaking to CU Boulder, they definitely did a lot this year – they spoke a lot about social justice programming. They increased leadership development through retreats. Detailed information on NRHH relations is also included.
 - xi. SA: Recognize OSU and how they hold a leadership conference, on-boarding first year students.
 - xii. GL moves to narrow the list to the top four; 2nd by NE
 - 1. No objections
 - xiii. The field has been narrowed to the following nominees:
 - 1. ASU-Tempe
 - 2. CSU
 - 3. NDSU
 - 4. UNC – Chapel Hill
 - xiv. IA: Echo what MA stated earlier about the criteria. Having a good focus on the campus level.
 - xv. GL: Looking at ASU-Tempe's bid they exceed the criteria for this award.
 - xvi. PA: Recognize ASU-Tempe as well. They were also the NACURH POY winner.



- xvii. NE: Impressed with CSU and their first-time delegate attendance. They have incredible conference involvement on the regional and NACURH levels.
- xviii. IA: When we looked at the nominees we struggled with CSU's bid, they are lacking in some areas with regional achievements. We are unsure they meet the criteria. When looking at ASU-Tempe's, submitting awards to the NACURH level when you did not win on the regional level is commendable. ASU-Tempe has shown they met
- xix. CA: With NDSU, they are hosting the Annual Conference. They showed diverse involvement in their bid. The majority of those who participate on campus
- xx. SA: We agree with IA about regional and NACURH involvement. UNC Chapel Hill is lacking in this area.
- xxi. NE: We look at educational program as a huge asset of living on campus. This encompasses diversity, inclusion, and leadership development to name a few. ASU-Tempe, CSU, and Chapel Hill did the best to create a diverse set of messages students could take home with them.
- xxii. CA moves to vote; 2nd by PA
1. No objections
 2. A majority has not been reached
- xxiv. MA: Both have had involvement on the regional and NACURH levels. Both have hosted or are about to host a conference, both host RBD members, both have won and submitted awards. I haven't been able to find out how many awards ASU-Tempe won. We are not looking at the campus level as much – we are looking at the regional and NACURH involvement for differentiation. Believe NDSU has more involvement.
- xxv. SA: It interesting that NDSU includes sustainability in their budget.
- xxvi. SA: On the regional level, they are equitable. We should be considering the campus level more in-depth because this is an award for what they do at their school.
- xxvii. IA: We want to echo those statements by SA. When we look at ASU-Tempe they have a strong engagement with their residential community. They focus on the residents themselves and bring back what they have learned from conferences.
- xxviii. PA: Want to speak on the thoroughness of the NRHH section of ASU-Tempe's bid.
- xxix. GL: We believe ASU-Tempe outshines NDSU slightly. They are dedicated to growing their students through diverse opportunities. We commend both schools.
- xxx. SA: Both speak about OTMs, and all have won campus, regional, and NACURH levels. NDSU provided numbers.
- xxxi. MA: I am an alumnus of NDSU. We have two great schools. Both are very qualified. Regardless of the decision, a great school will take home an incredible award. Should we discount the fact that NDSU is hosting the annual



conference? No. We should be looking at the campus level and be focusing on the content of the bids. The content speaks for itself.

xxxii. IA: What we look at as well is taking regional and NACURH services. NRHM is service we provide, and took the initiative back from NACURH to implement on their campus and have had success with this. This is one way ASU-Tempe has bridged the gap.

xxxiii. SA: Something that resonates with us are quotes from members that show the impact of programs and services. NDSU's bid includes that.

xxxiv. GL moves to vote after a four minute caucus; 2nd by SW

1. No objections

m. Vote

i. ASU - Tempe has been selected as the 2015 NACURH School of the Year Award recipient.

34. Recess

a. GL moves to recess for until 1:30 PM CDT

i. 2nd by MA

ii. No objections

35. AAFN Inductions (4)

a. Nominations

b. Discussion

c. Vote

i. The 2015 NACURH AAFN Inductees are:

1. Kat Roemer

2. Brianna Gomez

3. Melissa Lourie

4. Amanda Christianson

36. Legislation

a. GL moves to bring MM 15-74 to the floor, 2nd by CA

i. Blue Jeans Presentation by Author

ii. Q&A

1. MA:

a. 100 users per call. You would have the ability to manage who is a user.

b. Is there a limit of the number of accounts per license?

i. No, as far as I know. You do not have to have an account to participate in the call.

2. NSRO: With the price change point, the offices and Execs do not have less access because we pay less?

a. No. We know those entities are different. It doesn't make sense to pay just specifically because we know we won't use it as much.

3. NE: Could you explain more about the licensing?

a. They won't contract for less than 10 users. We could eventually limit, but it promotes regional autonomy.



4. SW: Appreciates the research. Do we need to have the information
 5. NAF: When you say the annual conference, do you want it to be added to the delegate fee?
 - a. It's honestly up to how the NAF sees best fit.
 6. IA: Based off of the pieces presented by Kat about the uncleared checks, do you believe this addition of \$14,000 would be beneficial during this fiscal year?
 - a. We have a lot of money sitting in the reserves. If this is something that will be beneficial to our organization, we should move forward with it. This is similar in price to Guidebook. It is an annual agreement.
 7. PA: Are there any charges for international calling?
 - a. For the video service, no. I'm not positive about other charges if they were calling in from the phone.
 8. NSRO: From what got brought up about user interface. Because the offices are sharing, who has the power to set that up?
 - a. I believe that can be figured out in the future.
 9. NAA: here
 10. IA: Does this limit our ability to use other chat services?
 - a. No
 11. NSRO: What are the benefits for us in this?
 - a. Ask Blue jeans to see if any affiliated institutions signed up in the past year. They I'm sure would be willing to provide sponsorships.
 12. PA: If passed, what suggestions for funding would you make for the regions to fund this?
 - a. Our region added onto the add-on fee for conferences. It's also about planning. If you added a dollar to your add-on fee it can almost cover the whole cost.
 13. CA: You mentioned your negotiations. What was the original price?
 - a. \$19,000.00 – brought it down about \$5,000.00
 14. NE: Is there a way we could be paid for bandwidth usage?
 - a. It's a big buy-in for a trial. There is really no other option for the services we would like
 15. IA moves to end Q&A
 - a. 2nd by CA
 - b. No objections
 - iii. CA moves to table until after dinner; 2nd by GL
 1. No objections
37. Recess
- a. SW moves to recess until whenever we get called back by the chair
 - i. 2nd by Annual Conference
38. Legislation



- a. CA moves to bring MM 15-74 off the table, 2nd by SW
 - i. Discussion
 1. SW: Supports the idea and appreciates the work done into researching BlueJeans. We want to make sure all regions can financially support this so we know we can afford it. We'd also like to see information on where it will come from.
 2. CA: Collectively, this is a great deal based on cost. It's similar to the costs of Guidebook. We are getting a substantial deal in that we would use this service more often. The cost to benefit is so much higher.
 3. PA: As being a region that currently uses an Internet services. We do use FUZE. We don't have a partnership. Our subscription is \$600.00. You cannot do video for more than 12 people. You can have up to 250 people in the chat, but they cannot all do video stream. In order to use FUZE to it's full potential, you need to download it to your computer. We have found it to be really beneficial to our region. As far as the video service goes, we don't personally use it as a region. It's not within the culture of our region. Realistically, we do not think it's sustainable to use video chat with more than 12 people. If you had more than 12 video streams going. For us, we do not believe it is going to be beneficial to us.
 4. MA: Free services are by no means a viable way to do this anymore. We believe the costs may be more than the benefits. It's not necessarily something every region will use. MA cannot support this to continue adding fees.
 5. IA: We feel that after getting to use Blue Jeans, we think it's super beneficial. The service is unique. It's cloud based and that is user friendly. It has a lot of serious potential for the organization. We feel this platform will give us so many ways to grow the corporation. The hardest thing for us is the costs. However, we do need to spend money in order to move forward. \$1500.00 is significant for us. Our add-on fee would need to be at least \$5.00 more.
 6. NSRO: Do you know if BlueJeans has accessibility for special needs.
 7. NAA: Statement here
 8. CA: In the piece of legislation, this is a yearly thing. In the first year, the piece outlines that NACURH will cover it. This will not hit regional budgets until FY17.

