



NACURH INC.

2017 SEMI ANNUAL BUSINESS
MEETING
PURDUE UNIVERSITY
JANUARY 3-8, 2017

Presiding Officer:

Shannon Mulqueen
NACURH Chairperson

Minutes Prepared By:

Emily Braught
NACURH Associate for Administration

Parliamentarian:

George Papp McLellan
NACURH Corporate Office at Kent State University Director

Recording Secretary:

Luke Habib
Northeast Affiliate ADAF

Tuesday, January 3rd, 2017

- I. Call to Order at 4:26 PM
- II. Oath of Office for the NACURH Associate for Administration and the NACURH Associate for Finance
- III. Board-Driven Expectations
 - A. Give members new to semis room to grow
 - B. Don't use "I statements" use "X Region/Office believes". Come to a consensus as a directorship
 - C. Refrain from passing notes during presentations
 - D. Speak as if you're representing your region/entity not yourself
 - E. Moves to recess by CA, 2nd by GL
 1. No objections
- IV. Call to order 6:05 PM EST
- V. Executive Update & Strategic Plan Presentation
 - A. Q&A
 1. SA NRHH: If we end up finishing strategic plan year 2, would we go on to year 3? Or just hold off and talk about year 3 and see if there are things to add?
 - a) We will move on to year 3. Some things cannot be changed before the start of year 3, but those than can we will begin. Strategic planning is consuming so it would be good to start on year 3.
- VI. NSPA Assessment Workshop
 - A. What did you notice?
 1. MA: Transparency. We have been worried about this too.
 2. PA: Working on resources was common.
 3. SA: Some elements regarding operation that help to contribute to the mission that we didn't cover.
 4. CA: Conferences weren't noted often.
 5. NCO Kent: Everything we listed was covered by the mission statement, even if we didn't know it.
 - B. Purpose:
 1. PA: Why we are affiliated? Representing NACURH values.
 2. IA: Had a few things that couldn't connect, because they felt a lot bigger. Perspective about what we are doing



3. SA: Mission statement is the primary purpose of an organization. Need to focus based around that.
4. IA: Need to recall the mission of NACURH so that we can promote it
5. MA: Interesting how time gets sucked into things that don't appear in the mission. Need to reallocate time better
6. NAA: Least used, most concern; .if you can't connect these things back, are they worth our time?
7. NE: We have most of our lines coming out of one section. Thinking more holistically, provide equal dedications to all aspects of the mission statement.
8. SA AD: Some of the things that went up about weaknesses, our boards are actively trying to change things.
9. MA: We get discouraged sometimes about least used resources because we see them as aligned with the mission but members don't want to use them
10. SA: We need to take our regions and reevaluate our vision based on NACURH's vision. Need to look at the goals from bids.
11. MA: Need to take more time looking at the NACURH mission statement. We think things are important, but affiliated schools bought into the mission statement. We need to meet our promises.
12. NCO Kent: We need to allocate our time to things we are concerned about.

C. NSPA Data Presentation

D. 10 minute recess

1. GL moves; seconded by CA
 - a) No objections

VII. Call to order 9:20 PM EST

VIII. Legislation

A. NBD 17-08

1. NE moves to bring NBD 17-08 to the floor; 2nd by MA
 - a) No objections
2. NE moves to waive the reading; 2nd by the SA
 - a) No objections
3. Proponent Speech
 - a) We need to have ground to stand on pertaining to ethical behaviour within NACURH. This legitimizes us as a corporation, follows our strategic plan, creates an accountability measure.



There are many internal and external benefits. Affirms our values and mission and states our principles; helps with conduct. Can become a benchmark - gives us something to measure against. Central guide for internal decisions. Helps up externally with compliance and marketing. Gives us some risk protection because we demonstrate good faith that our org will follow these tenets. This comes from the virtual conference discussions about this. We took your feedback and based on ACUHO-I practices, as well as various corporations, we developed this.

4. Q&A

a) SW: How do you plan to hold all leaders of NACURH accountable to this?

(1) A: We will talk about this more later as well .We don't always hold people accountable all the time. We don't want to police people, but we want to use these policies if a situation arises. To compare to 48 hour response time, we wouldn't police this harshly, but could use this if there are other issues at play. We expect that people abide by these, but when the situation calls we can go back to this

b) IA: To clarify, on the pledge piece, does that include conference staff members, or will that change later on. Who takes this pledge?

(1) A: It will not include conference staff. If NACURH Leadership enters policy, it will be inclusive of that.

c) SA: How do points 2 and 5 relate to ethics?

(1) A: For number 5, using assessments for the advancement of our members demonstrates that we are doing our due diligence to advance the corporation. We want to be able to show that what we are doing is actually helpful. For number 2, there are times when we can't identify when something happens that's unethical, but we know that it is. Though it's not more specific, we want people to connect their values with NACURH.

d) MA: Yield to AD - You mentioned that you've made edits based on the virtual conference, can you expand on how you took our feedback?

(1) A: First, when we presented this it was a conversation of what you would like to see and what you felt about the statements at the time. We took those comments into consideration, and struck a lot of the more specific statements (very pointed statements in favor of a broad ideal). We then added a few based on similar corporations and aspirational corporations (Apple) - understanding some of their policies and why they have them. Then we went back through to read how each thing followed ethically rather than as a to-do list. An old copy should be available in the virtual conference folder

e) SA moves to end; seconded by CA

(1) No objections

5. Discussion

a) GL: Feels this is important that our corporation needs to adopt. Will help steer leadership towards brighter future

b) CA: Feels that while this is extremely important step, there is concern around the term of "ethics" versus positional responsibilities, however it doesn't capture the moral/ethical view of the corporation, but don't feel the piece should fail on that basis

c) PA: Feels that having this statement is a great addition to the corporation. Shows values. We do feel that there are certain aspects that are lacking that are important to be reflected, such as transparency and inclusivity. They might be lightly addressed, but should be explicit statements.

d) NCO Lincoln: May we amend the third line of proposed changes "through" two times

e) SA: Believes that the incorporation of a pledge prior to adopting a position is good for the corporation

f) NE: Appreciates incorporation of feedback on members of NACURH Leadership

g) MA: We support this piece, but would appreciate more time to go over this. We haven't been able to review this since the virtual conference and how our feedback was taken.

h) MA moves to end table to be heard on Friday the 6th of January by the end of business; 2nd by CA



- (1) Dissent from NE - Time allotted to review piece was the same given to all pieces. Will we just table everything that we haven't decided on yet even though it's been available for a reasonable amount of time
- (2) Second not rescinded.
- (3) 4-4-0
 - (a) NAF/Chair against table
- i) SA: Calls previous question
 - (1) Dissent from PA - There is need for more discussion, if there was a suggestion to table. Those who wanted more discussion lose that.
 - (2) SA withdraws
- j) PA moves to caucus for 5 minutes; 2nd by NE
 - (1) No objections
- k) NE: The Northeast feels that this piece is a strong step in the right direction of our corporation. The northeast stresses that this statement is malleable and can be revisited at will, should the need or desire arise. At this time, this is the most appropriate ethics statement that we could enact and will prove to create a structured measure of accountability for NACURH leadership
- l) MA: we see value in having this statement. Our reservations lie in the sense that the content included is not exhaustive of a code of ethics. With that we do not see that as a reason to fail the piece. There is no one amendment to achieve what we want, so this is the best we have at this time.
- m) CA moves to amend by adding "Operate under methods informed by our constituents" under point 5 ; seconded by MA
 - (1) No Dissent
 - (2) CA feels that we should have a statement that shows how we act as a corporation. We want to move from expectations to actual ethical statements
 - (3) Q&A
 - (a) SA moves to end; seconded by MA
 - (i) Dissent from NE - I have a question
 - (ii) Motion and second rescinded



(b) NE: You reference the importance of using assessments properly, does this amendment still support that?

(i) A: Yes and no because we wrote what we intended but this makes us more free. It is a more sweeping statement and there is certainly more than one method to make informed decisions about constituents.

(c) GL moves to end; seconded by MA

(i) No objections

(4) Discussion

(a) GL: As previously stated, this makes it less how and more what we should be following to do those things

(b) SA: This amendment allows the piece to focus more on ethics.

(c) GL calls

(i) No objections

(5) Vote

(a) 8-0-0; amendment passes

n) NCO Kent: We feel that an ethics statement is a fancy way to say what is good and bad. This talks about good behavior. Getting into semantics moves away from the point, this is clear and works for the organization.

o) SA: We see that as the piece now reads, it focuses much more on equity and inclusion, in support of the NACURH mission

p) PA moves to strike the 8th line; no second.

q) GL calls

(1) No objections

6. Vote

a) 8-0-0

b) Motion carries

B. NBD 17-25

1. SA moves; seconded by NE

2. CA moves to waive; seconded by SW

3. Proponent speech



- a) We have talked a lot about accountability. Being a student run corporation, there is a lot of risk and reward and generally a lot going on all of the time. We carry an intense obligation and our accountability process does not reflect that. It is very informal and ends up being removal or nothing. This puts into policy a formal process relating to accountability.

4. Q&A

- a) SA: Do the authors feel as though a timeline should be included?
 - (1) A: All pieces go into effect at the end of Semis
 - (2) SA: I mean a follow up time for the officer in question
 - (a) A: Yes that would be useful and I would accept an amendment
- b) NE: Will a preferred template for an accountability report from NACURH execs be provided?
 - (1) A: Yes;
 - (a) Chairperson pulls up report sample
- c) SW: In section two number three, does that include leadership and NACURH executives?
 - (1) A: Yes
- d) SA moves to end; seconded by MA
 - (1) No objections

5. Discussion

- a) NE: appreciates this piece. Objectives it accomplishes are long overdue
- b) SA moves to amend "A follow up meeting must be scheduled within a 48-hour period with the individual in question. The follow up meeting must be conducted within two weeks of the initial contact with the individual in question.
- c) During the follow up meeting, the regional agent and individual in question would be charged with creating an individualized improvement plan for the individual in question."
 - (1) seconded by NE
 - (2) No objections
 - (3) Proponent speech:
 - (a) In order to best foster accountability within NACURH leadership, we have to set a timeline.



This seems like a reasonable timeline for this process.

(4) Q&A:

(a) GL: Is the 48 hour time period to contact and have a meeting too restrictive?

(i) A: It's not in policy yet, but looking at the 48 time period I would be willing to hear an amendment for that.

(b) Kent: What happens after two weeks?

(i) With this, there is no follow up. There is nothing to state that a report can be done and there must be follow up. Now there is the ability to a discussion and actions to take place.

(ii) Kent: so at the end of the two week period there would be another meeting to ensure changes have been made?

(a) Yes

(c) Ca moves; seconded by MA

(i) No objections

(5) Discussion

(a) CA: Time requirement is too quick. Timeline of 2 weeks is unnecessary because this is the first infraction. This would be more appropriate later.

(b) NE moves to amend to replace the word completed with the word scheduled; seconded by GL

(i) No objections

(ii) Proponent speech

(a) This amendment honors the 48 hour response time that we want to adopt, but does not expect the unrealistic notion that a meeting could be scheduled and had within 48 hours

(iii) Q&A



- (a) Kent moves to end; seconded by GL
 - (i) No objections
- (iv) Discussion
 - (a) SA: Feel that this change allows for more realistic expectations of our boards
 - (b) Kent calls
 - (i) No objection
- (v) Vote
 - (a) 8-0-0
 - (b) Amendment passes
- (c) MA moves to amend; no second
- (d) IA moves to caucus for 2 minutes; seconded GL
 - (i) No objections
- (e) IA: We are conflicted about the amendment. There are multiple individuals involved in the accountability process and we have faith that follow up will occur. 48 hours makes us nervous because some people simply cannot do this. We want to explain that there are multiple people in this process to follow up and restricting the timeline for follow up may make it less effective
- (f) SA: Due to a high rate of turnover in SA this year, we feel that this amendment is necessary for follow up of all involved.
- (g) PA: We want to echo the concerns of IA with the timeline. It is restrictive and makes us uneasy. If there was a conflict between members that needs to be addressed, 48 hours may not be enough to cool off and come back with a level mind. If there are personal issues, 2 days won't resolve that. If someone isn't on email for 2 days (or if email response is an issue in general), 2 days won't yield a response. Similarly, the 2 weeks to fix behavior is hard considering not even another regional chat



happens. You won't see improvement in certain things with this timeline.

- (h) CA: it's important to have a timeline because in professional settings these timelines are necessary. This amendment is too specific, though. We shouldn't be policing policy, we should be managing situations on a case-by-case basis.
- (i) PA: We are also worried that at the end of the two week period, what happens if corrections haven't been made.
- (j) MA: We echo CA. This piece would benefit from having a deadline, but we are concerned that there isn't a timeline within which the meeting must occur. There also aren't clear expectations of the 2 week period.
- (k) NCO Kent moves to vote; seconded by NE.

(6) Vote

(a) 2-6-0

(i) Amendment fails

- d) NE: We want to stress the essential need for an accountability timeline. We have had people removed based on accountability and a timeline was needed for the continued success of the region.
- e) Conf Chair: In this piece, NACURH leadership is used, is this in reference to the other piece up for discussion this week?
 - (1) A: NACURH leadership is used in the policy book and if that changes, so will this piece.
- f) PA: We feel that a timeline is important to ensure accountability is held, but with the variety of case-by-case situations. If a timeline suggestion were put in here, we would rather it say that a timeline be developed rather than us develop a comprehensive one.
- g) CA moves to amend seconded by MA
 - (1) Proponent



- (a) CA: There is a need for a specific timeline. We want to allow for the creation of an improvement plan.
- (2) Q&A
 - (a) GL moves to end; seconded by MA
 - (i) No objections
- (3) Discussion
 - (a) GL: Feels this is a well balanced amendment. Takes into perspective a need for a timeline, but makes it breathable for regions that cannot fall within a strict timeline.
 - (b) SA: This is a happy medium that grants regions autonomy and expediency in solving issues
 - (c) IA: NRHH - There are some violations of duties that may not be fixable, such as missing a conference deadline that isn't relevant until the next conference.
 - (d) NCO Kent: It's a good amendment, but seems minor in the grand scheme. It's important to think of the overall context.
 - (e) SW calls
 - (i) No dissent
- (4) Vote
 - (a) 6-2-0
 - (i) Amendment passes
- h) CA: NRHH - What if multiple reports are submitted for the same infraction? How can we be sure that this will still be treated as one infraction?
 - (1) A: There are no plans for this with the intent of not over legislating. Situations that require accountability reports are conducted in shades of grey and I want to allow for that.
 - i) SA: Believes that at the discretion of the NACURH executives, separate issues would remain separate and that one issue would remain that.
 - j) NE calls
 - (1) No objections



6. Vote
 - a) 8-0-0
 - (1) Motion carries
- C. CA moves to bring NBD 17-19 to the floor, seconded by SA
 1. No objections
 2. NE moves to waive the reading; second SW
 3. Proponent Speech
 - a) This is accountability for financial issues pertaining to all signatories. The process for accountability in finances in the NACURH policy book is messy. This piece splits things up that need to be to make the financial policies more clear as well as developing an accountability process for signatories. We want to clearly establish a plan of action if responsibilities are not fulfilled. The NAF will decide based on various factors if an AD AF has been doing their due diligence before moving forward with this evaluation. The formal notice of the evaluation is if we decide to move forward and can let the advisor know, who may have more access or experience discussing these things with their student. This also allows the individual in question to see what they are being held accountable for. We also feel that if someone is removed from an account, they also should be removed from their position, but this was not clear before. The language was intentionally changed so that these things happen at the discretion of the NAF in collaboration with the NACURH advisor or Accountant because each situation is different and needs to be treated as such. This will allow action as deemed appropriate for the situation.
 4. Q&A
 - a) CA: Why is the CRC notified in the event of the evaluation?
 - (1) A: The CRC is on all of the NACURH accounts as well. This also creates an extra person on the process.
 - b) IA: Does this process outlined here currently affect the regional advisors as well as they are accountable for finances?
 - (1) A: Yes, the language includes all account signatories. Some regions have NRHH advisors that are also signatories, and others don't; it is comprehensive language.



