



NACURH INC.

2015 CORPORATE BUSINESS MEETING
NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY
MAY 23 - 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 Secretary:

Andy Sokolich
Central Atlantic Affiliate AD-AF

Saturday, May 23rd, 2015

1. Call to order at 8:20 AM CDT
2. Roll Call – 220 present; quorum has been met.
3. Parliamentary Procedure Session - Nathan Tack, NACURH Parliamentarian
4. Approval of Corporate 2015 Agenda
 - a. Truman State University moves to approve the NACURH 2014 Corporate Business Meeting Minutes
 - i. 2nd by University of Houston
 - ii.No objections
5. Approval of [Corporate 2014 Minutes](#)
 - i. No changes
 - ii.No objections
6. Reports
 - a. Overview of 2014-2015 NBD Legislation - Danielle Melidona, NAA
 - b. Overview of 2014-2015 NNB Legislation - Bri Gomez, NAN
 - c. NIC Report - Ethan Schwarten, NIC Director
 - d. NSRO Report - Megan Corder, NSRO Director
 - e. ACUHO-I (Professional Partner) - Tom Ellett, ACUHO-I President
 - f. NACURH Strategic Plan
7. Legislation Preparation
8. NACURH Business Meeting - Kenneth J. Hughes, NACURH Chairperson
9. Budget Update - Kat Roemer, NAF
10. Recess
 - a. University of Northern Colorado moves to recess until 8:15 AM on Sunday, May 24;
 - i. 2nd by Oakland University
 - ii.No objections



Sunday, May 24th, 2015

1. Call to order at 8:15 AM CDT
2. Roll Call - NIC
3. Reports
 - a. OCM Report (Corporate Partner)
 - i. Q&A
4. Legislation
 - a. [MM 15-A: NBD Title Change](#)
 - i. Authors: Jacob Crosetto, GLACURH ADAF; Nathan Tack, IACURH Director; Danielle Melidona, NAA
 - ii. SUNY New Paltz moves to bring MM 15-A to the floor; 2nd by Louisiana State University
 1. No objections
 - iii. Proponent Speech
 1. Essentially, this piece moves NACURH away from a student organization to a student corporation and how we refer to entities within the corporation as a whole. It changes references from "National Board of Directors" to "NACURH Board of Directors." We did not find any multinational corporations with a reference to "national" in the title; they just use their company's name. We believe that NACURH is more inclusive than "national" which will make our corporation more inclusive to affiliates from around the world.
 - iv. Q&A
 1. No questions.
 - v. Discussion
 1. Humboldt State University moves to amend the third whereas statement to strike "there/their/they're."
 - a. This is a grammatical change that does not require an amendment.
 2. Texas State University moves to strike the second whereas statement because it does not fit in with the intent of this piece. Changing the name of the NACURH Board of Directors doesn't negate the fact that the word National is still within the title, but Texas State University is in support of this piece.



3. University of Georgia: This piece of legislation furthers the work that we do in our residence halls by moving toward inclusivity.
 4. University of Texas at Austin moves to end discussion, seconded by University of Northern Iowa. No objections.
- vi. Vote
1. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and MM 15-A passes.
- b. [MM 15-C: Perpetuity of NACURH](#)
- i. Author: Kenneth J. Hughes, NACURH Chairperson
 - ii. American University moves to bring 15-C to the floor, 2nd by Northern Illinois University.
 1. No objections.
 - iii. Proponent Speech
 1. If you are every bored at night and want to fall asleep, we have the Articles of Incorporation on the website. The Articles reference the date that NACURH was incorporated in 1971 set to a limit of 50 years. This piece intends to amend the Articles of Incorporation to ensure the perpetuity of NACURH without a finite time limit.
 - iv. Q&A
 1. University of Louisville: Will this change cause any slow down or set back within the NACURH offices?
 - a. I could process this online right now with the State of Oklahoma's Secretary of State.
 2. DePauw University: Are we missing opportunities if we don't reincorporate, rather than just extend it?
 - a. We would have to choose a state to reincorporate in and seek non-profit status again, which we already have. We would be losing out on this if we had to reincorporate, but nothing else will slow us down or set us back if we were to reincorporate at this time.
 3. Clemson University: Why are we incorporated in Oklahoma?
 - a. In 1971 when NACURH was incorporated, it was incorporated in Oklahoma because of the NACURH leadership at that time. If you go to the address on the Articles, it is for a building that no longer exists. We simply need a physical address to receive mail, and Oklahoma is very friendly to nonprofits.