39. Call to order May 21, 2015 at 11:03 AM CST

40. Roll Call

41. Boardroom Buddy Reveal

42. Legislation

- a. NIC moves to bring MM 15-61 to the floor, 2nd by MA
 - i. Proponent speech



1. There has been a lot of expansion of swaps over the last two years. It's a great opportunity for the expansion of knowledge. In NEACURH, we've had two swaps from CAACURH, and have sent one to IACURH. We need to do better documentation of swaps. This season was difficult because so many conferences fe

ii. Q&A

1. GL: Considering the NAA only keeps records of corporate liability for 3 years, is 10 years excessive.
 - a. Spreadsheets are thin. There wasn't huge thought behind it, it's such a small file, why not keep it for 10 years.
2. MA: There is nothing against policy you are proposing as far as finances.
 - a. Yes, the only stipulation is that they need to select their swaps by 30 days out from the conference to comply with the travel policy.
3. CA: What was your reasoning behind having someone from the region more than once?
 - a. I'm not so sure that a region can gain from having multiple swaps from one region. Swaps are to not only serve the individual but serve the region they are swapping to.
 - b. So if they pay for themselves, is that different?
 - i. That region is comping the registration costs. There's diminishing results. I'm not sure how much I would learn and exchange.
4. NSRO: We had transition on our staff. How would you envision special circumstances
 - a. I left it open to swaps from the offices and the annual conference staff. They viewed it as a great training opportunity. If you have a member of the NIC or NSRO who has never been to a conference, it's hard to introduce them to the culture to representing their staff.
5. CA: Does this piece at all regulate how many swaps a region is allowed to take?
 - a. No.
6. SW: Did you reach out to any other regions to see their practices?
 - a. Based it on my own experience. I talked to them about their process. My perspective is from having conversations with others.
7. GL: If a conference staff member takes a position the following year on an RBD, how does that effect it?
 - a. They shouldn't be swapping to the same region they swapped to as a conference or office member.

iii. Discussion

1. PA moves to caucus for three minutes, 2nd by SW
 - a. No objections



2. IA is against this piece in it's entirety. Swaps are a regional service. Within our own region, we do not pay for swaps. That's a decision our board makes. We give the right to the
3. CA: Agree with IA; do not support this piece. We can accept anywhere from one to four depending on budget. If I have six apply for four swaps. I don't want to have to take people we don't feel will have an impact. NACURH should not regulate it. We do care about the individual and their experience.
4. MA: We are torn with this piece; agree with the spirit. We're torn over where we draw the line between NACURH policies and regional autonomy.
5. NSRO: We support this piece. We feel like unless you can justify them. Like the standardization. We do support this. NACURH level expectations help. We don't want to take away autonomy.
6. GL: This year we accepted an advisor as a swap. We've been on a board for three years. In each position, you look at the positional responsibilities. Feel it's limiting
7. CA: If that is the case, the Chair can address issues without legislation. In regards to finances, limiting the amount. Going to multiple regions can be expensive. It's forcing our individuals to shell out more money to have an experience.
8. PA: Torn; we appreciate the effort for NACURH to regulate this, as friends it's easy to want to swap to regions to see friends. We can see the need for understanding that the money for swaps come out of the money for a student. We do not really need to regulate it specifically. First we would like to see a purpose defined.
9. MA: As a regional buddy, do you feel like your experience was different at the regional conference and business conferences.
 - a. NAF: I got to know many of your delegates at your regional conference. At No Frills, we spent a lot of time in boardroom. Your CCs knew me. I also dealt with an issue I needed to be there for. It was a completely different experience.
10. CA: We're confused; if Coty went to IA last year. Does that mean that I can't go to IA next year?
 - a. Each region can accept one from each region and entity per year.
11. PA: We think that swaps are valuable opportunities
 - a. CA moves to extend time by 5 minutes; 2nd by SW
 - b. No objections
12. PA: Feel swaps are a great opportunity for educational development across NACURH. Allowing a variety of regions to have those interactions is going to optimize that educational value for both the individual and the region.



- 13. SW: When we were reading under regulation F, I took it as I couldn't go to NE regionals and also send someone from my region to Minis.
 - a. They will only accept one if you apply if this passes.
- 14. PA moves to caucus for four minutes; 2nd by MA
 - a. No objections
- 15. SW: We discussed that we agree with a purpose; the issues the whole room seems to have are the regulations.
- 16. PA moves to recognize the amendment
 - a. Discussion
 - i. PA: Like the SW was saying, this is identifying the purpose, but looking to modify the regulations. Feel that members of NACURH can
 - ii. SW: Likes most of the edits; but that maintaining a record is important
 - iii. CA: This would improve
 - iv. IA: Likes the amendment. We think that J. should remain stricken.
 - v. CA calls the question; no objections
 - 1. 7-1-0; amendment carries
- 17. GL: We feel this is a clear example of over-legislating. Believe it
- 18. CA: Agree with GL.
- 19. IA calls the question; no objections
 - iv. Vote
 - 1. 4-4-0
 - 2. Chair refuses to cast a vote; motion fails.
- 43. Affiliation Presentation
- 44. Recess
 - a. MA moves to recess until 1:30 PM CDT, 2nd by SW
 - i. No objections
- 45. Call to order at 1:30 PM CDT
- 46. Strategic Planning Presentation
 - a. Q&A
 - b. GL moves to adopt the NACURH Strategic Plan for implementation from 2015 through 2018.
 - i. 2nd by IA
 - ii. No objections
 - c. Vote: 8-0-0; motion carries
- 47. Recess
 - a. SW moves to recess for ten minutes, 2nd by NE
 - i. No objections
- 48. Call to order at 3:00 PM CDT
- 49. Legislation
 - a. SW moves to bring MM 15-45 to the floor; 2nd by MA