- c) NCO Kent moves to end, second by GL
 - (1) No dissent
 - 5. Discussion
 - a) SA: is in support of this piece; by creating a very strong system of accountability for all account signatories
 - b) IA: AD - Finances are a high risk for NACURH, and we appreciate this piece as it develops the accountability process and updates verbiage to be inclusive of all signatories.
 - c) GL calls to question, no dissent
 - 6. Vote 8-0-0
 - a) Motion carries
- D. NBD 17-20
- 1. NE moves; seconded by MA
 - a) No objections
 - 2. SW moves to waive; seconded by NE
 - a) No objections
 - 3. Proponent
 - a) On behalf of the NACURH Executive Committee, in the spirit of expectations and accountability, we should create equal standards across the corporation. Especially given the fact that the NCO has these expectations in policy already, we should hold all of NACURH accountable for this so that we can adequately and fairly hold NCO accountable for it.
 - 4. Q&A
 - a) SW: Would this take into account federal and religious holidays?
 - (1) A: With automatic responses this could be covered, but as far as equity is concerned we wouldn't hold it against them
 - b) NE: Automatic responder counts in this?
 - (1) A: Yes
 - c) GL moves to end; seconded by MA
 - (1) No objections
 - 5. Discussion
 - a) MA: Supports this piece as an organization that communicates a lot virtually, this is a good standard to uphold across NACURH leadership.



- b) SA: Supports this. Holds all entities of NACURH to the same standards
 - c) NE calls the question, no objections
 - 6. Vote 7-1-0
 - a) Motion carries
- E. SW moves to recess until tomorrow at 8 AM; seconded by SA
 - 1. No objections.

Wednesday, January 4th, 2017

- I. Call to Order at 8:10 AM
- II. Roll Call
- III. CRC Election
 - A. GL nominates Christina Aichele, seconded nd by NE
 - 1. MA moves to close, seconded by CA
 - a) No objections
 - B. Expectations
 - 1. NE moves to close; seconded by SA
 - a) No objections
 - C. Presentation
 - D. Q&A
 - 1. IA: Is there anything you didn't get to that you'd like to share with us?
 - a) Serving as a resource to the corporation (FLSA, etc). We don't know what that looks like for everybody and I'm willing and able to continue those.
 - b) Beyond that, we have two more advisor transitions coming up (next year and the year after). Seeing how those processes go and having seen the positions grow, being able to support her advising peers will be great.
 - c) Transitioning into one branch of the NACURH Corporate Office, history and background to how we arrived there will be really important.
 - d) Finally, why I want to do this: conferences are the first people experience with NACURH. It's interesting to me to think about how it starts with one experience, one weekend, not even 48 hours and now you are all sitting here. For most of you, it's

because you went to your first conference. I like being a part of that process and being able to support that

2. MA: Yield to redundancy.
3. SA: What are the goals for continuing relationship with ACUHO-I?
 - a) That's a new role, a newly stated role. It was just put into effect at the end of the last affiliation year. This is primarily program of the year, but in working with the Execs and the Boards, I would want to define stronger things outside of POY. In addition, POY is currently not always well attended at ACUHO-I; how can we make it more advertisable, and more marketable. Our agreement with ACUHO-I hasn't been looked at recently either, likely will start there.
4. CA: You talked a little bit about transition of conference chairs; how would you that with the NACURH Leadership incorporation?
 - a) NACURH Leadership retreat is not the place perhaps, however likely a virtual training makes sense. It would be first an individual conference with each region and then adding basic functions like conference finances and guidebook. Spend some time with them; what is their role and how do we help them.
5. IA: Could you expand on goal of hosting regional meetings for conference chair and advisor and what that would look like?
 - a) NE moves to extend time, GL seconds
 - b) A: That's something I have always offered; one meeting in the fall and one in the spring. Conference chairs don't have opportunities to connect with one another. Its just a chance for them to come together and interact, to network and bounce ideas back and forth. It always covers guidebook and wrap up report. There is an opportunity for them to ask questions and work comparatively
6. GL: Can you discuss improving transition process of regional advisor position? Expand?
 - a) A: Conference training for regional advisors is not really an expectation; this should be added to regional advisors expectations. I didn't receive a training as an advisor and I saw the need for it. Timing has been difficult; currently our window for that is during the annual conference. Regional Advisors are being pulled in many ways with their boards, which means there

isn't much time. We try to continue over the summer, but would like to focus on developing one time for some more indepth training.

7. SW: Appreciative of time and thought put into the bid - what new personal/professional experiences could you gain from return to this position?
 - a) No two days have been alike the last four years. You don't always know what is going to happen/ I'm looking forward to that difference, it will keep me on my toes. The added responsibility of ACUHO-I will be a new professional opportunity together, not only for the CRC, but also for all of us. Having been through a strategic planning process, looking forward to the next one as well.
8. NE: Great job so far, what obstacles do you see being prominent for someone serving as the CRC?
 - a) A: Depending on what happens with FLSA, that could have a huge impact on this role and our conferences. Depending on which institutions/staffing structures we have for hosting our conferences. How feasible is it going to be to continue operate the way we've been operating. There are a lot of unknowns, but I'm ready.
9. MA moves to extend by 5 minutes, second by NE
 - a) No objections
10. GL: Can you briefly discuss your time commitments from 2017-2020?
 - a) A: 3 years is hard project, plans to stay connected with professional organizations but take no leadership roles, she has a job.
11. SW: Conference chairs are part of regional board for some regions; how do you plan to support those chairs in different ways with their added responsibilities?
 - a) A: This looks different for each region so I would like to more in depth look into that, however most of that will come from Directors based on what functionality of your board
12. CA moves to exhaust speakers least, second by SA
13. MA: Appreciates the accessibility goal; how will you work with each region to work on that guide?

- a) Tailor pieces to each region. Everything will be there for the region to use and implement; continue to review the guides and making sure it fits each different region's conference structures.

E. Discussion

1. SA: believes that Christina has the skills and experience to succeed and improve NACURH as the CRC
2. GL: The Great Lakes is in full support of the selection of Christina Aichele as the CRC for the 2017-2020 term. She brings a wealth of knowledge and experience to the position, which will help provide continuity for NACURH as well as helping to expand reach as an organization. Her goals in regards to support conference hosts and regional advisors, expanding our relationship with ACUHO-I, and overall commitment to providing ample time to position are what truly sets her apart for reclaiming her role as CRC.
3. MA: echoes previous points. Wealth of experience will help her with her current goals in her bid and presentation
4. SA: appreciates attention to the NBD and NNB
5. Annual Conference: feels that christina as the CRC brings incredible knowledge base about conference happens. Good role model for professionalism, detail oriented mind to assist annual conference, especially if they don't understand the scope.
6. NCO Kent: feels forethought to the office restructuring is beneficial and appreciates that connection and focus and demonstrates knowledge of NACURH structure and ability to aid in
7. MA: appreciates that christina has goal sot recognize importance of conference chairs and increase their transition/involvement
8. SA NRHH: Appreciates the thought of recognizing the NRHH and NACURH strategic plans
9. NE: appreciates christina's willingness to go behind the prescription of the position and the ability to fill a need when the opportunity is seen
10. SW: echoes previous thoughts; experience and knowledge to expand the position, develop more personally/professionally within the next term.
11. PA: appreciates the goals to improve conference transition process and feels that christina has the most experienced to accomplish goals within the term

12. MA: appreciates goals on accessibility, especially to personalization of each region
13. Sa: appreciates the interest of christina in connecting conference staffs from all regions
14. GL: echoes sharing equal time between NBD and NNB as that's an important factor as maintaining strong coalitions
15. SW moves to end, 2nd by NCO Kent
 - a) No objections
16. Christina Aichele is selected as incoming NACURH CRC

- F. GL Moves to groove for 7 minutes, 2nd by IA
 1. No objections

IV. MA moves to bring 17-06 to the floor

- A. SA moves to waive all readings for all pieces until the end of Semis, second by NE

1. MA objects
2. NE rescinds, motion dies

- B. SA moves to waive reading, 2nd by Midwest

- C. Proponent Speech: This piece puts practice into policy; we have expectations from contracts and Memorandums of Understanding, but these things are left out of policy. We are looking for an addition that is broad enough that we can accommodate for the future

D. Q&A

1. SA: Could you give an example of an additional compensated delegate?
 - a) A: OCM comes to all regional leadership conferences and there are rooms allotted in the contract, but not consistently is this found in NACURH policy. We abide by the contracts, but not per policy. If we're using the policy book as a resource, we need to include this.
2. IA: Can you elaborate on whether having these additional individuals covered significantly increased delegate cost potentially?
 - a) A: it's already the current practice, so this isn't going to raise anything as of now
3. NE moves to end, second by CA
 - a) No objections

E. Discussion

1. CA: CA feels that this piece would be good for the future and the direction the corporation is moving

2. NE: NE feels that this is basically putting practice into policy in a sustainable way that can move with the corporation as partners grow and change
3. NCO Kent moves to end, second by SW
 - a) No objections

F. Vote: 8-0-0;

1. Motion carries

V. NBD 17-07

A. CA moves to bring 17-07 to the floor, second by NE

1. MA moves to waive the reading, second by GL
 - a) No objections

B. Proponent Speech:

1. There is currently a disconnect between add-on fee funds and conference excess. We would like to lower the amount of conference excess to the ADA fund. This aligns policy more consistently across the board.

C. Q&A

1. NCO Lincoln: Why did you choose to send all of it over 3,000?
 - a) A: In the event that ADA meets or exceeds \$3,000, then things would be reallocated; ADA accounts either goes through the fee or through the excess, so our ADA account is well above what is needed, so we aren't anticipating adding it the next two affiliation years
2. SA: Can you elaborate on section three, subsection E, Point 1: It seems to contradict section 19, 5, B. Can you elaborate on those contradictions?
 - a) A: In section three, that is what happens if the fund meets or exceeds \$3000. This is saying it must contribute that until the ADA fund reaches \$3000.
3. PA: Can you elaborate on what the ADA compliance fund is utilized for?
 - a) Utilized for funding the ADA account and regional ADA account. The ADA add on fee in budgets is there in the case that we need to come up for more funding if a delegate, advisor needs accommodation. It's easier charging a little each time than to spend a large amount at one singular time so that we always have money in order to assist those who may need it. Some

years, we don't spend any money from this fund. The fund is large and we likely wouldn't use it all in one chunk.

4. SA: recognizing the contradiction previously asked about, If the ADA compliance fee exceeds 3,000 is it reallocated to the conference staff or put in the ADA account
 - a) It depends. If a conference excess occurs, 10% would go to an ADA fund. In the instance that an ADA account meets or exceeds, then we would reallocate. The fund must be contributed to until the ADA fund gets to 3,000
 - (1) Follow Up: If the ADA compliance fund doesn't exceed, is 10% allocated or 25%?
 - (a) A: 10%
5. PA: for the ADA add on fee, those funds go to the ADA compliance line item?
 - a) A: if you budget FY 18 with an anticipation of increasing that savings account, then there would be a recommendation to add a line item in the regional budgets that would be an add-on fee. It operates more as a savings account to be utilized when necessary.
 - (1) Follow Up: This is for the annual conference specifically?
6. NCO UNL: In the instance that the ADA account is less than 3,000 but that 10% allocation would put it over, would a calculation to make it exact happen, or is more within that 10% okay?
 - a) It would be 10% no matter what; the purpose of the fee is those expenses
7. IA: Would this policy be expected for regional conference if approved?
 - a) A: This is written primarily for the annual conferences, so no. Regions have different practices for regional conferences.
8. NE: Does this at all change how NACURH practices regarding excess policies and ADA fund?
 - a) It changes how NACURH approaches excess and the ADA fund. Some things didn't really make sense; we don't want to have a percentage in there that doesn't allow us to divert funds in other ways. We don't always need excess to go to this fund. We rely on the two different revenue streams.
 - (1) Follow Up: The 10% for the ADA compliance was in the ADA section, but not in the excess section?

(a) A: No, instead of allocating 25%, it would be 10%. It wasn't included in the conference excess and only in the ADA fund policy so it used to be 125% of the excess would be allocated and that doesn't make sense.

9. PA: For how much you are receiving in the ADA add on, then the number of the delegates times the add on fee would not be sufficient for covering the fund?

a) This is an extra buffer in case we need it and ensures we are almost always at the threshold. We might make enough in the add on fee, but this gives us the insurance to know we always have enough money. This is a worst case scenario if we took out all of the money for some type of situation

(1) Follow Up Q: So you won't always charge the add on fee?

10. NCO Kent moves to end, second by CA

a) No objects

D. Discussion

1. GL: is in support of 17-07 as it ensures that all numbers align in policy, as well as ensures we can fund the ADA fee which helps to uphold equity within NACURH

2. CA: emphasis this is about conference excess not ADA fund and is in full support of the piece

3. NCO Kent calls the question

a) no dissent

VI. IA moves to split boardroom to NBD and NNB, 2nd by NCO UNL

A. No objections

VII. SA moves to bring NBD 17-12 to the floor, SW seconds

A. No objects

B. SA moves to waive all readings unless someone request, second by GL

1. No objections

C. Proponent Speech:

1. We appreciated UDel's wrap up report because it had a summary for the feedback in a one page response. They provided recommendations within the context of the feedback and raw data provided. Having a formative response and recommendations based on feedback can help future conference staffs apply feedback where appropriate. This also

gives the NBD and opportunity to provide feedback that would not be covered in the general conference feedback. The focus group would be chaired by CRC and facilitated by Chair. Questions would be created by the CRC. We don't need policy-required assessment, but this gives further assessment. It's not just another form. It also gives the NBD a way to talk more in depth about your and your region's' experiences and can help to set the tone for the rest of the year with a slight but necessary conversation

D. Q&A

1. IA: This focus group is the newly elected NBD?
 - a) A: Yes
 - b) IA: Will there be input from past officers?
 - (1) A: It's hard to require past people to come back for something like this, but we could ask them to come back. We can only hold current NBD members accountable.
2. NE: If it's put in as an expectation of a position to attend this, would their position truly end if they had to attend this focus group after the conference?
 - a) A: Yes, but people are done when they're done. To put these requirements in, it makes it much more difficult. There is importance to their feedback. We have talked about bringing in past exec teams to talk about wrap up conversations because we felt uncomfortable making decisions and statements without that input. It's an interesting place. There is value, but I'm not sure we can get it.
3. MA: Would you want COs to be a part of this process?
 - a) A: Yes, but then it becomes a focus group of 50 people, which is not a focus group.
4. Kent moves to end; second from IA
 - a) No objections

E. Discussion

1. MA moves to amend to make the focus group consist of NACURH Boards, rather than just NBD; deemed friendly
2. IA: Only concern is that not everyone that is newly elected was previously on the board and not definitely have attended conference. We are running under the assumption that all individuals were in

attendance, but not everyone experienced pre conference ahead of time and couldn't provide feedback on that

3. NCO-Kent: We are in support of this, but recognize IA's concern. The feedback that this will consist of will pertain to the 3 day conference not preconference. This will focus on the actual events of the conference, which hopefully everyone will have attended
4. SA: We are in support of this piece. Adding to the wrap up report will help future bid teams preparing for NACURH conferences
5. MA: In support because it will inform assessment driven decisions in the organization
6. GL calls the question
 - a) No objections

F. Vote

1. 8-0-0
2. NBD 17-12 carries

VIII. GL moves to bring 17-13 to the floor, 2nd by SW

A. No objections

B. Proponent Speech

1. This is to address the conference scholarship policy in the policy book. The outgoing conference staff can apply for a scholarship for their RHA. Policy states that we have to give \$5000 and from there the excess is split per policy. Making the policy "up to" \$5000 allows us to take different things into consideration and make an appropriate decision. The inclusion of the Past Chair in this decision removes any uncomfortable decisions on the new execs who may not have all of the context. The advisors were also involved, but their work with the annual conference is different from the other execs. Having a max of \$5000 makes sense because all or nothing can hurt NACURH at the end of the day.

IX. Q&A

A. NE: In the circumstance where the scholarship is significantly decreased compared to the \$5000 max, would rationale be made available?