4. University of Illinois – Springfield: Why did we only incorporate for 50 years?
 - a. We don't have historical perspective specifically, but it may have been because Oklahoma limited a corporation to 50 years.
 5. University of Mississippi: moves to end Question & Answer, seconded by Baylor University. No objections.
- v. Discussion
1. SUNY Geneseo: feels that NACURH is all about growth and extending it perpetually allows for more opportunities for growth and removes limitation.
 2. Arkansas State University: believes in everything NACURH stands for and would hate to see it end.
 3. Texas State University: supports passing this legislation because the time to apply for nonprofit status takes two to twelve months, and if delayed could affect future conferences and retention rates. Passing this piece will be beneficial for our future.
 4. Eastern Michigan University: sees no positive outcome to allowing the end of NACURH.
 5. University of Georgia calls the question; no objections.
- vi. Vote
1. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it, and MM 15-C passes.
- c. [MM 15-B: Small/Large School Distinction](#)
- i. Author: NACURH Policy Review Commission
 - ii. South Dakota State University moves to bring 15-B to the floor; 2nd by University of West Georgia.
 1. No objections
 - iii. Proponent Speech
 1. We chose to bring this piece up because the services we offer are not exclusive to the size of the school. Every institution has equal access to service. In looking at the distinction, are primary. No cut off is sufficient for distinguishing between small and large schools. RHA budget isn't necessarily continual on how large or small the school is. RHA attendance and NRHH membership vary across institution size. With the move, everyone will be paying the same amount. For the 2015-2016-affiliation year, this will



remain the same. During the 2016-2017-affiliation year, the amount will change.

iv. Q&A

1. Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts: Why was there a distinction in the first place?
 - a. It's because when NACURH first began, the leadership may have seen smaller schools not having the resources to contend with a large school. When examining this, it does not impede small schools. It could also encourage small schools to get involved.
2. University of Houston: When it comes to the amount for each school, would we meet somewhere in the middle?
 - a. Since a large portion of NACURH's membership are large schools, we will be converting to the large school fee.
3. Eastern Michigan: If you were to separate small and large school? How would
 - a. There can still be a second or third place winners for those awards it affects
4. Webster University: How much more small schools will need to pay?
 - a. The difference in price is \$25.00.
5. New York University: Would it not be more prudent to have schools pay a percentage of their RHA budget?
 - a. We believe schools should have the right to not disclose their budgets.
6. Rutgers University - New Brunswick: What exactly would be impacted by the removal of small schools?
 - a. As far as awards go, it will be one large award. Scholarships will be two generic overall awards for NACURH to apply for. We are just getting rid of that delineation.
7. University of Idaho: Is this in any way to threaten the empowerment of small schools?
 - a. Everyone has the same representation – one vote, one voice. In our policy, this makes it more equitable. Delegation caps affect everyone the same.
8. University of Central Florida: How will this impact our finances and our non-profit status?



- a. In terms of the non-profit status, it will remain the same. With the extra \$25.00, it would add some to our income, but it would not affect our status.
9. University of Oregon: What does NACURH plan to do with the increase in revenue?
 - a. NACURH is always looking for new streams of revenue. It helps us to be significant. There would be 60 schools - \$2,100.00 It's not a huge amount, but it is helpful. It would help to balance out our deficit.
10. Georgia Institute of Technology: Could you give us some idea of research on small school budgets?
 - a. During the 2012-2013 affiliation, the concept of budget came up a lot – there is a varying disparity. We did not discuss any census data. Through our communication with some schools, they found that their move-in numbers were depend
11. University of Louisville moves to extend Q&A by 5 minutes; 2nd by San Diego State University
 - a. No objections
12. Arizona State Poly: We would like to know what the budgets are from the institutions the authors represent?
 - a. My undergraduate institution had an on campus population of 1,200, but a considerably larger budget.
 - b. Nevada Reno – 2,600 residents – budget is \$35,000 - \$40,000
 - c. Buffalo – 7,000 residents - \$67,000 budget
13. Washington University of St. Louis: What would the on-campus capacity number need to be to set the boundary at 50% large schools and 50% small schools?
 - a. Not much census data. We could not find a number that would be equitable. Being at a large school just over the small school line. There would always be a group of schools...
14. University of Alaska – Anchorage: Speaking from a small school with a small budget; how would it not
 - a. For the annual conference scholarship we select based on need – taking budget into consideration
15. UNC Wilmington: Since this legislation has the possibility of discouraging small schools from affiliating, what plans for reaching out are there?