- b. Proponent speech
 - i. Consistency of language in bids; some awards included a statement of good academic and conduct standing, some did not. Instead of having them have a whole separate letter of good standing, the residence life letter could. Speaking to formatting changes, including adding one inch margins.
- c. Q&A
 - i. NE: Why did you go with one-inch margins?
 - 1. There are some delegates that do print out their bids. It's close to the standard margin setting since that is standard across platforms
 - ii. PA: Letter
 - iii. IA: In reference to letter of good standing with the DSA bid?
 - 1. During the time in which they were bid, they were in good standing.
 - iv. SA: A lot of time bids have boarders.
 - 1. The one inch margins
- d. Discussion
 - i. GL moves to recognize an amendment; 2nd by SW
 - 1. GL: It's not always possible to get letters from both. If you can't get one or another, your school is going to sign off anyway.
 - 2. IA: Agree; it could be difficult to get support from one or the other.
 - 3. PA: Especially in consideration of candidates going from one school to another, this is a good change. The open-endedness is important.
 - a. Amendment carries
 - ii. GL moves to recognize an amendment; 2nd by CA
 - 1. GL: We feel removing the one-inch margins; this could be a lot of space. Yes, it does get abused. We feel we should not be limiting someone's creative freedom.
 - 2. CA: We don't want to get to a point where we are over-legislating criteria
 - 3. NSRO: Some short of margin requirement is important to have. This would lead to a consistency of award bidding.
 - 4. IA: Agree with GL and CA; no one wants to pull out a ruler to measure.
 - a. Amendment carries
 - iii. GL moves to recognize an amendment; 2nd by IA
 - 1. GL: This was the initial intention we required earlier.
 - 2. MA: By getting a letter from residence life, this
 - 3. CA: This piece addresses two totally different things; I'm just. If we strike....
 - 4. CA calls the question
 - a. Amendment
 - iv. CA moves to table to authors to bring back before the end of pre-conference; 2nd by MA.
 - 1. No objections



- a. NIC moves to bring MM 15-56 to the floor; 2nd by SA
- b. We did more
- c. Discussion
 - i. PA: Want to thank George for his work in finding an appropriate laptop.
 - ii. GL calls the question; no objections
- d. Vote
 - i. 8-0-0; motion passes
- a. PA moves to bring MM 15-57 to the floor; 2nd by SW
- b. Proponent speech
 - i. Per the feedback of the room we made some changes. Now that the bar pin piece has passed, we would like to put it under the same policy. NACURH Executives will be the ones to award them. \$500.00 is good to get around 200 pins.
- c. Q&A
 - i. PA: Can you speak to the NAF setting the price?
 - 1. It's standardized for every pin.
 - ii. PA: How much is in the NSRO reserve
 - 1. We have enough to cover this.
- d. Discussion
 - i. PA: We are in full support of this piece.
 - ii. IA moves to caucus for five minutes; 2nd by GL.
 - 1. No objections
 - iii. SW: We are in full support. Conference staffs work really hard. It's important to recognize them.
 - iv. NSRO: We have about \$30,000.00 dollars in our checking.
 - v. Annual Conference; We would like to express our support of this piece.
 - vi. SA: We award this on the regional level. Often times, some institutions need to take a step back. They should be honored.
 - vii. NE moves to recognize the amendment; 2nd by SA
 - 1. NE: The NSRO holds NACURH Awards. We pay for the pins and award the pins. It's at a small cost for the organization. Given that it's a conference staff, it's going to be a small cost.
 - 2. CA: Striking this, we will not be remaining consistent. The policy says NACURH will purchase
 - 3. PA calls the question
 - a. Vote
 - i. 2-6-0; amendment fails
 - viii. SW calls the question
- e. Vote
 - i. 8-0-0; motion passes

51. Call to Order

52. Legislation

- a. CA moves to bring MM 15-74 to the floor; 2nd by MA



b. Proponent speech

- i. There is not going to be a price change. We have this unrealistic expectation about a partnership. We're getting a service that we are paying for. They already did come down in price. The first year that will come out of the reserves. I did have another idea that is a little out there. I am proposing that it's a viable option to put it in the annual conference budget. Including this in the budget isn't going to radically affect conference attendance. We do something similar in CAACURH with add-on fees. It's a good idea so as to not put it on the regions.

c. Q&A

i. GL: Do you see option two

1. I can see it more as being added as an expense rather than an add-on fee. Instead of splitting it, it's making it easier. Two years from now when it is split up, there's more managing involved. Because this is a service that is servicing NACURH, this c

ii. NSRO: As we're transitioning did you consider it being

1. Yes, because \$14,000 is a lot of money for a line item. Since we do budget a deficit, that may be unrealistic.

iii. MA: We do like the different options. Have you thought about a middle ground between the two? This service could provide a lot of service to those who attend the annual conference budget, but maybe the rest be divided up.

1. I think it's just going to get confusing. We're going to need to make it one or the other to transition. It's going to be paid for by the same people, the venue will just differ.

iv. PA: Have you considered increasing membership dues?

1. In the future that is something that could be considered. If we see that we are appreciating services like this in the future – changing those dues could be beneficial.

v. Discussion

1. NE: We really like the idea of having a recognized income. We fear the equitability of moving it to the annual conference. It's not fair to those schools that do attend when those others are not paying to use the service. PA raised a good question of increasing membership dues.
2. MA: Both of these options are going in the right direction. MA is a little concerned about putting it all on the annual conference. Most of the benefit will be outside the annual conference. Finding a middle ground would be beneficial.
3. NIC: We are at 399 affiliated schools.
4. CA: To clear this idea up of the annual conference paying for it. The only revenue the annual conference gets is member funds. The annual conference will not be paying for Blue Jeans. It will come back in the form of an excess.



5. NSRO: Definitely in support of it being a NACURH level expense. Have some reservations about it being in the annual conference budget, but do agree with CA.
6. IA: The conversation should be focused more on what we will be doing over the next year. If we are feeling comfortable with the \$14,000.00 coming out of the reserves, we should move forward with a vote. We can figure
7. PA: Size of the region does not equate to use of service.
8. IA: Appreciates the extra work. Thinking long term about our own region – for us, we can sustain it for a smaller region in crunching those numbers already. Thank you Melissa.
9. SW: Echo what IA has said. We are only focusing on this year. Also echo what was said before about size equating to use. We can see ourselves using this a lot. See it going into the annual conference budget.
10. MA: In responding to IA, we don't believe that all we're voting on is the next year. We need to be able to plan ahead to plan the future costs of this. We don't want to not figure out those details.
11. SA: We definitely appreciate the more work that was put in. We're not taking into the fact that all of the licenses are separate.
12. GL: Blue Jeans seems to be what we all prefer. We haven't seen other options. The expense is there. I would just like us to see more option. Spending almost 8% of the NACURH reserves, we need to assess where we are. We would be in favor of charging this to the next Executives to bring back
13. PA: We are in favor of looking at adding this to the membership fee. Echo GL.
14. SW: We have talked about other options. It was stated that the other options do not have the number capacity to hold what the regions would need to get the most out of this service. Taking that much out of the reserve is not one to be taken lightly, but we are in favor of testing it to see the benefit.
15. NE: Values the services Blue Jeans is offering. We feel it's on the high end. We would like to see more research on the piece. NACURH as a whole needs to investigate other options and present that to the boards as well.
16. GL: In doing some math, it's going to take more time to determine whether the affiliation fees
17. CA: It's much smarter and more responsible to take it out of an identified source of funding.
18. PA: What sets this service apart from other services. Is paying to have more than 12 video