1. We've talked about it too in terms of how we might want to break it down. We've considered tiered breakdowns either by percent or a number. Tiers could be impacted by subjectivity; how do we justify a rubric, especially if institutions, policies, exec bias can come into play

- B. IA: Are conference staffs encouraged to reach this dollar amount in this excess?
 - 1. We're not going to encourage conference staff to produce an excess, but they are putting in a lot of work, hosting Semis and the annual conference, so we feel like it is necessary to include it. If they look at policy and talk to Christina, they should know the benefits. They shouldn't be trying to gouge money from NACURH, because they shouldn't forget why they're doing this. This is a gift from NACURH for the work they've done to keep them affiliated.
- C. SA: What is the typical annual conference excess?
 - 1. NDSU had over 45,000
 - 2. Delaware had 11,000
 - 3. Unsure of Eau Claire and Pitt off hand
 - 4. Multiple variations of how excess can happen
- D. IA moves to end, second by NCO Kent
 - 1. No objections

X. Discussion

- A. SA: The South Atlantic is concerned about this policy as a whole that this is an incentive for schools to have excess and as a nonprofit corporation we are looking for funds to be spent in a way that is best for our schools
- B. CA: We are not voting on if we are having a scholarship, but how we give out the scholarship
- C. MA: Echoes the Central Atlantic; We stand in support of the changes, specifically from a financial perspective to allow for conference excess to be allocated more responsibility and appreciate the Past Chair
- D. NE: Echoes sentiments of CA and MA and appreciates the accountability to the host institution and implies a push towards excellence
- E. PA: The Pacific has some concern with including the past chairperson as an additional evaluator in this process because it was our understanding that the past chair offers guidance and perspective instead of being a voting member.
- F. GL: Echoes previous sentiments of support and appreciates inclusion of past chair as it adds increase accountability to conference staff
- G. NCO Kent: NCO Kent is echoing the sentiment of PACURH while we are in support of the piece overall , would like to caution the boards of inclusion of the past chair too frequently
- H. CA: We want to highlight that the past chairperson is directly stated to help close out actions of the past year, which is what this is.

- I. GL calls the question, no objections
- J. Vote
 - 1. 8-0-0
 - 2. Motion carries
- XI. CA moves to bring NBD 17-28 to the floor; second from SA
 - A. No objections
 - B. Proponent:
 - 1. Finance officers are well aware of transfers out, but we have to get Guidebook allocations approved by the board. We actually pay 13,000+, but some comes from NACURH and NCO, which is why this is only \$8300 in total.
 - C. Q&A
 - 1. CA moves to end, seconded by SA
 - a) No objections
 - D. Discussion
 - 1. NE calls the question, no objections
 - E. Vote
 - 1. 8-0-0
 - 2. Motion carries
- XII. MA moves to bring 17-21 to the floor
 - A. Proponent Speech
 - 1. For this piece, we came together to take a critical look at Swaps, which are not currently in policy. NACURH supports swaps and many participate. This piece is two fold; working to define what swaps are as well as who funds them. We value the in which swap selection has been selected; the process falls to the chairperson, but the selection falls to each region. Underneath of the finances, it affirms the perspective that it would inequitable if some are afforded to swap when some are not
 - B. Q&A
 - 1. PA: For Title 13, Section 5, Item 2, where it says that no NACURH/ Regional funding will be used for what exactly?
 - a) Registration is covered in swaps for compensated delegate. Conference related expenses could be a meals, so anything related to traveling
 - (1) Follow Up Q: Can you please redefine in a different way?
 - (a) A if the language is concerning, we can limit to only travel expenses, but we wanted to be clear

that nothing such as meals, boardroom buddies, and such would not be included

2. IA: Could you explain your rationale behind when you chose 21 days prior to the start of the regional conference and do you think that would be limiting for travel arrangements?
 - a) This is representative of timelines that have been practiced the past two years
 - b) We recognize it's not within the 28 policy, but really this hasn't been practiced. It would be ideal to do it earlier, but because of the way the processes have fallen, it could allow for some lenience
3. SA: have you spoken to the region that covers the conference expenses?
 - a) Don't want to speak on their behalf.
4. SW: Do you think this piece will exclude anyone who isn't financially supported by anyone who cannot afford them and their host institution will not either?
 - a) We aren't changing what does happen in practice. Realistically, swaps are extra and not required of you to do your job. Money that could be doing other things is going to paying for swaps. Swaps are a cool initiative but are not required.
5. NE: Do you not believe that swaps is ever used as a basis for leverage in an election or forming relationships or showing commitment to NACURH. Do you believe that swaps are truly extra?
 - a) It's a personal development if you are using it as leverage in an election, its a directly beneficial to the person in an election
 - b) A commitment to NACURH is still a personal reason
6. NCO Kent moves to end Q&A, second by IA
 - a) No objections

C. Discussion

1. NCO Kent: The 28 day travel policy is for flights booked through NACURH, then the 28 wouldn't apply to flights booked for personal travel
2. IA: moves to formally amend the piece to state "The NACURH conference swap selection process must conclude at least twenty one (21) days prior to the close of the first regional conference registration" Rather than "The NACURH conference swap selection process must

conclude at least twenty one (21) days prior to the close of the first regional conference registration start of the first regional conference.”

a) 2nd by NE

b) No objections

(1) Proponent Speech:

(a) registration based versus conference based.

Complicated if there are conferences at different times. To allow swaps to decide and book travel in a more consistent manner.

(2) Q&A:

(a) NCO moves to end, 2nd by SA

(i) No objections

(3) Discussion:

(a) NE calls the question, no objection

(i) Vote

(a) 8-0-0

(i) Amendment carries

3. NE: As the region who funds swaps, NEACURH would like to provide additional clarification. There is a Swap scholarship for anyone who has been accepted to a swap. Current practice is that a percentage based award would be provided for. The percentage based system makes it equitable for their board.
4. NE: There are sustainable ways for regions or NACURH to fund swaps. We appreciate that this piece adds purpose/definition to regional swaps, but believe that this piece inequitably restricts the swap opportunity to those who can personally or through host institutions finance this opportunity.
5. SW: The Southwest includes a lot of different people/different backgrounds. We currently do not have this kind of scholarship and we appreciate the time and thought in the piece, but if this piece is passed, it would prevent us from giving this kind of opportunity
6. SA: SA agrees with all changes except for the financial pieces. Recognizes benefit in hosting and sending. It benefits the region to provide swap finance information.
7. NAF: From the NACURH perspective, swapping is not a right, it's a privilege. Funding for swaps is fiscally irresponsible for NACURH. We already are providing a lot of funding for conferences. Having

something that additionally compensates the swaps is unethical. We think about a mission. Our member schools deserve resources from us. If we're providing funding for travel for us, then we aren't doing so our members. Funding expenses for swaps does not make any sense to the NAF.

8. CA moves to amend to state: "No NACURH or regional or office funding shall be used to pay for the cost of travel or conference related expenses for swap conference attendance, either in the form of direct payment or regional scholarship"

- a) Seconded by NE

- (1) No objections

- (2) Proponent Speech: While the Central Atlantic hears and understands concerns related to the equity of swaps, we believe that regional funding should not be used for swaps on the basis that it is not widely practiced by regions and until such a time that all regions can fund travel to their own conferences, we should not be funding travel for non-required events/opportunities. The Central Atlantic feels that the Strategic Plan may suggest that NACURH should support leadership opportunities for our member schools but also leadership development of NACURH Leadership. This opportunity can be viewed as a professional development opportunity for individuals within the corporation and that there should be financial support for this from the NACURH level. The potential and requirements for a NACURH-wide swap scholarship should be explored during conversations this week or post semis. While we have ideas about what this process may look like, we believe that a task force should be assembled to discuss this potential and evaluate the necessary changes to the operating budget, if any.

- (3) Q&A:

- (a) MA: Since the office is funding through NACURH, doesn't that seem counter intuitive? The funding would need to come from the NACURH overall rather than the office budget

- (b) NE moves to end, second by SA

(i) No objections

(4) Discussion:

(a) NCo Kent: While the NCO feels that the Central Atlantic's Amendments is of good spirit, but it may not necessarily be the right place for it. We would rather see this be a piece that is more elaborated on later

(b) NE: echoes Kent. Agrees the spirit, but feels uncomfortable with this as a solution to the current discussion

(c) MA calls the question, no objections

(i) Vote

(a) 1-7-0

(b) Amendment fails

9. NCO Kent: the NCO is in complete support and agrees with the NAF's statement

10. IA: highlight the piece is supporting conference staffs for budgeting as well as supporting the development of swap practices

11. SA: Recognizes that it is important that regions do have a say in their regional budget and each region will vote on their regional budget when that time comes around

12. NE: Austin said we already paid for things like meals and entertainment. Does this piece state if you are swapping you now have to assume all costs as a swap other than a conference registration? Are their swaps included in that for a regional budget? (If you go to the Northeast from the South Atlantic and they are buying dinner for the RBD, does the Northeast pay for the swap or not)

a) NAF: This piece interpreted is specifically for travel, but conference expenses that would be in the compensated delegates sections would continue to be part of their regional budget

13. NE: So this is effectively just travel then.

14. NE: Seeking a middle ground.

15. PA moves to caucus for 3 minutes, second by NE

a) No objections

16. SW: We agree with the Northeast in that we feel there is some sort of middle ground. It's still optional for a region to do this, so if they cannot provide funding, they do not have to.
17. CA: CA would like to highlight the additional conference expenses that a swap individual's host region should not pay, not other regions, etc. We should not be funding our own members to go to other regions.
18. GL: The Great Lakes is in the support of the piece as it stands as it pertains to spending regional budgets on swapping. We would like to also call attention to the idea previously entertained by the Central Atlantic in creating a NACURH level swap scholarship that all swapping individuals could apply for in which we believe that would be the most equitable means of providing additional opportunities for NACURH leadership to develop professionally and personally.
19. NE moves to table to this piece to a committee of the officers, with the addition of finance officers from each entity
 - a) 2nd by SA
 - (1) No objections
 - (a) CA feels that the room has reached a decision and would like to vote
 - (b) SA does not withdraw
 - (i) 5-3-0
 - (2) Objection is sustained
20. SA: appreciates and supports title 11 of this piece, we feel as though title 13 should be revisited after an in-depth conversation with the authors of the piece, the NAF, and financial officers from all entities, in determining proper policy for as this affects regional budgets. SA feels as though RBDs should be given proper time to present and discuss this change with their students.
21. SW: echoes the belief that a NACURH level swap scholarship would compensate our concerns with the piece
22. CA calls the question, PA objects
 - a) PA has a point to make
23. PA: While a swap is a privilege, it's an earned privilege from being elected to this position and so we also feel that with putting a restriction such as this on our regional budgets that are approved by our delegates and them understanding where the money is going, then it is in removing the trust that we put in our delegates in restricting regions from deciding how they use their money. We feel that a NACURH level swap scholarship would appease our concerns.

24. NE: NE supports 99.9% of this piece and feels inequitably involved in the conversation that lead to this. We would like to ask an extension of an opportunity to provide conversation. Points cannot be made efficiently at this time. Tabling this to finance officers would be more effective for further discussion that we felt shut out of previously

25. GL calls to question, IA objects

26. IA: Can we split the piece?

27. CA: Yield to the IA Director

a) IA: formally moves to split the piece into Title 11 and Title 13

(1) 2nd by Northeast

(2) Hearing a lot of concerns, it sounds that overall conversation that Title 11 is agreed and Title 13 is what is challenging us. We can have a conversation about Title 13 to do separately, but we could pass what is successful now. Easier solution for coming to terms with both halves of the piece.

b) Q&A

(1) SA moves to end, 2nd by NE

c) Discussion

(1) SA calls the question

d) Vote

(1) 8-0-0

(a) Motion to split the piece carries

e) MA moves to caucus for 5 minutes, seconded by GL

(1) No dissent

28. NAF: Considering regional affiliates and I value each and every one. If one has concern, then let's have intentional conversations. I don't want finance officers to feel silenced, so for the sake of making sure we're transparent, a table for the this piece might be best.

XIII. Q&A on 17-21

A. NE moves to end; second by MA

1. No objections

XIV. Discussion on 17-21 Title 11

A. GL Calls the Question

1. Vote

a) 8-0-0

(1) 17-21 (Title 11) carries

XV. Discussion on 17

A. Proponent speech

1. Sentiment still stands on how we feel, however we are open to tabling the piece until the end of Friday, including the authors, NAF, and ADAFs from every region. We can still hear it at Semis. Ultimately, we stand by NACURH funding being for the members, but we are open to more discussion

B. Q&A on 17-37

1. Ne moves to end; second by SA
 - a) No dissent

C. Discussion on 17-37

1. GL moves to table 17-37 to be heard by the close of business on Friday of Semis to be tabled from all entities ADAFs, the NAF, and the authors of the piece (and any additional parties); second from CA
 - a) NE: Thank you
 - b) CA calls the question

(1) Vote

(a) 8-0-0

(i) Motion carries

D. SW moves to groove for 10 minutes, 2nd by MA

1. No objections

XVI. SW moves to bring 17-26 to the floor; second from CA

- A. Proponent Speech: Current wrap up policies prevent the conference staff from having meaningful feedback about the previous Semis, because it comes so late. This piece tries to ensure that the conference staff has information about logistics, preserves institutional memory, and ensures that this is all finished early.

B. Q&A

1. GL: With the creation of a separate wrap up report, will this remove the semis portion from the overall NACURH wrap up report?
 - a) A: It's not structured that way. It's a month by month account of the conference planning and execution. It's not pulling the semis info out of the report. Each chair/position will do a monthly report and those committee reports essentially create the final wrap up
2. SA AD: Were there pieces in the wrap up report about semis that you wish you'd had?

- a) A: Yes (NBD Liaison)
 - 3. NE moves to end; seconded by SA
 - a) No objections
- C. Discussion
 - 1. Kent calls the question
 - a) No objections
- D. Vote
 - 1. 8-0-0
 - a) Motion carries
- XVII. SA moves to bring 17-09. SW seconds
 - A. Proponent speech:
 - 1. NACURH leadership exists in the policy book already without formal definition. The policies and practices taskforce reviewed the policy book looking at who is excluded in policy through phrasing. We cannot change certain things, but what can change is when some things that are discussed pertain to more than just the NACURH Boards. NACURH Leadership exists 3 times in the policy book without definition. This does not include conference chairs because regions define them differently and we don't want to have some conference chairs included and others not. Important pieces to note that the spring responsibilities of the taskforce would be reviewing via searching for other instances to make these changes. They will also be charged with bringing forth pieces at NACURH if the meaning of the policy comes into question. There are 190 "NBDs" and other iterations that could potentially be changed to apply to more people because of practice.
 - B. Q&A
 - 1. Lincoln: AD: Could be syntax, you have Officer Staff Members, but what does that mean?
 - a) It's Office
 - 2. CA: You say that you had conversations about conference staff members not being included, but who was in those conversations?
 - a) A: That was decided when this was introduced in the 3 year strategic plan. This is a 2 year decision and the practice that we have adopted when referring to NACURH leadership
 - 3. SA moves to end; second from GL
 - C. Discussion
 - 1. SA: Greatly appreciates definitions and that's it.

2. NE calls the question
 - a) No objections

D. Vote

1. 8-0-0

XVIII. GL moves to bring NBD 17-35 to the floor; second from SA

A. Proponent Speech

1. Current taskforce has been charged with developing connections with Its On Us. The advocacy grant will be funded through Its On Us Pins. We would sell them and the profit from the pins would go towards the advocacy grant. Advocacy grant applications would be due before December 1st and the winner would be decided by January 31st. Selection of this award would be done by COs who work most directly with RHA Presidents. Privilege of selecting award to those who may not usually do so. In the event that this group doesn't exist, then the NAA could create the taskforce.