- a. If everyone has access to equal services, everyone should be paying the same. We don't feel that small schools are less powerful at all.
 16. Southwest Minnesota State moves to extend Q&A by 5 minutes; 2nd by Boise State University
 - a. No objections
 17. Texas State: Can you elaborate between the pros and cons of the non-existent distinction?
 - a. Pros: because how we function, there will be no distinction when it comes to access of materials and services – you're all buying into the same thing. Streamlining affiliation – it will definitely help.
 - b. Cons: we heard a lot about the \$25.00 difference. Another challenge is explaining the change and provides support and outreach.
 18. The Ohio State University: Could you please clarify the number of small schools in NACURH?
 - a. The current number: there are 60 small schools.
 19. Arizona State University West: What was the process of increasing the fee to a large school cost?
 - a. Since the majority of the corporation is large schools, we felt that it would be important to not affect the majority of member schools.
- v. Discussion
1. NAF: Point of Information – it would be \$1,500.00. If we met somewhere in the middle, it would significantly decrease our member dues line, impacting the corporation.
 2. Washington University of St. Louis: Would like to draw attention to what is currently in the policy. All schools pay a fee, there is a reduced fee. If we think about it that way, there is a distinction between members. We think this is beneficial to NACURH – being more inclusive.
 3. UT Austin: While the distinction between awards and scholarships is a good thing – changing the price may hinder our ability to affiliate more schools in the future.
 4. California State University - Monterrey Bay: In full support of this piece. School size has no bearing on who can have access to resources NACURH provides.
 5. University of Georgia: Support the piece – remember we are here to make a decision. Do not be repetitive.



6. University of Central Florida: In it's current state – this piece should be tabled and the authors should look to the strategic plan and reconsider the proposed changes.
7. Saginaw Valley State University: Small and Large school distinction can feel limiting.
8. SUNY New Paltz: In full support; as a school right on the line – an increase of \$25.00 is not a big deal. Removing. Not defined by our size, we are defined by our performance. We have the full opportunity to participate.
9. Webster: We are in full opposition due to what small schools can accomplish. Small schools should not be exploited. Our budget is only \$7,600.00 for the whole year. With only \$3,800.00 per semester, the \$25.00 does make a difference.
10. University of Illinois - Springfield: In full support of this piece – we are also in a unique position. This would benefit us. We would
11. Fort Hays State University: Earlier a point was made about 50% - please realize this also impacts the NACURH budget.
12. Brigham Young University: Smaller schools generally have smaller budgets – most are unable to bring more delegates to conferences. Making this change could impact the experience of our students.
13. University of Houston: Because there was not a clear consensus made, this should be tabled until more information can be presented.
14. University of Houston moves to extend discussion by five minutes; 2nd by Adelphi University
 - a. Humboldt State University objects: We feel the conversation is going in circles and the same discussion is taking place – WE believe we should end discussion
 - i. Vote on Objection
 1. A two-thirds majority has not been reached; we will move back into discussion
15. Saint Louis University: Believe smaller schools do not necessarily necessitate a budget. Another option is adding additional scholarships for members to apply for.
16. University of Connecticut: Feels the money received from small schools should be put towards another scholarship.