19. IA: The other huge component of this it's cloud based. Looking at that, this has a lot of potential. We need to probably push this to be looked at the next few months.
20. CA: I've done the research. The conversation needs to be whether or not we need a video service or. I've already got them down \$5,000.00. We saw where NACURH is going in the strategic plan, we're not going to get there with 12 video streams.
21. GL: We understand that there is a lot of research behind this. But we should test more services. We assume this
22. GL moves to table this to a committee co-chaired by the Chairperson and the NAF, including all four Execs, with one person representing each from each region, office, and conference staff, with at least 4 finance officers, with a returned answer by Semis 2016.
 - a. 2nd by NE
 - b. CA: I think this would be difficult. The price has already been significantly reduced. We do not want to delay this negotiation. They are going to walk away and now give us this deal. We're about to burn a huge bridge if we go back and tell this company no.
 - c. NSRO: We are not in favor of this going to a committee. We think that it's very clear this has been thoroughly researched. We are in favor of this discussion, but we believe the information already exists.
 - d. Annual Conference: Recognize while there may be a deal lost, where this would go for us as building it into the budget. It's concerning that we were not approached about the potential to add this to the budget. Little costs tend to add up. We would like to have a better voice in this.
 - e. PA: We would like to see the benefit of the committee to find viable options for a long-term plan for payment.
 - f. NE: In addition to previous thoughts. We think this would be best to go to a committee. We don't have a contract in front of us. To take this step now without a contract or promise to ensure this rate, the money we are saving now could be gone in the next year. To take our time to make this decision would be in the best interest of NACURH.
 - g. IA: Considering the research, some organizations and corporations spend years researching services. We do want to make sure it is a good investment. We may not have immediate impact. We are torn. Years of research compared to months of research could be different.
 - h. MA: The biggest hiccup that we are experiencing is how to finance the second year. Will it go to the regions? The annual



conference budget? Is the \$14,000 worth the value we will be getting out of it. If after that we find that it doesn't work out. Sometime we need to take risks to achieve results. We spent \$10,000.00 to finally get our plan done to approve our strategic plan, which was approved. A committee would be good. We are torn. There has been a lot done to lower the costs. If we pass it right now, we just saved \$5,000.00 by making that decision. Plenty of research has been done on the actual product itself.

- i. CA: Based off of what MA said, we're talking about a motion to table. We should fail this motion to table. We should amend the original piece to approve it for the first year, and then utilize a committee to determine the second year.

- i. Vote

- 1. 2-5-1; amendment fails

23. CA moves to recognize the amendment; 2nd by SW

- a. CA: This is what I believe is the result of the discussion we've been having. Do a trial the first year, and determine next steps.
- b. MA: If we pass this, this would renew for the year for July 2016. That gives about 6 or 7 months to work to warn the regions about potential changes. We are not sure if that is enough time. Even if we put it into policy, we still have to get the money. It's a little worrisome. The timeline makes it a little complicated.
- c. NAF: Just to throw it out there. I just want to caution us that we don't think it wouldn't only be detrimental to the regions. It would be just as difficult for NACURH.
- d. PA: Would you be open to an amendment that will add a statement
- e. PA moves to amend; 2nd by NE
 - i. PA: Just to make it clear that if Blue Jeans is too expensive they can make that recommendation to the board.

- 1. Vote

- a. 8-0-0; amendment to amendment carries

- f. NE: This is a great compromise. It gives us the benefit of Melissa and the price she negotiated. This is something NACURH needs to prosper. This amendment also gives us the ability to evaluate it and provide additional software.

- g. SW calls the question; no objections

- i. Vote

- 1. 8-0-0; amendment carries

24. GL: We simply can't support this. When the presentation was given to us. We don't doubt the research was done, but we do not have that. We can't support an 8% hit to the reserves for a trial.



25. MA: We are torn. We see the benefit this will bring. After all the concerns that have been brought up regarding the timeline, we cannot support this piece as it is. It's not a sustainably financial piece.
26. SW: Torn; do see that it is a huge cost. However, we have said we need to change and adapt to the needs of NACURH. We think that it is something that is important to have. Setting up this committee gives us a buffer to make a decision that is fully researched after one year. While we are torn, we do believe this is something worth doing.
27. IA: I want us to consider the concerns coming from the outgoing and incoming NAF's. They are the stewards of NACURH's funds. Their perspective is important.
28. NSRO: We are in support of this piece in that it provides a NACURH level service. Businesses provide resources for the company to succeed. This is in line with that vision.
29. PA moves to caucus for three minutes; 2nd by IA
30. NE: NACURH's reserves grew to \$180,000.00 by not using that money. If we don't take this risk, how are we better serving our members. This aligns with the future goals of not only our region, but NACURH's Strategic Plan. We have set up a separate fund for special projects for risks we may want to take. We are a virtual organization
31. MA: We feel concerns could be alleviated pending a phone call from Melissa to our contact. We are making assumptions. We recommend we table this until that call is made.
32. CA: I know some concerns were brought up about using the reserves. The only money we are required to pay out of reserves is if the ADA drops. We have made significant excess over the last few years.
33. SW: After caucusing, the SW feels that everyone has decided what side of this they are on. I believe it' at least time to call the question.
34. MA: Blue Jeans is a business. If any conversation with them happens, it should happen soon.
35. GL: We shouldn't be depending conference excess. We don't believe that has any weight.
36. MA moves to table this piece to a later time to allow Melissa to call Blue Jeans; no second – motion will not be heard.
37. GL calls the question; no objections
 - a. Vote
 - i. 4-4-0; the motion fails

53. Recess

- a. GL moves to recess until the NACURH Recognition Ceremony; 2nd by SW.

54. Conference Walk Through

55. Awards Ceremony Practice

56. Recognition Ceremony

56. Legislation



- a. SW moves to bring MM 15-45 from the table, 2nd by SA
- b. Proponent speech
 - a. We worked to pull out the section that people had issues with and will be presenting that section at a later time once there is more of an opportunity to work on it. What remains is the rest of the piece which is largely good to go. We kept true to the intent of the piece with the beginning section.
- c. Q&A
- d. Discussion
 - a. MW – Yield to AD – This is a good thing to even put on the regional level. We had an issue in which we had a letter from a campus advisor but it did not include good standing. There isn't a reason to not have it.
 - b. Chair – This used to be one of the biggest hang-ups with award bids and a discussion was had to determine what is the actual definition of "good standing."
 - c. NSRO – This is a good level of verification. We are lucky at our host institution to have a Dean of Students who is aware of NACURH because she came up through housing, but not everyone is that lucky. "Good standing" can be ambiguous at times.
 - d. IA moves to caucus for 2 minutes. No objection.
 - e. CA – Upon reading minutes from Pre-Conference in 2013, the discussion was not very helpful. The Central Atlantic requires letters for this on the regional level, but "good standing" can mean different things at different institutions. If we want to implement this we need a better definition.
 - f. PA – Would the Author yield to a question? Yes –
 - i. Since we are student leaders, we have to bring
 - ii. Follow-up: Is it consistency in regards to each award, or to the NACURH level?
 - 1. Ultimately, we were given the title, so it's a mix to be honest.
 - g. SW – We like the idea behind this piece. We are student leaders, and part of that is being a student. We did have some reservation about the letter of support from a professional advisor or residence hall staff member and were wondering if there could be a friendly amendment that the bid could include that letter, rather than it being a separate letter. You can get a letter of good standing from the registrar.
 - h. NE – Yield to Director – This practice was recently adopted in the Northeast and we thought it was a good idea for emphasizing the "student" part of student leader. We didn't want to require an



entire page to a letter from a registrar because most bids are limited to 8 pages. A letter of good academic standing was a good compromise.