B. Q&A:

1. GL: Did you consult with the NAF?
 - a) Yes
2. MA: Series
 - a) 1) Where is the \$800 coming from this year?
 - (1) Ideally the general fund, likely no need to transfer any money. Won't hurt us, especially with the sale of inventory
 - b) Any negative implications of adding a specific pin versus other pins? Maybe in the future we would like to have an advocacy grant, but it wouldn't be able to be funded only by its on us
 - (1) Currently official partners with its on us, so promotion of name recognition
 - (2) For policy sake, neutral language for future use would be fine with the acknowledgement that right now our active partnership is with its on us
3. NE: Are we allowed to do this other than It's On Us
 - a) Yes, this is part of the Pin Pros Plus agreement
4. CA moves to end, 2nd by GL
 - a) No objections

C. Discussion

1. GL: The Great Lakes is in support of this piece, and appreciates the point on including COs who work with Presidents in terms of their work with advocacy.
2. PA: appreciates this piece as the pacific recently passed a structure as well and we love advocacy
3. NE: We also support this piece, put advocacy in the spotlight, which can be swept under with other exciting things at conferences
4. AA: SA is also in support of the piece, continuing to provide resources to our member schools as well as supporting partners
5. IA: We recognize the fact that this is a really great demonstration to member demonstration to member schools about how advocacy doesn't need to be a certain way.
6. CA moves to amend any mention of "It's On Us pins" to be "advocacy pins", 2nd by SA
 - a) Proponent Speech: It was brought up in question and answer, we think this solves
 - b) Q&A
 - (1) NE moves to end, 2nd by GL
 - c) Discussion:
 - d) SA: We are concerned about that the advocacy pin may not be specific enough if we are purchasing it from another group.
 - e) CA: Advocacy pins is not too general as we have "philanthropy pins"
 - f) IA: The budget is currently based off of this specific It's On Us pin and the Intermountain is throwing out that the budget may need to be considered as funds may change if we are more general
 - g) NCO Kent: We are in support of this amendment even though its general. We all know the intention for now and we can adjust for difference in the future
 - h) SA calls the question, no objections
 - (1) Vote
 - (a) 8-0-0
 - (b) Amendment carries
7. GL calls the question, no objections
 - a) Vote
 - (1) 8-0-0

(2) Motion carries

XIX. Roundtable about Regional Brand Standards

XX. OCM Presentation

A. Q&A

1. PA: If a school isn't registered can they order care packages, etc
 - a) But yes, schools who are connected have additional benefits
2. SA: As our member schools are being approached by your competitors, what work should we emphasize about your corporation?
 - a) It's about meeting the schools where they are at. Individualized. Let OCM know which schools might be interested

XXI. NACURH 2018 Pre-Bid Discussion

A. Overall Feedback

1. NE: There are a lot of pieces that are just completely omitted. Make sure that everything is available and nothing is left out.
2. SA: As far as philanthropy goes, it is better when schools don't focus on too many different philanthropy topics. Minimize to increase the "rally" behind one philanthropy.
3. GL: Omission of conference staffs and bid teams. This is essential information. Offer qualifications as to why the bid team should host and what experience they bring out to the overall hosting experience.
4. NE: A lot of schools had intentions of more than one key note speaker; ensure that they understand to pick on key note.
5. NE: When looking at programming, most of the bids had omitted NRHH. There were some implications to service and recognition programming, but more intention towards NRHH programming would be good.
6. SA: Large amounts of dining focus for vegan/gluten free, but not much attention to airborne allergies as that has been an issue and topic that has needed to be addressed in the past
7. IA: Please note where location of housing is and how far things are from activities. Conference transportation information has been omitted and is essential as well.
8. SW: For theme incorporation, a lot of them made sure that the theme was present. They should figure out how to incorporate it into other areas of the conference such as Housing, Programming, etc.
9. MA: Housing sections omitted details about different amenities about the places they'll be staying in, such as restrooms, security

10. SA: As far as volunteers go, I don't feel like a lot of the schools put in a lot of detail of the timeline for volunteers. There isn't much detail on how they will be utilized either..
11. NE: Dining wise, plans for allergies and airborne allergies should be included. For vegetarian and gluten free and other preferences, making sure they outline plans. Rather than just saying the options available, it would be nice to know what exactly the options are. Ensure that there is a full and extensive dining plan. For all delegates, Complicated ideas with different dining halls might be more confusing for delegates, whereas sticking to one dining hall might be more easy to follow for delegates new to the campus.
12. MA: We appreciate the schools that took the time to highlight their RHA / NRHH Chapters. But I would like to see how their institution can further support the conference.
13. SA: Appreciate schools that took into consideration the price for shuttles from the airport, but would like to emphasize and have more consideration for more affordable and fiscally responsible options.
14. IA: The Intermountain Affiliate wants to recognize the innovation in the programming. The idea to have Advisors, staff, or other students to present to delegates is interesting.
15. Annual Conference Chair: Points out missing or lack of depth in semis preparation in the bids, which is an important part.
16. NE: Just wanted to note a lack of innovation in communication, a lot of people just said the standard expectations. Would like to see something different.
17. Annual Conference Chair: Overall, some bids had some grammar issues or repeated content. Please ensure you proof read!
18. PA: Appreciates that most of the bids were able to be navigated easily. Everything was where it was supposed to be.
19. SW: Feels they could extend beyond required letters of intent, and explore other departments on campus who could speak to why they should host
20. SA moves to end, 2nd by CA
 - a) No objections

B. Individual Institutions

C. Final Feedback

1. CA: it's really important for schools to remember that NACURH-U is a thing. Emphasize that you should be thinking about that.
2. IA: specify housing assignment process, timeframe for arrival and departures and limitations for transportation, all transportation options, and amount of shuttles. Staff at airport/train station/parking lots, parking fees. All of this is important!
3. NE: specifically for less developed pre-bids, make sure you look at past NACURH bids. If we didn't have too much information, it's hard for us to give extensive feedback on what isn't there. Utilize past bids for comparison.
4. NCO Lincoln: Make sure to include plans about the NACURH Store for the Corporate Office.
5. PA: include sample sponsorship letter because it shows intention on how you will be approaching potential sponsors
6. NE: reminds all bidders that while providing general information is helpful, it's crucial to provide information about the conference lense. Apply general institutional information to the conference for the bid.
7. CA: keep in mind institution's policies on selling good's on campus as it relates to money, advertising, etc and make plans for addressing this.
8. GL: commends all for submitting pre bids. Note feedback- it's never too early to ask questions. Ask the executives as well as the CRC. It's never too early to ask and develop and discuss further to ensure a great end product.
9. SA moves to end, 2nd by CA
 - a) No objections

XXII. NE moves to recess for 15 minutes, seconded by SA

XXIII. SA moves to bring NBD 17-33 to the floor; NE seconds

A. Proponent speech

1. This piece allows the NCO to vote for NACURH executives. We currently do not have a vote in virtually all circumstances. We see the need to vote on the executives because of our unique interaction with them. We have seen the executives make a lot of decisions that impact our operation. Also the NCO ADAF works directly with the NAF. A lot of our positions have direct supervision from the execs, which makes our interaction unique. From the NACURH Exec position, we do work with the offices in a very different way. It seems strange that those who

we work with the most don't have a say in who is elected. It will be one vote starting this NACURH.

B. Q&A

1. SA: How are office directors selected?
 - a) When you bid for an office, it's the conference chair equivalent. It's an internal process for the bid coordinator essentially. For the following years, it's an interview and hiring process. Submit resumes and interviews and you are selected from there. Nowhere in policy, but this is the precedent set
 - (1) Follow Up Q: Who coordinates the interview/selection process
 - (a) Current Director hires the next Director. Generally an incoming process. Typically this person is an "in house" position. The incoming and current director hire the rest of the staff
2. CA: What is the relationship between NAN and NAA and the office?
 - a) We do a lot of work for NRHH in general. It's ambiguous right now, but will be the CO for NRHH (OTM management, sits on NNB). Apart from that, working with NRHH affiliation. Helped to get affiliation, census, up and running. NAA works with COs, which is unique and different from other COs. I work with them on affiliations (policy issues), technology. Marketing position works extensively with NAA
3. NE: Why the NCO may not be pursuing voting rights in the election of the advisors?
 - a) We currently don't vote for the CRC, but we do vote for the advisor in the case of a tiebreak. We don't work as much with those two individuals unless there's a financial issue.
 - b) Time called; SA extends by 5; CA seconds
 - (1) No objections
4. IA: From the relationships you described, do you see any potential conflict of interests?
 - a) The idea is that the NCO functions as an ex-officio branch of the NACURH Executive committee. People need to be able to speak on elected officials.
5. SA: The only voting right that this piece would add is for election of NACURH Executive offices?

- a) Yes
 - 6. NE moves to end, second by GL
 - a) No objections
 - C. Discussion
 - 1. NE: fully supports this piece. It does a fine job of navigating the specific needs of the NCO. It does what the NCO needs, but nothing further. It's not an overstep or pursual of unnecessary rights.
 - 2. GL calls the question
 - a) Vote
 - (1) 8-0-0
 - (2) Motion carries
- XXIV. CA moves to 17-10; second by GL
 - A. Proponent
 - 1. Policy and practices taskforce feels passionately about this. This allows for a taskforce that operates FOR inclusivity to have an inclusive membership.
 - B. Q&A
 - 1. CA: Why did we make this longer rather than just saying that it would be open to member institutions or any member?
 - a) A: It was meant to be as similar as what already exists as possible. Just saying all members does not emphasize the fact that it's open to all of these people.
 - 2. SA moves to end; second from NE
 - a) No objections
 - C. Discussion
 - 1. GL: Appreciates this piece; allows member institutions to serve in this capacity and offer insight into this taskforce
 - 2. NE calls the question
 - a) No objections
 - D. Vote
 - 1. 8-0-0
 - a) Motion carries
- XXV. General Issues Roundtable
- XXVI. NBD 17-15
 - A. GL moves to bring to the floor, seconded by the Midwest
 - 1. No objections

- B. Proponent Speech: The intention behind this piece is pretty simple and straightforward. Focuses on making a more inclusive NACURH. Mirrors current NBD name to NACURH NRHH Board. By using the term, we are using NACURH it is more inclusive with our international members. By changing the words it's not changing the acronym. It still remains NNB.
- C. Q&A
 - 1. NE moves to end, seconded by GL
- D. Discussion
 - 1. SA: The South Atlantic believes that while the first therefore statement regarding inclusive is not really affected by changing National to NACURH because NACURH still stands for National
 - 2. PA: The Pacific overall is in support of this piece, but there is hesitation in terms of having acronym-ception. Alphabets within alphabets concerns me.
 - 3. MA: to the Chair: From a corporation standpoint, are there negative implications for the corporation for doing this?
 - a) Chair yields to the NAN
 - (1) Answer: If you think this name change fits within the language we've been moving forward with whether or not this reflects the fact that the honorary is a branch of NACURH, then how does this fit in and that's what we want to see
 - 4. CA: the Strategic Plan calls for name standardization anyways, so this makes sense to standardize with the NBD. A lot of the National Residence Hall Honorary language falls in a "national" mindset, so this might be a way in which we can contribute to that.
 - 5. NCO Kent moves to end, 2nd by SA
 - a) PA Dissents
 - b) SA withdraws
 - c) NCO Kent withdraws
 - 6. NCO Kent: we believe that NRHH is a branch of NACURH, so we feel that this association between the two is strong
 - 7. CA: would be open to hearing other names for things
 - 8. NCO Kent: to speak on naming conventions, we appreciate that this piece stays consistent with the initials. We already feel that we're pretty deep into the alphabet soup
 - 9. PA supports this piece and all its implications

10. GL in recognition of the canadian institutions, we are in full support of creating a more inclusive language as it currently stands
11. SA does support this piece, but would encourage in the future as we make changes that we consider adjusting some of the larger parts of the organization such as NACURH and NRHH. Perhaps these things start with the largest naming convention
12. NAN: I would just like to remind the AD-NRHH's have speaking rights as well, I would like to see the ADs discuss more here.
13. SA: sees the value of inclusion here for the name change
14. PA: values this change, although would like to see this name changed moved so that there isn't word National multiple times
15. NCO Lincoln: feels that this is a good piece especially uniting the NRHH Board as it relates with NACURH as a whole
16. SA calls the question, no objections
 - a) Vote
 - (1) 8-0-0
 - (a) motion carries

XXVII. NBD 17-16

- A. SA moves to bring to the floor, seconded by GL
 1. No objections
- B. Proponent Speech:
 1. More inclusive language around the particular position if anything is more reflective for the position. Communicates with and for NACURH not necessarily as a nation as a domestic entity
- C. Q&A
 1. NE: Did you consult with any NCCs?
 - a) Consulted with the GL NCCs, as well as the GL NRHHCCs
 2. NE: asks question of the NCO Kent: Does this affect anything you intended and intend to create in the near future?
 - a) NCO Kent: No
 3. GL moves to end, 2nd by NCO Kent
 - a) No objections
- D. Discussion
 1. IA: in favor of this piece, this is actually a topic that several of the NCCs have brought up to the RBD in the Intermountain
 2. PA: support of this change to increase inclusivity. Just kind of wonders a little in terms of our member institutions how they might feel about

changing this on their campus level. Opens the opportunity for umbrella terms for those who choose not to change the campus level name.

3. GL: echoes sentiments about NCCs asking about this often
4. CA: feels that although the feedback we've gotten about this name change, we would like them to give the opportunity, which they would only be able to have if this does go to corporate. That way they can decide for themselves.
5. SA would like to reaffirm that changing National to NACURH does not foster inclusivity because NACURH starts with National still
6. NE appreciates the spirit, though SAs may be true. This is a bandaid. We support this piece knowing that discussion will continue
7. SA would like to note that these are discussions in our own region. Our region will not have an idea that this is coming up
8. MA is in support of this piece and echoes sentiments about this going to corporate, which is our responsibility to NACURH
9. MA: generally regardless of the acronym nonsense, the Midwest feels that the change falls in line with the NACURH Executive labels (NACURH Chair versus national Chair)
10. CA also has mixed feelings on the title as it may not as fully reflect responsibilities that we . NACURH Communications Coordinator may not accurately reflect their role within their camps
11. NCO Kent calls the question, no objections

a) Vote

(1) 8-0-0

(a) NBD 17-16 carries

XXVIII. GL moves to bring 17-34 to the floor, 2nd by SW

A. Proponent Speech:

1. Discussion of topics about how we can better protect our corporation. We have discussed this at length. If things aren't doing everything we need, we are more than willing to table it in order to gather feedback first. This piece was created in consultation with Christina. The risk management section was chosen to be added as the entire policy book. It's more than just conferences. This is not exhaustive. Voice will actively work towards continuing to develop in the future. A lot of this already exists in policy. There are new things, but many things are already being done in practice as well as in policy

B. Q&A

1. NCO Kent: For the recommended hours of sleep, why 5-7?
 - a) We thought that that was realistic. It's hard to define a recommended hour of sleep, but we felt that within that time frame people could be well rested.
 - b) The implication is that more than 1-2 hours of sleep is acceptable. Some sort of equivalent to a restful night's sleep is essential
2. IA: Can you elaborate more in the chats in a public space?
 - a) That statement does not truly apply to all chats likely, but it might be "easier" to include all chats. Sometimes we discuss corporate matters in NBD and we wouldn't necessarily have open meetings for that. Management of risk overall even for things that may not matter.
3. IA: Wondering if there is a contradiction in point 1 that says conferences must provide transportation while point three says it is encouraged for conference staffs to provide transportation.
 - a) It's honestly a scribes error. It should be a recommendation. What we are trying to stress is that we want to eliminate the ability of the RBD to "force" a conference staff to be the ones that drive them
 - b) It's assumed that we will be chauffeured around by the conference staff
 - c) There should be no unnecessary third party transportation use
4. SA: In article 3 section 3, if the authors would consider adding RBDs and special guests in that section.
 - a) Yes.
 - b) Follow up: Would the authors prefer the amendment to be made or if it is tabled?
 - (1) An amendment would be accepted.
5. SW: Under emergency response plan, does this include RBD summits, retreats, and host site visits?
 - a) Yes
6. NCO-Kent: Why are the titles shifted around rather than using Title 8 that's on reserve?
 - a) We wanted a new title to be added but weren't sure how to do so.