17. ASU-Tempe: Feels that removing the distinction is not putting schools down; 1,000 bed spaces is an arbitrary number. We believe removing the distinction makes NACURH a more inclusive environment for all members.
18. Georgia Institute of Technology: We feel that size is the best indicator of ability to pay. Those schools whom this may affect, probably are not able to afford to go to NACURH and therefore, are not represented in this room.
19. Florida Atlantic University - Boca: With no census data, there is not enough information to make a good decision either way.
20. University of Massachusetts: While we may be equal, our budgets are not. It may be better to determine distinction based on percentage of budget.
21. Grand Valley State University: We are in support of this piece; regardless of distinction, all schools have access to the same resources.
22. Appalachian State University: We are in favor. We have found the OCM fundraising helpful to us attending conferences and encourage others to find appropriate fundraising sources as well.
23. University of Iowa: There is plenty of potential for other budgetary initiatives. The pros outweigh the cons.
24. University of Alaska - Anchorage moves to extend discussion by five minutes; 2nd by Winthrop University
 - a. Objection by Arkansas State University – we have been going in circles – this should be voted on.
 - i. Vote on Objection
 1. In the opinion of the Chair, time will not be extended by five minutes.
25. University of Louisville moves to table this piece indefinitely back to the authors; 2nd by Western Illinois University
 - a. Discussion on Motion to Table
 - i. Southwest Minnesota State University – Point of Information: What is the time frame for this?
 1. We would have another full year with the distinction. Then the fee would be made the same. During FY 2016-2017, regions would receive more money.



- ii. American University: This motion should not be tabled – this is an important piece and should be voted upon immediately.
 - iii. University of Illinois - Springfield: We are against tabling; the authors have spent a lot of time on this. The time is now to vote on this.
 - iv. University of Alaska - Anchorage: Do not agree with tabling; believe this should be dealt with now.
 - v. University of Southern Mississippi calls the question.
 - 1. St. Cloud State University – believe we have not heard both sides of the motion.
 - a. Vote
 - i. 189-25-0; motion passes
 - b. Vote on the motion to table back to the authors
 - i. 46-164-0; motion fails
 - 26. University of Arizona moves to vote on MM 15-B; 2nd by American University
 - a. University of Idaho dissents
 - b. Vote on whether to consider this piece as a whole
 - i. 186-28-1; motion passes and will be voted upon
 - vi. Vote
 - 1. 154-59-3; MM 15-B passes
5. Recess
 - a. American University moves to recess for ten minutes; 2nd by University of Wyoming
 - i. No objections
6. 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
- 8. Call to Order at 10:33 AM CDT
- 9. Executive Host School Acknowledgement
 - a. Daniel Ocampo, NACURH Advisor - University of the Pacific
 - b. Christina Aichele, Conference Resource Consultant - University of Wisconsin - Whitewater
 - c. Brianna Gomez, NACURH Associate for NRHH - Northern Arizona University
 - d. Kat Roemer, NACURH Associate for Finance - Brigham Young University
 - e. Danielle Melidona, NACURH Associate for Administration - The Pennsylvania State University
 - f. Kenneth J. Hughes, NACURH Chairperson - Ball State University
- 10. Recess
 - a. Coastal Carolina moves to recess until Closing Ceremonies; 2nd by University of Guelph
 - i. No objections
- 11. Signing of Regional Charters
 - a. Central Atlantic Affiliate - Melissa Lourie, Director
 - b. Great Lakes Affiliate - Andrew Haugen, Director
 - c. Intermountain Affiliate - Nathan Tack, Director
 - d. Midwest Affiliate - Samuel Wagner, Director
 - e. Northeast Affiliate - Nicholas Chen, Director



- f. Pacific Affiliate - Dani Hall, Director
 - g. South Atlantic Affiliate - Kaley Van Zile, Director
 - h. Southwest Affiliate - Ian Giese, ADAF & Molly McKinstry, Director-Elect
12. Gold Pin Presentation
- a. Lydia Batchelor, Outgoing NACURH Chairperson
 - b. Brianna Gomez, NACURH Associate for NRHH
 - c. Kat Roemer, NACURH Associate for Finance
 - d. Danielle Melidona, NACURH Associate for Administration
 - e. Megan Corder, NSRO Director
 - f. Nick Chen, North East Regional Director
 - g. Adam Schwartz, ART Coordinator
 - h. Beth Sutton, Annual Conference Chair
13. Announcements
14. Adjournment
- a. North Dakota State University moves to close business for the NACURH 2015 Annual Conference; 2nd by University of Delaware.
 - i. No objections