- i. CA – We think this needs more detail before it can be considered. Just because a residence life professional can provide a letter doesn't mean they have access to the information. Once we have a better definition established we can decide if this is valuable.
- j. IA – The Intermountain has a similar practice. Most bids require a letter of good standing that isn't necessarily a letter from the registrar. Similar to the Central Atlantic, how do we define good standing? Each university is different in their approaches to grades, conduct or judicial standing. It has good intentions to emphasize student leadership, but needs more work if we're striving for consistency.
- k. SW – I think it's a good idea to help our student leaders be more accountable to students, but there needs to be a more specific version of this piece presented in regards to the definition and page numbers.
- l. CA – Moves to table this piece back to the authors until Semis 2016. Seconded by SA.

i. Discussion:

- 1. IA – This will give the authors a chance to better discuss good standing and how we can apply it equitably throughout all of NACURH and our standards for awards.
- 2. PA – This could play into a larger discussion about award policies in general.
- 3. IA – Calls the question.

ii. Vote: 8-0-0 in favor tabling this piece to Semis 2016.

e. SA moves to recess, seconded by MA. No objections. 9:59pm.

57. Call to order May 22, 2015 at 8:00 AM CST

58. Roll Call

59. NACURH 2016 Host Site Selection

a. Process Overview

b. Presentations

i. University of Toledo

1. Q&A

- a. SW: Congrats on a bid well done. We really appreciate the accommodations you are willing to make for dietary restrictions.
 - i. Those would extend to pre-conference
- b. Annual: For regional breakout spaces, what is the largest size available?
 - i. There are a couple with 300 accommodations.



- c. If more than 300 people attend, how will you accommodate them?
 - i. That is something that we can determine based on registration numbers.
- d. NE: How will you identify
 - i. We will be utilizing individual committees to select programming based off of their expertise. For example, Diversity programs will be selected by our Cultural Ambassadors.
- e. CA: Can you elaborate on the ride share program?
 - i. There will be a link on the website. Students will click the link and will be able to see schools in their area with the schools contact information available
- f. PA: Can you talk more about your sponsorship?
 - i. We have letters out right now. All places that have connections with the University of Toledo. We are waiting to first find out if we are hosting before we solidify amounts.
- g. MA: Within NACURH, NRHH is an important aspect. Do you have any plans for incorporating it?
 - i. NRHH programming sessions; boardroom. We want to make sure they feel welcome.
- h. NSRO: Could you talk about your ADA accommodations for larger spaces.
 - i. All of our rooms are equipped with microphones, buses and residence halls are ADA accessible.
- i. Annual Conference: How do you plan on dealing with the peanut allergy
 - i. We will allow delegates to let us know ahead of time whether or not they have a peanut allergy. We will be accommodating those individuals by having them participate
- j. NE: In your bid you mentioned about the conference app. Can you speak more to that.
 - i. Our website will be fully compatible. We will be utilizing Guidebook. We will also be building an app.
- k. Annual Conference: You mentioned you will be doing training volunteers throughout the year.
 - i. We always have people available to implement training. We have a diverse staff. We would schedule one training in the Fall, and have one training per month leading up to the conference.
- l. NSRO: Can you expand on NSRO accommodations?



- i. There will be plenty of room around campus to set up shop. There will be a locked space available.
- m. SA: A lot of times delegates arrive early. What do your plans look like for
 - i. Dining accommodations will already be available. It will be \$20 a night.
- n. MA: Safety and security of delegates is most important. Can you walk us through the UT Alert service?
 - i. You send them an email, they add you in. Once the conference is over, you will be able to unsubscribe.
- o. PA: Could you elaborate on shuttles to and from the airport?
 - i. We would like schools who are flying in from Detroit to indicate on their registration when they will be arriving so we will be there as soon as you step off the plane. There will be an additional shuttle cost
- p. PA: Are those shuttles buses or vans?
 - i. Both – it depends on how many delegates you have.
- q. GL: It says in your bid, that you will determine your cap at Semis.
 - i. We could hold up to 3,000 delegates on campus. It could be lower due to construction – 8 to 9 per institution.
- r. Annual: What plans do you have if positions turnover?
 - i. Even though people have dropped off, we have an understanding that transition and mentoring needs to occur. If we get the conference, that will carry into the conference as well.
- s. Annual: How do you plan to make sure your conference team is not getting burnt out?
 - i. Breaks are nice. We need to focus on not pushing things off and waiting to do everything all at once. We want to be consistent in the work we are doing throughout the year. Taking advantage of our academic breaks.
- t. NE: If you win the bid, what do you foresee as your greatest challenge and how will you overcome it?
 - i. It would be the distance of our campus from our airport. Detroit is a beautiful airport. It's worth flying into there rather than not coming at all.
- u. MA: Can you talk about the advising team?
 - i. Our conference advisor is someone who is experienced in CAACURH and NACURH. They are all involved in residence life in some way and understand what undertaking this will look like.
- v. CA: How do you plan to build a great team dynamic?



- i. There will be retreats throughout the year. We will have team building opportunities. To do a conference like this, you need good team chemistry.
- w. NSRO: What is your favorite UT tradition you hope to share with delegates?
 - i. I love just walking around campus. Experiencing the campus is my favorite.
- x. MA: What was it that inspired you to bid?
 - i. NACURH 2013 – going into it, we didn’t know what to expect. It was my first conference. You learned to take it all in. My love for residence life grew from that experience. Which in turn, made me into a better leader. Not only that, it’s giving back to the University of Toledo. It’s underrated, and we want to share that experience with everyone.
- y. NE: You mentioned use of Twitter, Facebook, - how will you engage the students of NACURH?
 - i. Our plan is keeping everyone up to date for their arrival. We’ll be excited to post updates.
- z. MA:
 - aa. PA: Can you speak to your dining plans?
 - i. Breakfast will be 60 minutes each. Lunches and Dinners will be 90 minutes. There will be two shifts per meal.
 - bb. MA:
 - i. Because all delegates will be around academic spaces, we will be using
 - cc. CA: A lot of things don’t always go the way you’ll plan. How will you adapt when things won’t fit into your original vision?
 - i. Making sure we are prepared in advance for those things should they come up. We cannot be complacent with where we are at – we need to be thinking ahead.
 - dd. GL: How did you go about putting the bid together?
 - i. We have a large word document we compiled back in Novemeber. Our Marketing and Communication Department helped us to transfer that into the bid.
 - ee. Annual Conference: Why do you not have a late registration?
 - i. We will. It will be about two weeks after
 - ff. PA: Can you expand on your banking plans?
 - i. We are well partnered with Huntington Bank to handle all of our transactions
 - gg. SW: You mentioned that BBQ is a tradition. What will be done to ensure those with restrictions will be included in that tradition.
 - hh. IA: In terms of paying invoices, what



- i. Credit card information as well as checks
- ii. PA: Can you talk about your ability to accept international currencies?
 - i. That process would be handled more by the bank itself.
- jj. MA: You mentioned in your bid that parking will be free of charge to delegates. Where will delegates be able to park?
 - i. On the registration page, they will give their license plate to pa
- kk. SW: If you're going to ask for license plate numbers, we know a lot of people rent cars. We will ask for rental car information to update parking services.
- ll. NAF: What are your background in the organization?
 - i. We have all been involved in Residence Life. Everyone involved has been involved in. A lot of us are out of state students. We want to showcase our home.
- mm. NSRO: It seems an overarching trend is you have a lot of institutional support – how has this been key to your process?
 - i. It's amazing to feel the support from upper level administration.