7. GL: In regard to meeting in public spaces, do you keep like this is inequitable because some people might not have their own laptops.
 - a) Because the language says "discouraged" it implies that you can imply that you think about it. The thought is that if you have a laptop then you are being cognizant of where you are.
8. CA: In regard to emergency response, what does this look like because not all institutions face the same emergencies? What are the expectations?
 - a) This section is intentionally not specific because of things like this question. It's basically to ensure that the institution has thought out emergencies and institutions may know what are the kinds of emergencies most likely to occur in their environment. Ultimately it makes sure that these things are communicated.
 - (1) Follow Up: If an institution doesn't already have something like this in place, how does this impact their institution?
 - (a) An emergency response protocol could just be a chain of phone call procedures through the conference staff and regional/nacurh leadership
9. CA: Curious in travel liability portion, in many regions, they can't fund travel and cheaper flights are often earlier, does this increase the burden of finances.
 - a) These are "official recommendations". We would hope that institutions would spend quite a bit of money to ensure that people are safe. Monetary is less important than the sake of safety. It's merely a recommendation, there is no negative repercussions. It's really calling attention to it so that conversations occur prior to making these kinds of decisions.
10. GL: In regards to the NACURH conference times, can you walk us through the decision to change the cut off time to 12AM?
 - a) First of all, having the boardrooms end at midnight and conference activities that end at one, it causes discrepancies for staff and advisors (especially as it relates to FSLA). We recognize that this may be hard, but . We feel that this is necessary especially because we hope that this allows to make the sleeping policy work as well

(1) Follow up: In regards to "all other activities", does this mean that hospitality rooms also end at midnight, does that mean that hospitality would end at 12AM too?

(a) Yes. But we don't have a best answer on how to address that.

11. NE: Going back to travel liability, it says "early departure" because this pertains to someone leaving a conference early. Would you just have to make sure your travel time started outside the range as well?

a) This would apply to both arrival and departure times. Perhaps this section should be renamed if you arrived at a conference early. Traveling during the "unsafe" window is not recommended

b) Follow up: Early departure means leaving from home or conference and is more about we're discouraging travel during that time, regardless of when it started.

(1) Yes.

12. CA: In article 2 section 2, it says that the collection must be approved by the NACURH advisor or CRC. Why not have this approved by regional directors?

a) Ultimately because we felt that this would allow the best practice for our members. On a regional level, I would want to this to be reviewed by advisors as they frequently work with conferences. On the NACURH Level, we want the CRC to be a part of this conversation

13. PA: For clarification, the majority of these things are encouragements not requirements, yes?

a) Most of it, but drugs and alcohol. This is a fail-safe.

b) It might be more of the recommendation. In situations where it's more than a recommendation, it allows for NACURH not to be held liable for something like this.

14. NE: moves to end Q/A, second by South Atlantic

a) No objections

C. Discussion

1. SA moves to amend this piece via "Early Departure

a) NACURH, Inc. does not support ~~host institutions~~ any conference attendees in traveling or operating vehicles prior to 7:00 AM or after 1:30 AM. This includes, but is not limited to, flying, driving, busing, etc.

- (1) Should an individual, host institution, Regional Board of Directors, or Special Guests choose to travel between 1:30 AM and 7:00 AM, they must do so with the knowledge and approval of the delegation advisor and Senior Housing Officer from the respective host institution and must indicate this in their signed delegate waiver prior to the start of conference. "
- b) Seconded by NEACURH
- c) Point Of Clarification: IA: Did the authors want this to be a feedback session instead?
 - (1) If the amendments are fast, then yes, but otherwise no. We just want risk management adopted here.
 - (2) Proponent Speech: Adds leadership in to ensure their compliance
 - (3) Q&A:
 - (a) NCO-Kent: What are your thoughts between the senior housing office and the delegation advisor to the regional board and special guests and how that might play out?
 - (i) Perhaps that might need to change
 - (a) Follow up: how does this work for conferences outside of normal business times?
 - (b) I would love to continue discussion on this.
 - (b) NE: Is there a reason why the last host institution wasn't included?
 - (i) I'm good to take it out, I just hadn't caught it
 - (c) SW: moves to end Q&A, seconded by IA
 - (i) No objections
 - d) Discussion:
 - (1) NCO-Kent: With this second edition, I think we really changed something. It says that we are discouraging travel at unsafe times but are giving them a letter saying it is okay.

- (2) Author: I am concerned about what culture it promotes if it says we don't support this for NACURH, but we'll give this
- (3) CA: Feels like the intention of this section should really focus on institutions leaving conference early. We believe that if we want a section about RBD, thi should be another point under this. It shouldn't be forgotten about.
- (4) IA: Move to caucus for two minutes, 2nd by the SW
 - (a) No objections
- (5) NAA: moves to take a straw poll of if you were travelling at a certain time by time.
- (6) NE: Fells opposed to the amendment because we aren't leading by example.
- (7) Amendment Author: At our RLC, there were many people travelling at this time. I did not feel like I was safe to travel. This is why I brought this up.
- (8) CA: feels that this amendment and probably any other amendment is going to draw a very long conversation. We experience this often. We all have some reliability issues that are important to them. If we table it, then we can have stronger discussion
- (9) GL: Hesitant on this amendment as the wording gets a little specific. We echo the Northeast. But we also acknowledge the straw poll. We're conflicted.
- (10) PA: appreciates the intention of safety and risk management of this travel portion, but would like to put out there about the fiscal impact of purchasing of flights. We purchase a lot of flights, redeyes are the cheapest for us. In order for us to get here on time, we needed to take a red eye
- (11) NCO Kent: Echo the sentiments of everyone else. This amendment should not be part of this piece and should be proposed separately and maybe put in travel policy. Straw poll is eye opening, but also concerning.
- (12) NE: calls the question, no objection
 - (a) Vote: 1-7-0
- (13) Amendment fails

2. NE: The northeast understands the desire to table this and have discussion and some time, but we also feel that this piece as it exists right now and in the section of the policy book is in no way contradictory to any additions that any of the regions would like to make. It is important that we do pass this risk management as it exists and continue to build on it after it has been passed.
3. CA: Moves to table this piece back to the authors to be heard by the end of pre-conference for NACURH 2017
 - a) No second, motion dies
4. IA: Agrees with the sentiments that this is important. The hesitation is we don't feel that we have enough understand of whether or not this actually covers a liability, we wonder if this is infringing too much upon if it doesn't protect us. We want us to be safe and healthy and all included, but we want to examine more about its actual liability and what we can and cannot recommend an institution does as well as its practicality.
 - a) SA: would NACURH ever be held liable for travel?
 - (1) Chair: Yes, even after the waiver
5. Author: Question to Dan: Does risk management protect us or prevent us from sueing?
 - a) Advisor: It protects us. Judges look at our policies and analyze if we are protecting our entities. This gets us closer to being protected, but we must be following our policies. The spirit is good. We have to think about what is the rationale for us. We don't want to get wired down in the language. This helps to protect us in the end.
6. NAF: Speaking from the NAF, NAA, and Chair perspective (also NAN) and we hold a lot of the liability. It's not perfect, the committee that formed this doesn't have the experience necessary to completely and 100% understand. If this is something we can show in a court of law, that's one step closer to doing something good for the corporation overall. A group of people has taken time to appreciate that someone have taken the time.
7. Advisor: This will lead to more policies at your regional level, which is where we need more protection. I worry about liability from regional levels.
8. GL moves to propose an amendment to read "Early Departure

- a) NACURH, Inc. does not support-traveling or operating vehicles prior to 7:00 AM or after 1:30 AM. This includes, but is not limited to, flying, driving, busing, etc.
 - (1) Should an individual, host institution, choose to travel between 1:30 AM and 7:00 AM, they must do so with the knowledge and approval of the delegation advisor and Senior Housing Officer from the respective host institution and must indicate this in their signed delegate waiver prior to the start of conference.
 - (2) Should a **host institution**, choose to travel occur between 1:30 AM and 7:00 AM, NACURH, Inc. shall not be held liable for any damages or injuries that may result."
- b) No second, motion dies
- 9. PA: the Pacific is wondering that to be consistent if this legislation passed, how would NACURH suggest PACURH get to Semis if we're not taking red eyes and affordability
- 10. CA: Would the chair yield to a question?
 - a) Chair: Yes
 - b) CA: If we passed this piece, could we clean up language later this week?
 - (1) Chair: Technically this doesn't go into effect until after Semis. I would prefer that if there are continuous amendments, it would be tabled.
- 11. CA: move to table this piece back to a committee of the authors and and NBD and NNB members Feedback would be gathered through a boardroom roundtable. Presented at the end of Semis.
 - a) seconded by PA
 - b) SA: Would this be enough time to meet?
 - (1) CA: No, but when I tried to move this until before pre-conference it wasn't seconded.
 - c) NE dissents
 - (1) Discussion is being had now.
 - (2) There are still people on the speakers list with good points.
 - d) Motion withdrawn

12. Chair: can we share our opinions about this and then gather information and then finally table to ensure productive feedback and further development
13. NE: I'd first like to respond to the rhetorical question about how we would suggest regions travel by stating that travel/housing arrangements could be made by the host site that appropriate arrangements can be made. Generally, this piece is good.
14. IA: we believe that this is a lot to take in. We aren't sure if it is possible for this all to be implemented, possibly it may be better to table this in sub-pieces.
15. NCO-Kent: We would like to suggest to the room to consider just passing it since we agree it is good. This is mostly recommendations anyway. We can submit amendments after this. We also feel like having a minimum of 7 hours of sleep is not enough for policy.
16. CA would like to recommend several changes, however we echo the sentiments that it may be the best interest to pass the piece. The Central Atlantic does believe that within Article 3, Section 1, Point 2 is redundant and doesn't need to be here. Also, it's likely we could remove the section about the consent of SHO and the time of traveling mainly because our concern is our members.
17. SA: We believe that these recommendations are not unreasonable. In the care that student leaders, especially in terms of travel, exceptions can be made.
18. GL: The great lakes by and large agree and disagree and everything in between. We agree that we need this in place. We also echo the sentiments of the SHO officer line. Additionally, we do somehow see fault in the suggested no travel time between 1:30 and 7:00 AM simply because the straw poll in this room. Accommodations can be made, but the budget is a concern here. We also feel that if we are leaving for a conference such as this, we had a member come very early, then if he was guaranteed 8 hours of sleep beforehand, then it shouldn't be an issue as long as he was well rested
19. NCO-Kent: We appreciate GLACURH about how there is no set time hour for something to be deemed safe. Finance shouldn't be an issue when it comes to safety.
20. SA: Called the question, dissent by GL
 - a) GL: wants a caucus period

- 21. GL: move to caucus for 10 minutes
 - a) Second by SA
 - b) No dissent
- 22. SW: calls the question
 - a) No objections
- 23. CA: moves to vote by secret ballot
 - a) Piece carries
- XXIX. Annual Conference moves to recess until 8:00 AM; seconded by NCO-Kent
 - A. No objections

Thursday, January 5th, 2017

- I. Call to Order at 8:03 AM
- II. Program of the Year
 - A. Nominations
 - 1. GL moves to open, seconded by CA
 - 2. SW moves to nominate Ball State University, seconded by MA
 - 3. NE moves to nominate Case Western Reserve, seconded by SA
 - 4. MA moves to nominate East Carolina University, seconded by GL
 - 5. PA moves to nominate Missouri State University, seconded by SW
 - 6. GL moves to nominate Fashion Institute of Technology, seconded by NE
 - 7. SW moves to nominate New York University, seconded by NCO-Kent
 - 8. SW moves to nominate Texas Tech University, seconded by CA
 - 9. NE moves to nominate the University of New Mexico, seconded by SA
 - 10. SW moves to nominate Virginia Tech, seconded by CA
 - 11. GL moves to close nominations seconded by MA
 - a) No objections
- III. Pro-Con
 - A. Ball State University

Collaboration with police

Clear student need

Reach limited students

Sustainable advertisement

Lacks a strong educational aspect

Few volunteers needed

Not sustainable

Adaptability

Multiple program dates

Increased RHA awareness
18% of annual budget
Regional letter of support
Evaluation methods

CA moves to end, 2nd by SA

B. Case Western Reserve

Evaluation Methods

Schedule and goals organized
Uniqueness
Program adaption
Conference presentation
Relevance to on campus students

Board-elect inclusion

Regional support

C. East Carolina University

Community inclusion

Low cost

impact

D. Fashion Institute of Technology

Evaluation metrics
Over the page limit

Free testing

Community involvement
Unclear student impact
Safe space
No budget
Addresses student need
Conference presentation
Future goals included
Originality
SA moves to end, second by SW

E. Missouri State University

Social media
Conference presentation
Address community concern

adaptability

Large student impact

F. New York University

Pictures of planning committee
Confusing bid
Student input
Letters of support

Program assessment
adapatability
budget
unique
Undefined acronyms

graphics
CA moves to end, second by SW

G. Texas Tech University

Campus awareness

Budget use

SWOT analysis

Valuable educational component

Planning programming timeline

H. University of New Mexico

Reflection for future

Student need

Educational component

I. Virginia Tech

originality

High cost

IV. Discussion

A. GL moves to caucus for 3 minutes, second by NE

1. No objections

B. SW: although Case Western Reserve put a successful program for their institution, it lacks adaptability because many institutions already do this

C. CA: feels like Va Tech has no originality. Nothing made it above and beyond as a program.

- D. PA: appreciates Ball State's effort to educate about campus to foster campus pride. Ball State could have been more intentional about making it more meaningful for their campus population.
- E. SA: appreciates the promotion of sustainability and programming timeline
- F. CA: feels that University of New Mexico did a fantastic job addressing student need.
- G. GL: would like to commend all bids submitted. We would like to commend Eastern Carolina's bid because it had a high impact for a low cost.
- H. GL: would like to commend fashion institute of tech for an innovational bid. Concerned about both budget and student impact.
- I. GL: is very thankful for all of the bids, but is concerned for lack of contingency plan in inclement weather in Virginia Tech's program.
- J. NE: In regards to Ball State, we do not feel like this directly affected student need. The university facts didn't add to their bid.
- K. CA: feels that Texas Tech highlighted awareness, but the use of their budget on giveaways was not necessary for the nature of the program.
- L. MA: In regards to East Carolina, we appreciated their community involvement.
- M. IA: would like to echo the sentiments in GL and MA on behalf of East Carolina University. Effective outreach to community and brand the university but also provide a service based on student need.
- N. CA: feels that while Missouri's program is adaptable, the student engagement is fairly low.
- O. GL: would like to address Missouri state as well. The social media aspect makes it more of a campaign and less of a program.
- P. SA: appreciates the University of New Mexico for providing an FAQ.
- Q. GL: although we appreciate NYU for the bid submission and its adaptability and uniqueness, the bid was confusing and the budget was missing.
- R. NE: echoes GL, we appreciate NYU's uniqueness, but the bid isn't clear.
- S. CA appreciates that FIT was able to execute the program but there were bid pieces missing making it hard to fully be considered.
- T. MA: Would like to recognize the University New Mexico for their student need.
- U. SW moves to narrow the field to 4 candidates, second by PA
 - 1. No dissent
- V. Top 5:
 - 1. Texas Tech
 - 2. Missouri State
 - 3. University of New Mexico

- 4. Case Western
 - 5. East Carolina
- W. PA: appreciates Texas Tech utilized advocacy efforts. Even in their giveaway it was a resource for their students. We feel it was a great advocacy effort and well planned.
- X. SA: appreciates Texas Tech's SWOT analysis in the bid.
- Y. CA: feels that when considering the ACUHO-I presentation aspect, East Carolina probably has the strongest plan of the bids as it relates to presenting to professionals in housing.
- Z. GL: echoes CA and comments on East Carolina for working with their surrounding community. Their impact is apparent.
- AA. SA: appreciates the low cost of Eastern Carolina's program.
- BB. CA: feels like an educational component is important, it isn't a set criteria.
- CC. NE moves to caucus to three minutes, 2nd by MA, No objections
- DD. GL would like to appreciate Case Western Reserve. In terms of adaptability for smaller campuses with less of a difference between first year and upperclassmen housing, it wouldn't be as adaptable.
- EE. SA: UNM and ECU both have very detailed budgets whereas Texas Tech is not as detailed and Case is confusing.
- FF. IA: would like to speak on behalf of Eastern Carolina. Clear demonstration of how it can be implemented as well as would work for small and large schools. Other programs are less adaptable.
- GG. MA: recognize while Missouri state is a passive program, we want to recognize the impact passive programs can have.
- HH. NE: The North East appreciates ECU raising awareness about a delicate topic. Their valuations and results were clearly indicated to show that their campus and the community they engaged with greatly appreciated the program. They indicated learning outcomes that they adhered to in planning and implementation as well as challenges that they hope to overcome for the future success of their program. The student and community impact is clear in the included notes from students and the principal of Hope Middle School and the various awards they have received they showcase the overall success of the program.
- II. SA: would like to call the question, NE objects
- 1. NE: would prefer to narrow the field and continue discussion
- JJ. SA reclaims time: SA would like to narrow the field to two candidates, second by the Great Lakes

1. No objections

KK. Top 3:

1. East Carolina
2. University of New Mexico
3. Texas Tech

LL. NE moves to caucus for 3 minutes, second by GL

1. No objections

MM. GL: Would love to hear elaboration about why budget is important within this bid and Texas Tech's budget con.