2. Pro/Con

ii. University of New Mexico

1. Q&A

- a. NSRO: Can you speak about the leadership class?
 - i. Our student are receiving one to two credits to work on the conference. It's to help keep us accountable. NACURH is important to us.
- b. PA: Can you speak on the regional breakout spaces?
 - i. Most of the buildings are
- c. SW: Can you talk about how you are going to incorporate NRHH into the conference?
 - i. NRHH boardroom will occur
- d. NE: Can you talk about how you will solicit higher quality programming?
 - i. We are offering nanometers. We will be forming a programming committee to select the best programs possible. It will be up to the chair. They will meet weekly. They will sit down with advisors to ensure they select
- e. CA: Looking at the budget, you are only projecting \$600.00 for sponsorship. What other sponsors are you looking into?
 - i. They are waiting to finalize numbers if we awarded the bid.
- f. CA: Do you have a set goal of sponsorship you would like?
 - i. Not at the moment



- g. MA: What would you say is the one aspect you would want delegates to take away from the conference?
 - i. That they can transcend. To ensure they experience everything the conference has to offer.
- h. Annual Conference: Can you speak on the 16 world records?
 - i. The exact 16 we are hoping to break are not concrete. We've done our research and it is definitely an attainable goal. We can do this. It will be really cool for everyone involved.
- i. IA: What payment will you be accepting?
 - i. Check and credit card.
- j. SA: As you know, the delegates are coming in at various times throughout the arrival period. What accommodations will you have for those delegates who arrive early?
 - i. We would provide accommodations and meals would also be provided.
- k. SW: What is the largest capacity for breakout rooms
 - i. 700 – it should not be too big of a deal to fit the largest region.
- l. NSRO: What do your ADA accommodations look like in programming spaces?
 - i. We would provide those to. If those with ADA accommodations
- m. PA: What are your plans for accounts?
 - i. Do not have an answer for that.
- n. NE: Have you thought about the flow of dining to ensure every delegate has an opportunity to eat?
 - i. Two regions will be split up for dining. Food trucks will be available. We will be providing signage.
- o. Annual: Turnover is inevitable. What plans do you have to overcome this?
 - i. We have a lot of incoming freshmen. Our RHA and NRHH relationship is really strong. We are planning to take leaders from there.
- p. CA: How do you intend to build a really great team dynamic?
 - i. Our housing facility has a lot of amenities. We are planning to do conference staff bonding outside the budget of the conference.
- q. MA: Can you walk us through the advising aspect of your conference team?
 - i. Once we got support from our RHA Advisor, we got support from the department. Our advisors have been involved



- r. SW: How do you plan on transporting people for philanthropy?
 - i. We were planning to do schools that are near to our campus. We wanted to stay within the area. In order to keep costs down, we're
- s. SW: How do you plan to transport those with ADA needs?
- t. NIC: Hosting is a big endeavor – why do each of you want to host?
 - i. From the beginning of my time in RHA, I wanted to get involved.
 - ii. We are dedicated to utilizing our own experiences to better the experience of delegates.
 - iii. Being involved in IACURH has really helped me to develop. Marlene, our one advisor has been a huge inspiration. NACURH is a big family, and I want to be integrated into that.
 - iv. When you come to NACURH or a conference, you really feel at home.
 - v. Also wrapped up my first year. It's been a developmental experience and would like to continue that. I am very proud of everyone on our team and to see that continue.
 - vi. NSRO: What plans do you have for NSRO Store accommodations?
 - 1. We would put you into one of our lounges which would be
 - vii. Annual Conference: 2 keynotes instead of one?
 - 1. We wanted to bring back someone who has had experience and NACURH and show how their time in this organization has impacted him.
 - viii. PA: Could you elaborate on your shuttle system?
 - 1. We will use parking and transportation on campus. They are ADA accessible. They will be on a 10-15 minute schedule. Airport shuttles will be based on logistics.
 - ix. CA: How do you plan to adapt plans and be flexible?
 - 1. We can be really flexible – we have experienced a lot of transition this year. The people on our bid team are already flexible. Having the experience we have, we are prepared. We all know each other well enough to have a flexible working relationship.
 - x. MA: As student leaders, we sacrifice sleep and food. What are your plans to ensure a high level of self-care during the conference?



1. We are students first and people first. I will step in and tell them to take care of themselves. We need to have open communication.
- xi. NAF: You have a lot of love for NACURH. What has your involvement been
1. Attendance at IA and NACURH, resident advisor, RHA Executives, NCC-IT, NCC, first NACURH
- xii. Annual Conference: How do you plan to support volunteers?
1. We will have ten teams with volunteer leaders.
- xiii. NSRO: Could you talk about how social media will work?
1. We will make a Snapchat for NACURH 2016. All of the delegates can add us. For Tumblr, we wanted to do a blog for people who will want to host conferences in the future.
- xiv. PA: How do you plan to fight conference staff burnout?
1. Through the leadership class; it's a great step towards accountability. We're getting grades for doing NACURH. It's a great back up plan
- xv. Annual Conference: Why host NACURH, now?
1. I think we're ready. Our school is really in love with NACURH. We show it in our residence halls. We want to give back to NACURH. We love this organization so much. We've hosted conferences and regional executives and we are ready to host the annual conference.
- xvi. NSRO: What is your favorite tradition you want to share with delegates?
1. Balloon glow – it's a really pretty sight. It will be a great thing for delegates to experience.
 2. We have a very diverse university. We focused on that when we planned balloon glow. You can get a really great understanding of what our culture is like.
- xvii. NE: Having multiple residence halls, how do you plan to make delegates feel united?
1. Our housing is spaced really close together. It's easy to talk to people.
- xviii. MA: How will you ensure delegates remain hydrated throughout the conference?
1. We have water bottle fountains in every building.



- xix. Annual Conference: During the conference, not everything will go right – do you have contingency plans?
 - 1. We haven't set contracts in stone with entertainment. We have back up plans available such as swimming, the Cellar, a club house will games and pool tables.

- 2. Pro/Con

- iii. University of Delaware

- 1. Q&A

- a. SW: How are you planning to incorporate NRHH into conference?
 - i. NRHH is equally represented. Both organizations came together to host this conference. We have a chapter of 40-50 students.
- b. SW: How will you include NRHH specifically?
 - i. NRHH social, NRHH boardroom, NRHH hospitality room to encourage mingling. To incorporate students from every region.
- c. NE: The middle of June is hot, how will you keep delegates hydrated?
 - i. We have more than one water fountain in each building. All academic buildings are air conditioned and most residence halls are air-conditioned. We will also have sunscreen protection available.
- d. MA: Can you provide more information on your registration process?
 - i. The time in January is making the announcements regarding the price. The month in between when conference registration opens gives us the opportunity to clarify any questions schools may have.
- e. CA: Can you discuss your advising structure with us?
 - i. We have a pretty large conference team. We will be seeking more advisors. We have a plan in place to reach out to the new hall coordinators. We have 2 to 3 chairs
- f. NIC: You talked about transportation – for schools that drive, what does parking look like?
 - i. Everyone will park on south campus. We are going to try to use our buses once they are parked.
- g. Annual Conference: I noticed you all are doing conference confessionals. How do you plan to keep them positive?
 - i. We trust that the delegations would maintain a sense of positivity. Everyone will be able to view them online. Knowing this is something that will be shared, they will be