NN. SW: would like to comment East Carolina University for addressing such a sensitive topic. We appreciate the aspect of having counselors on site.

OO. PA: We would've liked to have seen a breakdown of Texas's budget as well as we didn't feel like this was transferrable to smaller universities. We appreciate UNM's intent, we also don't think this program is transferrable because of storage needs.

PP. SA: Each university had a strong outline for conference presentation, East Carolina had three detailed pages on their presentation as well as specific examples.

QQ. MA: would like to commend East Carolina's bid. We appreciate the learning outcomes and their evaluation.

RR. NE: The Northeast has reservations regarding the selection of Texas Tech for program of the year. Although raising awareness of their campus's safety features is important, the Northeast feels that Texas Tech has presented a one-dimensional program with only one safety feature represented in this event. This program could have been strengthened through the incorporation of all additional prominent campus safety features, as this program leaves many of those aspects unaddressed. Additionally, the Northeast feels that the information about the ACUHO-I Presentation they intend to give is vague and raises concern over whether or not the attendees of that presentation would have much to take away.

SS. GL calls the question, no objection

1. Clear majority, Eastern Carolina receives the Program of the Year Award.

TT. CA moves to recess for 10 minutes; seconded by SA

1. No objections

V. NBD 17-14

A. CA moves to bring to the floor, seconded by IA

B. Proponent Speech: We should have rules for removal

C. Q&A

1. SA: Could you elaborate on the 3rd part of the 1st section that would be added.
 - a) If the Chair wants to recall, then the NAA would facilitate the process
2. NE: Is there a reason why this removal process doesn't have previous measures?
 - a) Nope, it would follow everything similar up to this point
3. CA: In that section of the policy book who is it referring to
 - a) NAA: we likely wouldn't utilize this policy as the guideline anyway

D. Discussion

1. NCO Kent: Something should be in policy around office removal. In its current functions, we don't go through anything similar to this. There isn't a formal process for us, so we're not elected by people. The Director is just in charge of holding people accountable. If an Office member is acting, it's the Director that would help the air those grievances. There are other steps as well.
2. SW: Yields to NCO Kent: Do you have any procedures on how you recall/hold the office Director accountable?
 - a) NCO Kent: We like this piece for the office director, but we don't have policies for that now.
3. SW: move to caucus for two minutes, second by NE
4. GL: appreciates that this piece would be in place for a Director. Concerns about removing the COs/ADAF here. NCO functions on Business Operations, we would have full faith in the director to allow the director to make decisions about COs. Would like to see an amendment that would remove the the CO.
5. NE: if the piece could be re authored with both office branches in the future then likely would have more understanding and focus
6. IA: Agrees with the piece, but would like more clarification within the piece
7. CA: It's definitely important to have some kind of formalized process to have for the removal of staff members. We fully trust the office to be staff, rather than elected. Therefore their structure should probably be reflective of their unique status.

8. SA: accountability measures for all staff members should be increased and is in support of this piece. The SA believes that the recall procedure used for regions would work well and would be the most transparent way to maintain the NACURH corporate office
9. PA: Can you talk more about removal procedures currently in NCO Lincoln
 - a) NCO Lincoln: it's on university rules. If here's a GPA that is too low because a GPA is expected, one could say "it doesn't meet the expectations of the office"
10. NCO Kent: we can make this work, but we are worried about how formal it is for the COs, but we could do it. We don't think it's necessarily perfect, but it's also not a bad formatting
11. SA: notes that if a student is no longer in good standing, they'll be removed from their position without the need for a recall. With that recall proceedings would be based in responsibilities not being met, which is worthy of a formal process
12. MA: feels conflicted. We see the value in having something in place, but are confused mostly based in the conflict between the two offices. Would like to see process described in policy rather than bylaws . Could use time and possibly presented at a later date.
13. CA: we believe that the office should have a removal process that is unique to them. There is not one standard removal process across all regions. Each one is individualized
14. NCO Kent: we agree this process warranting more formal removal process if this is more than minor infractions. We are hesitant to utilize the good standing policy should you want to use that to pull support. Campus Advisors should not need to crawl through policy
15. NE: Would the first part of this section of the bylaws contradict this?
 - a) NAA: these processes are unclear
16. IA: would like to formally table this piece to a committee comprised of representatives from both offices, a member of an executive committee, to be heard prior to the close of pre-conference
 - a) seconded by the GL
 - b) NE: would you consider any interested parties in the NCO?
 - (1) Yes
 - (2) No objections
 - c) Motion passes; piece is tabled

VI. NBD 17-17

A. GLACURH moves to bring to the floor, second by NE

B. Proponent Speech:

1. An extreme part of the documentation of transition is lacking, overall on a NACURH level. From a regional perspective, everyone should have some autonomy but for those who have a larger stake in NACURH there needs to be more accountability to ensure a successful transition for the future of NACURH. Is open to feedback related to this process and would ultimately be in favor of this process happening in the way that this room determines to be best. This would allow for more information sharing between regional members as well as across regions and would provide a unique resource for the future, specifically in situations of conflict between transitioning board members.

C. Q&A

1. CA: This piece mentions that it is specifically for individuals leaving a position, would this apply to people remaining in their positions as well as regional advisors with longer terms?
 - a) I think that this could be a good amendment to add in terms of turnover and multiple year positions if that what the room feels is best
2. IA: Wants to clarify that this would occur at the end of the term rather than a mid-year review at semis. Recognize that this is adding a task for pre-conference but feels that is it valuable regardless.
 - a) Currently no, but I feel like that this might not be a bad thing. I know this is another task, but there is not a page limit
3. SW: Appreciates this piece from a transition perspective, are wondering if turnover was taken into account.
 - a) If turnover occurs, the incoming position gets the transition report from the previous officer that finished their term. We would not require a report from a recalled officer or someone leaving for their own reasons.
4. CA: wondering if regions would be able to request additional information that is regionally specific to be included in these reports?
 - a) Yes, but if you would like that, this should be added to the piece. This may be a good idea so this sentiment gets passed on.
5. SA: What is the consequence of not completing a transition report?

- a) Required to be turned in before preconference. It is a voting rights requirement.
- 6. GL: In maintaining voting rights as a region, would everyone from the board have to complete the report to receive voting rights?
 - a) Yes.
- 7. NE: Are there any guidelines related to content or length?
 - a) I would say that the NAA would be able to say that something could be incomplete, but I am uncomfortable to put a page limit because of differences in writing style.
- 8. SW: move to end Q&A
 - a) 2nd by GL, no dissent

D. Discussion

- 1. CA: moves to amend
 - a) Amendment: in the piece changes to add the highlighted section: "The NACURH Associate for Administration may request additional information be included based on the current needs of the corporation.
 - (1) Regional and Office Directors or Advisors may request additional information be included based on the current needs of the corporation."
 - (2) seconded by MA
 - b) Proponent Speech:
 - (1) CA feels that this is important to allow for autonomy to meet the needs of each individual entity, wanted to leave the language vague but feel that this reaches the intent.
 - c) Q/A
 - (1) SW: Our advisors oversee our transition process. Would you be opposed to adding "Regional Advisors" to this section?
 - (a) Would be open to that as a friendly amendment
 - (2) NE: Could we have just one section including office directors?
 - (a) Would be open to that as a friendly amendment
 - (3) SA: moves to end Q&A, seconded by SW
 - d) Discussion:
 - (1) SW: Proposes an amendment to add Regional Advisors and Office Directors to this piece

- (a) Not accepted, would prefer a different wording
 - (2) CA: friendly amends his own piece to strike subsection B and add advisor
 - (3) SA: moves to make a friendly amendment to to section 7.
 - (a) Does not pertain to the motion currently under discussion.
 - (4) SW: calls the question on the amendment
 - (a) Vote
 - (i) 7-1-0
 - (ii) Amendment carries
- 2. NE: we have no reservations with this piece and commend the NAA for this work
- 3. CA: moves to strike point three that "a transition report will only be required of individuals leaving their position"
 - a) Seconded by GL
 - b) Proponent speech:
 - (1) this will allow for better transition considering turnover in positions and will allow for clear data from each year regardless of term
 - c) Q&A
 - (1) SA: moves to end Q&A
 - (a) NE: dissents
 - (b) SA: rescends
 - (2) NE: Do you believe that some aspects of the transition report may be weird for returning officers to fill out?
 - (a) Yes, but I don't believe that this falls under the spirit of the piece. We should be understanding that some sections aren't applicable, but overall most sections are applicable.
 - (3) SW: moves to end Q&A
 - (a) NCO-Kent: seconds
 - d) Discussion:
 - (1) SA: appreciates this because even if someone is returning, there is still an opportunity for turn over.
 - (2) GL: Echoes the sentiment of the SA. There are also some things that may be forgotten after re-serving

- (3) IA: we would like to echo the sentiments of the Great Lakes and feel that this would allow for the policy to be interpreted by the NAA in situations of two year terms
- (4) CA: feels like this is good because positions are annual and should be ran as such in terms of transition as opposed to who is serving within the position
- (5) NCO-Kent: calls the question
 - (a) Amendment carries
 - (b) Vote: 8-0-0
- 4. GL calls the question
 - a) SA: dissent
 - (1) Still has points to make
 - (2)
- 5. SA: moves to amend
 - a) Amendment: **"The NACURH Associate for Administration, Regional or Office Director, or Advisors may request additional information be included based on the current needs of the corporation."**
 - b) NE seconds
 - c) Proponent Speech: We are supporting shorter governing documents
 - d) Q/A:
 - (1) GL: moves to end
 - (a) IA: seconds
 - e) Discussion:
 - (1) NAA: Feel that this is fine but on the other hand, I appreciated about the sub bullet because it implied a coordination of the process. That is the way I interpreted it as the interpreter of policy for NACURH
 - (2) CA: echoes similar concerns, would like the intention to remain that the NAA has the responsibility of requesting information
 - (3) NCO Kent: Agree with semantics and think it should not pass, but love the idea of shorter documents
 - (4) CA calls the question
 - (a) No dissent
 - f) Vote:

(1) 1-6-1, amendment fails

6. NE calls the question
 - a) No objection
7. Vote
 - a) 8-0-0; motion carries

VII. NBD 17-36

A. GL moves to bring to the floor; second from SA

B. Proponent:

1. Tech catalyst has been looking at regional online business practices to standardize across NACURH. Looked at policies or practices and that is where this piece came from. Within the piece currently it says NACURH and regional affiliates, but the by laws have certain policies that we cannot break, so I would suggest we remove NACURH from that, but leave regional affiliates.

C. Q&A

1. IA: Will regions have to update their online business meeting policies with this?
 - a) A: Since regional affiliates is specifically stated, you will have to update your policies to match.
2. NE: Is there an accountability plan for enforcing the required use of Zoom?
 - a) A: We will not police policy, but you all are paying for Zoom so from a business perspective you should.
 - b) NE: Was the intention for this to be enforced?
 - (1) A: Yes
3. SW: When people call in to chat they cannot use the chat box, so we use GroupMe...so is that acceptable as a solution?
 - a) A: I don't know, to be honest. I think it could be acceptable if it is not possible at all, we just thought that most regions do this already. Whatever is easiest for you to use for those individuals is fine.
4. NCO Kent: We are worried about the fifth line that talks about voting procedures, what are we talking about there?
 - a) A: We are talking about the way the voting happens (placard or secret ballot). The same methods should be used in person and online. Also with regards to who gets to vote, simple vs. majority.

- b) NCO Kent: We are worried that this makes it difficult to fully follow this procedures.
 - (1) A: We talked about that and potentially requiring certain kinds of voting, but we decided that we didn't want to place requirements on how voting happens. We didn't want to require things that challenge practices and policies.
- 5. IA: Can you go over the point you made in the proponent speech in the business policies and why NACURH needs to be excluded?
 - a) A: Article 11 needs to be followed by NBD, but regional affiliates don't have to follow that because they don't vote on behalf of the corporation
- 6. MA: Does this supercede our current practices for divergence between in person and online business practices. How does this affect our need to make the region work?
 - a) A: That's a tough question based on differences. We know that quorum was a big issue, but I don't foresee that changing. Quorum is not in this piece because that is different in different policy books. If it is not specifically stated here you should not have to change it.
 - b) MA: SO quorum is not included in voting procedure then?
 - (1) A: Correct
- 7. GL: NACURH, Inc. Would have to be stricken, as previously mentioned, so is this just a dictation of regional policies? And would this be more efficient than regions making these policies?
 - a) A: I don't think you all follow the same rules because it's just is different and unnecessary. We also didn't want to leave it to the regions to create their own because this way we can have standard guidelines.
- 8. NE: Did you have hesitations incorporating Zoom specifically, given that the contract does not technically have to be removed.
 - a) A: Zoom was added after adding the other policies. We see that Xero is in the policy book so we felt that Zoom was also appropriate to add.
- 9. CA moves to end; second from SW
 - a) Dissent from IA: Has a question

10. IA: Could you provide perspective about the philosophy of standardizing these policies across the regions

- a) A: This was the task that the catalyst was given. The charge was to explore policy books for online business practices and to see if there were standardization opportunities

11. CA moves to end Q&A; second from PA

- a) No objections

D. Discussion

1. PA moves to amend to strike out in article 5 section 2 point 5 where it says it must be the same as in person meeting; seconded by NE

- a) No objections

b) Proponent:

- (1) We feel this should be stricken out because the policy books portion is enough to give that power of voting procedure if the region has it in their policy book and feel that's how they want to run online procedure. Restricting it to identical to in person meetings is not great given there are at least MA and PA that have contradictory policies already in our policy books.

c) Q&A:

- (1) MA moves to end; seconded by GL

- (a) No objections

d) Discussion:

- (1) CA: appreciates sentiment, but we believe that this should be inclusive of a much larger amendment and this is too narrowly focused. There are larger concerns

- (2) NCO Kent: We would like to say we appreciate PA sentiment, it's a large issue, but for time and focus we should pass this amendment and then make a commitment to address larger problems rather than making a series of amendments

- (3) NE calls the question

- (a) No objections

e) Vote

- (1) 8-0-0

- (a) Amendment carries

2. GL: The Great Lakes is not in favor of this piece as we see it as overstepping and creating undue inefficiencies in practices that many regions have already adopted which best fit their region and culture.
3. CA moves to amend:
 - a) "All necessary legislation and agendas are required to be sent out at least 1 week ahead of time.
 - b) Time given for proponent speeches, Question and Answer, Pro and Con, and Discussion will be equal to in person meetings
 - c) All other procedures are up the discretion of the appropriate Board of Directors and policy books and must be equal to in person meetings"
 - d) And to strike the last two lines of the piece
4. Seconded by SW
 - a) Proponent:
 - (1) CA feels there should be flexibility for regional needs, plus there are policies that will make it difficult to do this. Going for equality rather than identical policies implies equitability of power to legislate themselves. This is a larger, fairer, ethical statement rather than being so specific.
 - b) Q&A
 - (1) IA: The way we are interpreting equal, it is based on the policy.
 - (a) We should be focused on equity and consistency, but not specifics of how that is upheld. We want to represent everyone fairly and practicing in good faith. It's not wise to move into a direction of all practicing exactly the same. Certain things will be the same for all, but not necessarily methods
 - (2) NE: Does this amendment eliminate the need for the piece entirely?
 - (a) No because in point 4 for example it makes sure that certain procedures aren't unfairly changed between in person and online. It makes sense to legislate about using Zoom and that 1 week is

given for prep of legislation by voters. This avoids the small nuances.