- screened. We trust delegates to represent their universities.
- h. PA: Can you elaborate on your regional breakout spaces?
 - i. Utilizing rooms that can fit upwards of 400. AV capabilities.
 - i. NSRO: What accommodations will be given for the NSRO?
 - i. You will be in our dining locations and we will be providing storage spaces.
 - j. SA: A lot of times, delegates arrive early. What do these accommodations look like?
 - i. We will be encouraging delegates to eat on Main Street. We have a wide variety of opportunities for them. Registration will take place similarly with just an additional fee.
 - k. PA: Can you tell us about your plan for banking?
 - i. Working with conference services closely. They have this all planned out in terms of banking. This will also pertain to international currency.
 - l. GL: Have you thought about alternate dates for notifying program presenters?
 - i. It's going to be dependent on when we get program submissions. We want to individualize this process. Those dates are what we're looking at, but we are flexible in accommodating.
 - m. IA: How solidified are your conference dates?
 - i. Committed. We understand other universities. The dates also give us full use of the conference weekend. Due to our academic schedule, we want to
 - n. Annual Conference: Can you speak to the transition between bid and conference chair and any staff turnover?
 - i. It's going to be an easy transition. We're already equipped because we've been working through this together. In terms of conference team, we do have co-chairs to supplement turnover. We had to even turn down conference team applications because people are so dedicated to it.
 - o. MA: If there could be one takeaway delegates could get from your conference, what would that be?
 - i. Empowerment – taking on that responsibility and what it means. Being a super student.
 - p. NSRO: Can you speak more to the video option for submitting programs?



- i. The 1-2 minute overview allows us to see what the program is about. Seeing where our presenters are at – we want to make sure they are empowered to offer the best programs possible. In the case a presenter is unable to submit a video, we are looking at alternatives to individualize the process.
- q. NSRO: Would you incorporate feedback into that process?
 - i. Yes; want it to be developmental.
- r. CA: Can you speak on your flexibility and adaptability?
 - i. Navigating a university of our size can be difficult. By working with conference services we are able to navigate this and overcome the challenges we face as far as logistics go. We bounce off of each other's ideas. Working together has brought us the most success in overcoming challenges.
- s. PA: Can you elaborate on your airport shuttle plan?
 - i. We'll be using a shuttle company that will be running on a continuous stream from the airports, to the residence halls, and back. Once we reach 100-200 people coming in to BWI, we'll be able to make that decision to provide shuttle service.
- t. NE: Could you take more about your carbon neutral goal?
 - i. With the \$2.25 we are donating to Carbon Clear is going to the operation of a facility that maintains a landfill. We want to show we're working hard to function this facility. Our carbon neutrality doesn't begin when delegates arrive. We are working with a consultant at a company to make these decisions. We have thoughts about using two buses that Delaware owns.
- u. Annual: How do you plan on preventing burnout?
 - i. We've all become friends. We've bonded. We're a larger institutions, but we feel very small. We have each others' backs and are there with each other. The support system we have with each other and our advisors is important to our success.
- v. NSRO: What is your favorite UD tradition you want to share with delegates?
 - i. Blue Hen Drag Show – it's a pillar of educational and social options. There is a lot of passion and collaboration behind it. It's always been about education. Working with Haven has been beneficial.
- w. Annual Conference: Decision between top 40 and top 10



- i. We are going to be offering multiple opportunities for feedback. When we do get to the top 10, we will be filming them to upload on the NACURH 2016 website.
- x. NSRO: How has your institutional support lead to your success?
 - i. So many people have helped us to take our ideas and make them a reality. They have been champions for us. It's a university initiative.
- y. PA: Would you each share your involvement?
 - i. Innovation Fellow, RHA member, RSA President, Leadership & Development Intern, Resident Assistant, NRHH President.

2. Pro/Con

c. Discussion

- i. NE: In regards to programming. Toledo had a great committee structure set-up for the selection of programs. We felt that UNM was sticking to the standard. They said they were forming committees, but there was nothing new. With UD, we had some concerns that were addressed when the question about the video was asked. There was potential if they did not present themselves the best. After hearing their response, the feedback process could be fruitful. Appreciate Toledo and UD's
- ii. MA: In regards to Toledo – we really appreciate they are offering a keynote that is not res life related as it could help a lot of our members. In their Q&A and for Pro/Con, it was brought up that they did not have late registration
- iii. SW: We really appreciated Toledo's committee selection for programming. In regards to dietary needs, we appreciated Toledo's commitment to making sure everyone has dietary needs met; looking at the menu, it's not diverse. Appreciated UD's options.
- iv. Annual Conference: Concerned with two keynote speakers for UNM and Delaware. Generally a keynote lasts a half hour to an hour. As a conference staff now, all of our conference staff has one advisor and an advisee. Delaware is concerning in that regard.
- v. PA: Appreciate UNM's social. Appreciated conference costs of UNM.
- vi. SW: Commend UNM's incorporation of state culture into conference.
- vii. CA: We definitely believe UNM is not prepared to host this conference. We appreciate their effort and them coming back to present again. The two contenders for us are Toledo and University of Delaware.
- viii. PA: Want to commend UD in their transparency of sponsorship. If they reach their goal, their conference will be comparable in price.
- ix. MA: In regards to UD – they said they went back to their campus to see each other defeated. Instead it was the exact opposite. Through the presentation it is evident that UD has risen above their disappointment from last year. They came back with passion that was not seen in the other two bids.



- x.NSRO: We would like to speak to the ADA accommodations. We appreciate UD's commitment to ADA accessibility. We also feel Toledo is equipped to meet delegates' needs.
- xi.CA: Looking at Toledo and UD – UD is committed to a holistic and developmental experience. They definitely provided innovative ideas of how they are going to give a unique experience to every delegate. We appreciate their commitment.
- xii.NE: One thing we are concerned of with Delaware. We felt there was a lot of new information presented to us in the presentation that wasn't included in the bid.
- xiii.SW: In regards to NE's point, while I do agree that it is difficult when there is new information, conferences tend to be fluid in the planning process. I did not mind getting the updated budget. The information they brought to us was beneficial. While it's difficult to process that information so quickly, it's beneficial to this decision.
- xiv.Annual: I'm concerned with UD's focus on sustainability in their case study.
- xv.MA: In responding to NE – I enjoyed they have been working on it so much, they wanted to give us the most up to date information possible. They really went above and beyond so that we be presented with the most accurate information.
- xvi.Chair: There are things at NDSU's conference that have changed since they bid. The host will work with the CRC. Determine within yourself if that is a lynch pin or a moving part.
- xvii. NSRO: We would like to speak to some of the non-traditional approach by UD and Toledo, we are confident this conference staff will offer a lot of useful information on feasibility during transition.
- xviii. NE: We would like to point out that Toledo had already devised a spirit point structure in which to guide the experience. So they can hit the ground running with that. They also had a scoring rubric for programming – they are thinking not only about the details from a planning perspective.
- xix. NIC: Like to thank all schools for focusing on sustainability – really want to commend Delaware on reducing the carbon footprint.
- xx. SW: In regards to sustainability. Appreciate Delaware, are concerned about making the carbon footprint
- xxi. GL: Would like to speak on a question we asked – we are concerned with Delaware that many schools won't be able to get notification for programs
- xxii. PA: Wanted to speak to Delaware – we saw that they focused on the delegate experience. Their strong relationship with conference services, they have the best plan
- xxiii. NSRO: We would like to speak to Toledo and UD's institutional support – it's a school effort. The conference will be in good hands.
- xxiv. SA: UNM and UD mentioned gender-inclusive housing whereas Toledo did not mention that.



- xxv. NE: Toledo did state gender-inclusive housing.
- xxvi. IA: In regards to UD, we think there are some interesting elements. Since the carbon neutral cost is included in the conference, it's not a fee that schools incurred. We appreciate their social for program presenters. Their presentation overall killed the other two.
- xxvii. CA: Agree that UD's presentation was fantastic. This was Toledo's first time presenting.
- xxviii. PA: Speaking to the later dates of Delaware – a lot of our schools are unable to participate in NACURH because of academic structure. It gives an advantage of those schools that has not been given in the past.
- xxix. CA moves for a five minute caucus; 2nd by MA
1. No objections
- xxx. NE: To put two years of your collegiate experience and not vote on it because of a date, that is unfair.
- xxxi. NSRO: We want to recognize the developmental perspective UNM has taken.
- xxxii. CA: Toledo and UD are both committed to hosting the conference. Delaware is prepared to host this. Since they bid last year, they had the logistics done, the way they have their conference set-up gives them the opportunity to focus on the delegate experience.
- xxxiii. PA: In support of Delaware; encourage conference staff to incorporate
- xxxiv. CA moves to vote; 2nd by SA
1. NSRO – not much discussion after caucus.
 - a. Vote on voting
 - i. 2-6-0; back into discussion
- xxxv. MA: We were really looking at the different aspects of each of the conferences: we really enjoy the dynamic UNM's entertainment will bring as it highlights the institution and the city. Found other aspects such as transportation better. In regards to Toledo, you can tell they were nervous – that should not be counted against them. You can still see their passion. Delaware's bid was by far, the best presented. They've had all this time to prepare for this one day – they have that direct experience which has benefitted them. We also looked at the costs. When Toledo initially gave us the presentation, they gave us projected sponsorship. With Delaware they gave guaranteed sponsorship. There are differences in the initial costs: there would be a \$20.00 difference if both reach their goals. Speaking on innovation, we love Toledo's ride share program. Toledo's philanthropy was the best in our opinion. With UD, we appreciate their presenter social.
- xxxvi. NE moves to extend time by 15 minutes; 2nd by MA
1. No objections
- xxxvii. IA: During the caucus, we looked at few elements. We came to the conclusion that UNM's bid did not surprise us with anything new. We believe



this is between Toledo and Delaware. We do not know where we stand in regards to costs and other items.

- xxxviii. PA: To give UNM some additional feedback – they have a great opportunity to rebid. The major concern was the lack of specificity in logistics.
- xxxix. CA: Whoever gave the con for Delaware for consistency could elaborate?
1. NE: When it came down to it, it came down to what was presented in the bid to what was presented in the presentation. Enjoyed Toledo’s timely consideration of detail. Having all the details in the presentation being backed up by the bid. Ideas of innovation should be well thought out and planned and put in the bid. That was where that came from and why we felt more strongly that Toledo’s bid was more consistent.
- xl. GL: Touch on the point that two of the members from UD are leaving. Those individuals are leaving. We would have rather seen members from UD giving that opportunity to others.
- xli. MA: To make a point about UNM – while they didn’t have the most concrete answers. They may not have been able to bring as many chairs who would have known the answers. The individuals present may not have been privy to that information.
- xlii. PA: The element of transition for UD was a concern for us as well. Which they have addressed and demonstrated a plan. With it being a finals week – their ability to bring the new chairs may not have been an option.
- xliii. CA moves to discover the top two candidates for the NACURH 2016 Host Site; 2nd by GL
1. No objections.
 - a. Top Two
 - i. University of Toledo
 - ii. University of Delaware
- xliv. NSRO: We are in support of both schools that have the team, drive, and ability to host. We appreciate the innovation and consistency of UD and appreciate the student buy-in for Toledo.
- xlv. PA: Encourage the ex-officio members of the board to let us know what your thoughts are.
- xlvi. SW: Did any of these candidates reach out to you?
1. Annual Conference: Yes. Toledo’s conference chair and NBD liaison.
 2. CRC: We actually ask that the schools bidding not reach out to the Annual Conference host since they should be focused on hosting the conference. They are provided other resources to help them. This is included on the application.
- xlvii. IA: Both the schools could host. We think that there are innovative elements in both bids and presentations. Toledo is willing to give a try to electronic waivers. If we were to make a decision, we would lean more towards to Toledo.
- xlviii. NIC: Programming would do really well at both conferences. For UD, we like how they are going to film the top 10 and post them on the website.



xlix. CA: Speaking in regards to Delaware, they are trying to give an individualized experience. The idea of a presenter's social is going to go a long way for students. They want delegates to have an intimate experience. We think Delaware has the most potential to give delegates a new experience.

l. NE moves to vote; 2nd by PA

1. MA objects – three minute caucus before voting.

d. Vote

i. A majority has been reached and the conference host will be announced at Closing Ceremonies

60. Recess

a. SA moves to recess until 3PM CDT; 2nd by NIC

i. No objections

61. ACUHO-I Presentation

62. Recess

a. MA moves to recess until later; 2nd by GL

i. No objections

Sunday, May 24th, 2015

63. Passage of Regional Charters

a. GL moves to bring the Central Atlantic Charter to the floor; 2nd by SA

i. Proponent

1. CA: We made more changes in addition to the required changes; added conference chairs as official members; added references to policy.

ii. Discussion

1. IA: We are enthralled for CA.

2. NE calls the question; no objections

iii. Vote

1. 8-0-0

b. CA moves to bring the Great Lakes Charter to the floor; 2nd by SA

i. Proponent

1. Made appropriate changes.

ii. Discussion

1. IA: The GL is basic and didn't add anything else than what they were supposed to.

2. IA calls the question; no objections

iii. Vote

1. 8-0-0

c. NE moves to bring the Intermountain Charter to the floor; 2nd by SA

i. Proponent

1. IA: Also added the NRHH Advisor to charter and reference of Directorship.

ii. Discussion



1. GL: We think this is innovative of the IA region.
2. NIC calls the question; no objections
- iii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0
- d. SW moves to bring the Midwest Charter to the floor; 2nd by GL
 - i. Proponent
 1. MA: Reflected changes; including conference chairs as members of the board. Updated voting procedures regarding quorum – to include physical and virtual presence.
 - ii. Discussion
 1. NE calls the question; no objections
 - iii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0
- e. SW moves to bring the North East Charter to the floor; 2nd by NSRO
 - i. Proponent
 1. NE: Discovered the Coordinating Officers and NACURH Board of Directors changes.
 - ii. Discussion
 1. IA: NE made some great discoveries.
 2. SW calls the question; no objections
 - iii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0
- f. NE moves to bring the Pacific Charter to the floor; 2nd by SW
 - i. Proponent
 1. PA: Changed national to NACURH.
 - ii. Discussion
 - iii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0
- g. SW moves to bring the South Atlantic Charter to the floor; 2nd by NE
 - i. Proponent
 1. SA: Reflected changes as directed.
 - ii. Discussion
 1. NE: Let's do it.
 2. MA: Ditto.
 3. PA calls the question; no objections
 - iii. Vote
 1. 8-0-0
- h. MA moves to bring the Southwest Charter to the floor; 2nd by SA
 - i. Proponent
 1. SW: Same changes as everyone else.
 - ii. Discussion
 1. NE calls the question; no objections
 - iii. Vote



1. 8-0-0

66. Adjournment

i. CA moves to adjourn the 2015 Annual Business Meeting

i. 2nd by IA

ii. No objections

1. The 2015 Annual Business Meeting is adjourned at 10:25 AM.