(3) PA: Can you clarify by what you mean when you say "equal in person" besides listed in 4

(a) Our quorum is based on number of registered institutions at conference, but then for online chats we would have to register people or change conference quorum, and then we could not have quorum. Part five requires that we have to do certain things, but not how we have to do them.

(4) GL moves to end; MA seconds

c) Discussion

(1) SA: There is a lot in interpreting this piece that says that your online meetings are the same as in person meetings

(2) PA: If I had to interpret this amendment and I saw this, my interpretation would be that it has to be the same. I understand the interpretation of the CA, but it is open to interpretation. I'm wary of this amendment because of that.

(3) IA calls

(a) No objection

(4) Vote

(i) 1-7-0

(a) Motion fails

5. NE moves to amend via:

a) "Article V: Online Meetings

(1) 1. Video Software

(a) a. NACURH Inc. and all regional affiliates and entities shall have an official video software determined by current corporate contracts and best practices. The use of the currently defined official video software shall be required for all official virtual meeting sessions."

(2) And that rest of the piece be stricken

b) seconded by SA

c) Proponent

(1) This first section gives the policy longevity. This amendment still provides structure. The remaining sections could be kept in some capacity. However, to say

that policies and procedures are dictated by regions makes the piece unnecessary and over-stepping. A line from that section could be kept

d) Q&A

(1) CA moves to end; Second from PA

(a) No objections

e) Discussion

(1) CA: feels that although we appreciate the sentiment in that there is probably that maybe the online business meeting procedures may not be in the best interest of the boardroom at the time, but seeing that we specifically mention other softwares, we are in full support of the Zoom section and would

(2) IA: Appreciates the amendment and spirit, but we believe that the overall spirit of the original piece has not yet been discussed. We want to return to a conversation about the original piece and how it impacts the corporation as a whole

(3) SA: We are in full support in that it defines the boundaries of NACURH very clearly and NACURH is responsible for ensuring regions complete business in a responsible manner. It allows regions the freedom to define their policies and practices for online business meetings. NACURH provides guidelines for effectiveness and transparency, but the regions have some autonomy

(4) PA: Question of the chair: does the amendment change the spirit?

(a) A: This amendment is contrary to the spirit of the piece

(b) Moving back to the original piece

6. IA: Concerned about the implications of this piece. It's made clear in many strategic plans that we are moving towards more virtual business, but this is restrictive of the regions. We are unsure if this piece is necessary and many regions seem to be echoing that. We respect the ideas and thought behind this piece, but feel that this does not effectively move us forward

7. SA: Appreciates the work of the catalyst, but echo the sentiments of GL and IA that this is restrictive and unnecessary
8. GL moves to end discussion, seconded by SW
 - a) CA dissents - have not talked about all pieces of this legislation
 - b) Vote on dissent
 - (1) 2-6-0; objection is not sustained

E. Vote

1. 0-8-0
2. Motion

VIII. NBD 17-18

A. SA moves to bring to the floor; seconded by PA

B. Proponent Speech

1. NACURH U and LEAD are in an interesting place. Both are in a place where they need different kinds of work, but the work available is connected through a lack of intention at this time to move them forward in a productive way. We want to move forward in the intentional aspect given NSPA data suggest people are here for leadership development. Having a connection between the two pieces provides the NAA the ability to support both easier. NCO rep supporting LEAD will work with NACURH U more. Additionally, it provides a better connection with the in and out of conference arenas. This provides a streamlined approach between the two. This has a three word marketing campaign, but we do not want to create much of a curriculum based thing. Educate, Empower, Engage. One of the tasks next semester is for a catalyst to go into a tiered options and what LEAD needs to look like in those tiers if passed. This leads NACURH U in a better direction that is more streamlined. These are two important initiatives of NACURH and this brings them together to achieve a more important outcome. Also, NACURH U has eight categories. This means that programs should have some part of these categories that focus on our learning outcomes.

C. Q&A

1. PA: This piece looks amazing! Why, out of those 8 topics, regional involvement was not included?
 - a) A: Those evolved sort of organically. There were some aspects that were meant to be incorporated last year, but a lot of the other topics have always been utilized. There are a lot of things

that can fall within this and not necessarily everything is included. We want the regions to be educating the regions about themselves rather than NACURH doing it.

2. MA: How is LEAD tracked and who is responsible for that?
 - a) A: It is tracked via a google form by NCO Lincoln CO for NRHH. This will continue next year with the merged NCO. The forms are on nacurh.org/lead
3. GL moves to end question and answer; seconded by NE
 - a) No objections

D. Discussion

1. CA: Full support of this piece. It helps to organize two of our leadership development programs. This allows us to streamline the programs. We are concerned about marketing, but that the spirit of this is important.
2. MA: We are in support because it puts more organization and intention into these programs
3. GL: In full support and appreciate putting the desired outcome in policy
4. IA: Appreciates this from a marketing standpoint because it will help schools to get engaged. These three marketing words are very useful
5. IA NRHH: We appreciate the connection between NACURH U and LEAD, especially in that they help students get involved on the NACURH level.
6. NCO Kent: We want to thank the authors because it perfectly outlines LEAD and feel this is the direction NACURH needs to go in.
7. MA calls the question
 - a) No objections(1) 8-0-0

IX. Annual Conference Presentation

- A. SA: Where will the rest of the COs be staying?
 1. Same place as the NBD and NNB
- B. IA: For transportation at the airport, you are asking for delegations to arrive prior to the time you are supposed to leave.
 1. That's for departure
- C. IA: For flying delegations would you accept photo of students submitting food drive on their on campus?
 1. Yes

- D. SA: Thank you for your hard work, touching on volunteers: How many volunteers are you looking for and how are you planning on recognizing volunteers?
1. We want to have by the end around 100 now so we have 70 by conference. We do have recognition in the budget so we want to have a social or some kind of takeaway. They will all get t shirts and housing/dining for those who need it.
- E. IA: you all described NACURH U programming, but it wasn't in the schedule. What is the plan?
1. The current plan is that it will be implemented in the programming sessions. There will be some NACURH U programs within the other programming tracks.
- F. NCO Lincoln: Where is check in planned to be? And what are the logistics involved?
1. So the check in location will be first street towers. It's across the road from first street towers, to the right in that residence hall. It's the typical front lobby area and it has two activity rooms on the side. Will use these room to help organize table orders.
- G. SA: I want to commend you on your programming, very pleased with it. How will you incorporate ART?
1. ART is handled separately, outside of the programming for delegates. We'll be taking care of that separately, but we have planned for amenities and programming spaces. Working with Adam and the committee for ART coordination.
- H. GL: Proud of you!!! Although you'll already have signs at the airport, will you have signage on campus for those who are driving onto campus?
1. Yeah for people who are driving, we'll have signs where free parking is and centralized buildings. We'll make sure there is plenty of documentation demonstrating the best way to get to campus, how to find the specific parking garage/registration. Volunteers on shuttles if they are flying.
- I. SA: Last year, COs were pulled in for check in. Should they be prepared for that this year? We did not know this last year.
1. We would prefer for that not to happen
- J. OCM: How many bears can you build for philanthropy with Build A Bear

1. We got a quote for 1900 bears at \$6.25/bear. We are guessing that not all attendees will want to make them so we don't want to buy too many. We are currently budgeted for 1000 and the price point could change.
- K. NAF: Your key note speaker also appeared at GLACURH. What's the justification for innovating for that specific region that may have seen or may see similar context for that
 1. I know the keynote speaker from before GL. I have been working with him since and it has been a major point that he bring a new show to NACURH. He gave me a lot of different ideas and we will work with him to ensure it is not the same experience.
- L. GL moves to end Q&A, seconded by SA
 1. No objections
- X. PA moves for 15 minute recess, MA seconds
 - A. No objections
- XI. South Atlantic Regional Update
 - A. Q&A
 1. NCO Kent: Great presentation! You talked about SAAS, the alumni society, and how it's coordinated by one person, who is that?
 - a) A: Regional NRHH Advisor will coordinate. It was originally by PRS and advisors and we want to eliminate the confusion
 2. MA: Can you talk more about your new Bridge program? Is it similar/ conflicted with LEAD?
 - a) A: No. suggested list of activities for NRHH/RHA activities to do together. Basically what it is is an interactive program with different levels. Each step has more interactive items. Complete everything and then you go to the next level. You would get a certificate if you complete.
 - b) NCO Kent: Can you give examples of those activities?
 - (1) A: One of the activities is to have an OTM writing party. Recognition project or service project together. Goody bags for RAs would be an example. Diamond level includes presenting programs for RHA in their meeting and an NRHH meeting . While NACURH lead is more individual based, Build the Bridge is more institutional base. Based off the idea of an interactive program.
 3. NE: In your search of exploration of a regional philanthropy, what has your success been?

- a) A: My advisor and I have been working on this since the beginning. I contacted Megan to CO RS about IHAD. We have been in contact with their outsourcing person and we want to bring a group to present at our RBC NRHH Boardroom. We want to put it into policy this year or next year if we need to put connections together.
- 4. SW: for weekly snapchat, do you change the password every time you give it to a new institution. Only one institution can be signed in at any given time and I give emails to those who participate.
 - a) A: One consistent password. We tried changing it at NACURH and it's a pain. We follow a faith system that they will only use it once.
- 5. IA: You mentioned that a lot of your legislation had a lot consensus. What did you see in your reps for conversations that had consensus?
 - a) A: There was a large degree of acceptance. They did recognize working with the corporation's policy and the equity statement as necessary items. They generally didn't have too much dissent about any of it.
- 6. NE: Could you delve into the dynamic between the two advisors play out?
 - a) A: Our advisors are a huge support to all of us. The best way to describe it is that Adam plays a lead role as far as joint chats when we're all together and serves as guidance and 1x1s to those of us who are not associated with NRHH necessarily. NBD members are under adam and then Marti, Josh, and Ben are under Daniel. Adam has been working on advisor guides and list serves and buddy systems. One thing that is different is that Dan deals with ART (ART Coordinator) and Adam works with finance.
- 7. SW: How does weekly newsletters work exactly?
 - a) A: I would encourage you all to join the SAACURH list serve. We will be sending one out tomorrow as with every Friday. SEC members submit what they want to have published in the OTP. Ben creates this by compiling that information and sends it out to the region. It ends up being a lot of the same information but we try to switch out information about what RHA and NRHH chapters are up to at any given time.

- A. SA moves to bring 17-11 to the floor ; seconded by GL
 - 1. No objections
- B. Chair yields gavel to NAF
- C. Proponent:
 - 1. Page 12 of the NACURH strategic plan mentions the creation of a NACURH wide transition retreat. It encourages the creation of standardized documents and transition materials, as well as the use of the Annual Conference and Site as the site and location. We want a retreat for one night at the NACURH Annual Conference. There is HAND HEART FOOT and CO training and we want one training ran by incoming executive team and on Monday we want a transition retreat organized by the outgoing in collaboration with incoming executive team. We want a two year trial commitment, because it could affect the regional transition retreats. We want to give it time to try this year and have it be a standard aspect of a NACURH annual bid for NACURH 2018. We plan to have strengthened spring transition plans. On February 1st, all transition plans would be released to the boards. We will begin NACURH leadership transition officially by April 1, with the hope that these have started if you've had your RBC's earlier in the semester. This will be different for each position, with Directors likely having the heaviest transitions. These will exist as Zoom roundtable forums. We are looking for potential for a workbook which will be a "You've been elected...now what?" This is important because you plan a lot when you bid and that all changes when those goals become real. The retreat schedule that will make the most sense would be to do one night as a social team building thing with an expectation that incoming execs gave adequate time as to the structure of this time. The Monday retreat would have some combined things that would go into Hand, Heart, Foot, and Advisor (Conference and Foot training). Topics will be collected from current positions at a later date. We don't want this to be a stale training that can't evolve with NACURH. Since this piece affects this year's conference, regarding the conversation of "can we make this work on our end" and what will that look like, we needed to speak as a group with the conference staff. In closing, this piece did come late, but it is important. It needed to be late so we could talk to all parties involved and provide a complete picture.
- D. Q&A

1. MA: If incoming members travel with institutions, what are the reasons behind picking Monday?
 - a) It is advantageous to have this on Monday for the conference and we want to hear this now so that everyone is aware that this is an expectation. If necessary, it is also possible that they could be able to travel on their own at this point.
2. Kent: For the Saturday night how late do you expect that to go and how do you hope to be productive during that time?
 - a) That training is not great for the NACURH executives. You are elected during the week, but still acting in your role...but then you have a training to plan 48 hours later. We want to NOT do this. The incoming executives should be planning a social transition rather than the Monday logistical one. In working with the incoming executives, we hope they come in with plans on how that works with them.
 - b) Kent: What kind of timeline do you suppose this will happen?
 - (1) It will not end later than 11:30PM
3. CA: Are there things that will affect our budgets?
 - a) If your region covers incoming costs for COs, that cost is the same as an extra day cost. You don't have to stay Monday night, unless you have to stay later.
 - b) CA: Will meals be provided for this extra day?
 - (1) It could come out of the NACURH budget, but not always guaranteed
4. IA: How does it affect the trainings that happen in the evenings?
5. Time called - SW moves to extend; seconded by MA
 - a) We will only have one during the week in the evening, and the positional difficult trainings will happen Monday during the day and will hopefully yield a stronger retention of information.
6. NE: Is this required?
 - a) It is not required through NACURH. A good majority of regions require attendance from their COs. Hand Heart and Foot training is required for the Directorships. It would be highly recommended. We will explore in the future the necessity of attendance.
 - b) NE: Do the regions absorb the cost of registration?

- (1) I would not interpret it that way. Again, highly recommended is the language we would use.
7. GL: Can you reallocate boardroom time for this?
- a) Yes, that is being considered
8. SA: Are all outgoing regional officers staying until Monday already?
- a) Because of the space time and resources, it would be a transition for only incoming board. We will assess bringing the outgoing members for next year.
- b) SA: Hypothetically, if Shannon were a regional NRHH officer and ran for NAN, but wasn't aware she would be there, as a regional officer who wasn't required to stay until Monday know to book the correct transportation.
- (1) If you are intending to bid for a position, you should plan accordingly.
9. PA: Were the quarter schools taken into consideration?
- a) This year, the Monday is Memorial day, so most schools have it off. The Annual Conference does often land on that Memorial Day.
10. Kent: It seems ambitious to have all of this in 6 hours so we're concerned about this replacing regional stuff. How do you think that will play out?
- a) There is nothing in here that says that this year people cannot have a transition retreat. There might not be time to do everything, but we will have plans on Feb 1 so that we all have a concept of what will be happening. Also the virtual conference could be moved to the summer to cover extra things.
- b) Kent: Do you anticipate the future will remain on this 6 hour timeline?
- (1) We think that it could be changed. There isn't a perfect system for trying something new the first time. This way we have two trials and come the second time around, there will be people who have already experienced it.
11. GL: Thinking long term, moving through this entire transition period, if we are not requiring people to attend and some people can attend and then we are required to end all transition retreats, could this loose transition information for regions?

- a) Hesitant to speculate that far in the future. Leading up to this and following, regions can transition separately on their own virtually. We are working on creating failsafes as well through documents. What's cool about having a trial is that people who experience can speak to that experience.
12. GL: If someone comes with a host institution and they leave Sunday, I have to stay Monday and pay for travel out of own pocket?
- a) Host institution would stay until Monday because the conference isn't closed until then.
13. GL: For those traveling with institutions, do they count towards host institution delegation cap?
- a) Yes because we could go over capacity if we don't do this.
14. CA: Are conference chairs going to be included in this at all?
- a) NACURH Leadership is who will be there
15. SW: Is this not a liability issue in the sense that if the incoming person comes with their school
16. NE moves to extend by 15 minutes; second by Lincoln
- a) SA dissents - exhaust speakers with additions
 - b) Vote
- (1) 6-2-0
17. SW continued: Is the host institution still liable?
- a) That is a delegation liability not a NACURH liability. There are liabilities when we meet late at night too, though. Figuring this out now so people can make appropriate plans would be helpful.
 - b) SW: What if that person registered separately from their delegation, but traveled with them?
- (1) You have to register with a school or entity.
18. MA: We operate with transition as collaboration between outgoing and incoming boards. Is that a goal for this or is the training coming solely from the NACURH execs.
- a) This moves that collaboration like that will happen before NACURH virtually. Ideally we could have both outgoing and incoming, though.
 - b) Can collaboration happen within 6 hours?
- (1) One NACURH means One NACURH and this way we can have a standardized training.
- (2) Training is always different pieces. This is new to all of us.

19. SW: For the schools that drive, will there be a risk management problem since schools have to leave at a later time?
- a) That can be considered. Risk based on driving at 3PM is less than that of traveling after being up until 1AM.
20. GL: Revisiting Heart Hand and Foot being required, if a school isn't attending NACURH, that school cannot attend. Does this affect them serving in this position?
- a) It is required, but we have never actually had perfect attendance. If the person was elected they are affiliated and can register alone.
21. IA: What are regional advisors doing?
- a) Supporting their boards, helping transition, either way they will be there.
 - b) IA: Based on the ideas right now, are there ideas of implementing advisor training or development in this time?
 - (1) It's come up in conversation within the scope of what is the intent of an advisor. Is this a development opportunity for them or to advise students?
22. NE: When schools have a significant distance to travel and 2PM makes travel expensive/unsafe, would housing be available in the future?
- a) We could provide that this year
23. PA: If housing would be provided, is that cost added to regions or conference staff?
- a) The cost would not be added to the conference staff
 - b) NE: When a school is waiting for a newly elected member, and have to wait Monday into Tuesday, the region has to absorb that?
 - (1) The region is not requiring the entire school to be there so they would not absorb this cost. We have a similar situation for conference bid teams who have to pay to come early to bid.
24. Kent moves to end; second by CA
- a) No objections

E. Discussion

1. NCO Kent moves to caucus for 10 minutes; SA seconds
 - a) Dissent NE - wants to caucus for 30 minutes
 - b) Vote

- (1) 4-4-0; NAF breaks tie in favor of 10 minute caucus.
2. MA: The Midwest feels that ultimately we have gotten off track of the spirit of this piece. We commend the authors for taking this on and recognize the gravity. We see extreme value in having a standardized NACURH transition retreat and are confident that the increased training will result in a better future for our organization. Our hope is that we can shift back to the original goals of this piece and ultimately try this retreat option knowing that this would strictly be on a trial basis. That said, we are still concerned with the lack of individual regional time that would be allowed over all and are less comfortable with the legislation being "one or the other" for regional transition retreats
 3. CA: Central Atlantic is concerned that this piece aims to address regional transition, but that in reality piece aims to eliminate regional-level in-person transition, while restructuring NACURH training. While the Central Atlantic supports the goals of One NACURH and recognizes the need for standardization of that level of training, we also recognize that a lot of discussion and legislation has revolved this week thus far around the idea that we all have different regional identities. That we all function differently, with different positions, and different needs informed by the institutions that we were elected to represent and to serve. In fact, this distinction between regions has HALTED legislation from being passed this week, because we can recognize that in respect of one another. The Central Atlantic believes that One NACURH means that we act as whole while still being our own piece. Like a puzzle with different shaped pieces. Not 8 squares that make a bigger square. The Central Atlantic believes that while ONE NACURH and standardization is important, all regions have their own needs and structures. ONE NACURH is about resource and information sharing, as well as collaboration. Just because this is in the strategic plan, and helps move ONE NACURH forward in the eyes of the authors, neither of these require this training day to be passed, nor the regional transition retreat to be halted. The Central Atlantic does not believe that NACURH training is equivalent to Regional-level in-person transition, nor that this time will hold the values and benefits that regional-level transition holds.
 4. IA: We appreciate the idea that February 1 will yield a plan, and there is a special nature to regional retreats, but this is a trial and we will have time for feedback in time for altering this. There is always an

opportunity to meet via Zoom for regional retreats as needed. We should give this a shot and see what happens in the future

5. PA: We appreciate this for the attempt to help the corporation, regardless of the regions. We are concerned about the financial implications of this piece, however. Asking host institutions to put this financial burden on themselves to avoid it on ourselves has put host support in jeopardy in the past and will in the future.
6. GL: We echo every statement made by the Central Atlantic. Although we support the spirit of enhanced training at the NACURH we also are extremely concerned with the idea of eliminating regional transition retreats as technically our CO are at the service of our region's institutions first and not the overall population of NACURH's institutions. Additionally we are deeply concerned by the current NBD voting to eliminate regional retreats and would rather that be decided by a future NBD.
7. SA: We echo CA. We believe collaboration with incoming boards develops relationship with whole boards, but will also help develop and further and inspire new initiatives and goals for the upcoming year.
8. SA: We realize that the piece as it stands does not eliminate transitions as is, but is a trial period and an experiment. We support the purpose of innovation and change in order to best suit corporation as a whole. There are issues regarding transportation and additional lodging, we agree that some revisions need to be made. We do support the institution of some kind of retreat for all of NACURH.
9. NCO Kent: We appreciate the region's thought into regional retreat time, but feel that the NACURH transition would be beneficial to NACURH and should be tried. If the last line is the issue, we suggest an amendment so that we can talk about that to compromise. The other prong of discussion is that travel to this and around this: for the trial year, there will still be a regional retreat for these two years and when this piece is put into policy permanently, other options could be assessed.
10. NBD Liaison: We would like to encourage RBDs to think about whether or not transition is required or encouraged. There may need to be sacrifice for the furthering of the corporation. There may be increased financial obligations, but there is another sacrifice.

11. CA: We feel that the implementation of the spring transitions, which is not a part of the piece, but believe in the spirit of the focus on transition processes. Instead of exploring an in person retreat, instead explore virtual transition retreat and then reevaluate the in person retreat.
12. PA: We thought the transitional retreat was required for the directorships.
13. GL: The Great Lakes is also deeply concerned with financial and transportation implications this may have, especially as we believe this may spur regions to begin attempting to budget to ensure their future leaders are present to receive the necessary training to best serve our institutions. This is especially crucial to us as we acknowledge every region's task of passing balanced no-deficit budgets.
14. SW: Can we yield a question to the authors?
 - a) This year if we have board members who cannot attend, will there be plans to replace that experience?
 - (1) Yes, we will not let a region fail because someone cannot attend.
15. NE: moves to caucus for 15 minutes; seconded GL
 - a) No objections
16. PA: Delegates and RBD are students.
17. PA: Not every region hosts an in person transition retreat, such as us. If we were to support our board in the future to stay longer, that would increase costs in our budget
18. GL: moves to amend the piece to strike the last "therefore" statement
 - a) "Therefore let it further be resolved, that should the NBD and NNB decide that the NACURH Leadership Transition cease to be budgeted for"
 - b) CA seconds, no objections
 - c) Proponent Speech:
 - (1) The Great Lakes feels as though for the same reason as we have tabled and failed other pieces this weekend for not being inclusive of regional culture and practices, that we should remove this dictation. Some additional background for this decision is although we truly support enhancing NACURH level training, we must bare in mind what we believe is truly best for our region's institutions.

We are one region that has transition retreats in policy, and have them planned and structured with information regarding NACURH but predominantly, I'd dare to say, about 80% is regarding our regional practices, policies, and best supporting our region. We are also fairly confused on why supplemental transitions on a regional level would be outlawed by NACURH policies in general.

d) Q&A

(1) NE moves to end, seconded by SA

(a) no objections

e) Discussion

(1) NCO Kent: Appreciates sentiment, but prefer that the author do something less complete. The authors of the piece, we feel, intended that the relationship be addressed. If you want to remove the finality, the wording should be changed to "reevaluate" or "reassess" rather than eliminate this part in general.

(2) IA: Question to authors of the original piece - IA wants to hear original authors intent on the removal of regional retreats so we understand the original spirit and how this amendment would impact our decision.

(a) We didn't necessarily talk on this. The question is fiscal responsibility. If we move forward with this, and this were expanded or changed in ways that would cost regions more...is it fiscally responsible for regions to do both? We should be examining responsibility.

(3) MA: echo sentiments NCO Kent. We final value in regional retreats, but want to preserve language in NACURH Strategic plan. Want to see less finality, and more reevaluation.

(4) NCO Kent calls the question

(a) No objections

(i) Vote 3-5-0 fails

19. CA: CAACURH still has concerns over the necessity of implementing NACURH wide transition retreat immediately. Several regions have

concerns about having new members present at retreat. It is a better option at this time to move forward with a virtual transition.

20. NCO Kent: We would like to speak on the perception of in person retreat being valuable. With FOOT, HEART, and HAND training, we've had those in person at midnight and at one am. That culture says that something NACURH values is being in person, even though it's at one am. In that spirit, even if this doesn't pass, NACURH is going to have to do this transition and they're going to have to do it late at night in the middle of conference. In person and during daytime hours is more valuable to focus on. This is worth trying, even if just for that alone.

21. MA moves to amend

a) "Therefore let it further be resolved, that should the NBD and NNB decide that the NACURH Leadership Transition retreat be worth continuing that the practice of regional transition retreats be re-evaluated."

(1) Second from PA; no objections

b) Proponent Speech:

(1) The Midwest sees the NACURH transition retreat as valuable and ultimately are hopeful in seeing this pass. Because of this, we are proposing this amendment to meet and address some of the current concerns in the room. We choose the language of a re-evaluation over striking the piece entirely because we do know that the phasing out of regional transition retreats is in the NACURH strategic plan and feel that this would allow for that conversation to continue in future years. In summation, we see this as a middle ground to hopefully resolve some of the concerns being stated but also carry out the spirit of the piece and the direction of the NACURH strategic plan.

c) Q&A

(1) SA moves to end; seconded by PA

(a) No objections

d) Discussion

(1) IA appreciates this amendment. As the Midwest explained, it finds middle ground and enforces a focus on

assessment. Utilize the transition period of two years would focus on that specifically.

(2) GL: GL appreciates this amendment as it proposes to do what our intention was to begin with

(3) PA calls the question, no objections

(4) Vote

(a) 8-0-0 carries

22. IA: The Intermountain would like to remind the room that this training will only be an additional six hours on the original day of departure. With recent the passing of the risk management piece that prohibits any form of travel before 7am, there would be a high chance of any conference attendee missing any other commitments, such as school or work anyway. As the smallest region, we are not concerned about the financial aspect of this piece per our current regional practices though we recognize that some regions may have reservations about the financial implications. In addition, if individuals are coming in not previously on the NACURH leadership team, we have faith that individuals make agreements with their host institutions to make all travel and finances work. We believe that with this valuable, in-person training is worth any possible minor increase in cost.

23. Point of Information from Annual Conference Staff

a) Time Called 0 GL moves to extend time; seconded by CA

b) Each region responds briefly without being recognized

24. GL: One of the bigger problems our region has with this piece is the financial impact this could have on future RBD members. While we understand that this is an optional transition that future RBD members would not be required to attend we would like to prevent the scenario where someone such as a future finance officer had to wait for additional training at a later date while still conducting their positional duties in the meantime. We don't entirely feel as if the stress that could come from an scenario such as this is worth it or worth the financial impact it could have on a future RBD member from our region.

25. SW: It's possible that some of our incoming board members will not be able to attend due to the culture of host school support in our region. We understand the benefits of in person meetings, we don't want to take away the experiences of those who could attend.

26. NE: The Northeast is concerned that a One NACURH rationale behind reshaping NACURH leadership training in the manner suggested by this piece would serve as a detriment to the regions. Regional transitional meetings enable regional boards of directors to dictate the time and content of transitional items that would best serve their respective regions. Additionally, the added training time not only has the potential

to place an added financial burden on the region, but delegations from host institutions that might be required to wait for the regional leadership attending conference. In NEACURH, a regional training also provides a geographically close location for the regional board of directors. While we understand that this may not be applicable in all instances, as a region that is not currently able to fund the travel of its executives. The Northeast doesn't see the validity in strongly encouraging RBD members to travel to a location that could be anywhere in the United States to attend a training meeting. Additionally, this training is non-inclusive of differences between regions of the involvement of conference chairs on the regional board. The NEACURH SLC conference chair stated that "Attending the regional transition meeting was an extremely rewarding experience and helped me perform my functions as conference more adequately than if I had not attended an in-person meeting." There are different cultures across America let alone across NACURH. To suggest that 4 executives can effectively train and transition students on their positions as well as how to effectively lead a region that those executives may not have had hands-on experience with is misguided. In an increasingly virtual organization, the in-person connections are crucial to the success of the organization. The Northeast believes that productivity is increased during in-person meetings because feedback is instant. The Northeast Coordinating Officers have stressed the importance of in person time in developing their relationship with the RBD and their level of confidence in their positions. This in-person time is already limited, currently, the COs in the Northeast only have 16 days annually to meet and collaborate in person. feedback is instant. Overall the Northeast appreciates the push towards a mentality of "One NACURH" and with the overall concept of more regulated training. However, it is the belief of the NE that One NACURH should never infringe upon regional identity and this piece at as it exists now creates more issues than it is worth regardless of the fact that it will be a trial.

27. Annual Conference Staff: We want to address that the intentions behind this piece are to remove the liability and ineffectiveness of current transition training during the annual conference in the evening. We want to reduce ineffectiveness and liability in current training format.

28. CA moves to table to a group of authors, transition advisor, and any interested parties
29. NACURH Chairperson: No.
- a) Follow Up: This needs to be voted on now as it impacts the annual conference staff and their budget presentation and plans for the annual conference.
30. NBD Liaison: As we've learned, many regions do not have transition retreats in person. If we have this at the end of NACURH it's not a shifting, but a merging. This could save money, as many people have already traveled there regardless. This is also only a 2 year piece/test that is beneficial for all of NACURH.
31. PA: Yields a question to NACURH Chair and Conf - when is the soonest that we would know the cost of the extra day?
- a) NAF: There MAY be a situation that requires people to stay an extra day, but this does not automatically require that, as has been stated. The piece as itself ends still on the same day that everyone would have left anyway. Annual conference staff asserts that it would be \$25 if you had to stay for some reason and NACURH would likely be able to fund meals. If they couldn't fund meals, other arrangements can be made through NACURH.
32. NCO Kent - There is a large value in the in person trainings that NACURH currently provides. If we do not value Hand, Foot, and Heart training, that is another piece of discussion.
33. GL: There is a middle ground that can be reached for in person and online. We need to discuss hypotheticals for such a large piece with so many liabilities.
34. PA: For us to encourage incoming boards while staying in line with new risk management legislation, we will absolutely have to stay an extra day because of the liability. We want to support this but need to know added costs.
35. NE: Question: Will institutions who have submitted intents to bid be notified if this is passed?
- a) NAF: The executives, in collaboration with the conference, have thought about pre bid teams for 2018. We have a plan in terms of CRC outreach so they know about these changes so they can ask questions and address budgets. If this pass, we aren't going

to hide this from them and we will support them through the changes.

b) NE: Is it a requirement for schools who bid to include this, and if a school entered the bidding process being unaware and are currently eligible and then they're ineligible, is there anything we can do?

(1) NAF: It's hard for the NACURH Execs or people in this room to know the facilities of another institution, so I don't have an answer for you. This is coming up now so the pre bid teams have no idea. If this passes, we would make it clear to them that we will continue this practice through NACURH 18. It may not happen past that, but the communication will be in place.

(2) CRC: Most institutions entering into this process are anticipating that they are planning for early arrivals and late departures. The facilities likely are available.

36. NCO Kent: We wanted to talk about not having an in person training and when that comes up. Shannon mentioned earlier that it's pretty common for someone to accidentally not be there for something. That's a great loss, but they still get the training that they need, this also happens when you don't start the role at the annual conference. When I was an ADAF, I had a transition with an NAF. not as valuable without the in-person function, not going to be the most important thing.

37. CA: Appreciates points from the GL, but feel that this is about training not transition. There are other ways this can be done virtually before we decide to go into a full extra 6 hours over a slower process rather than just changing everything at once. If that doesn't work out, we can later decide to add that time.

38. PA: We would like to echo CA. Virtual transition time has the least amount of risk and most potential. Given that we are primarily virtual, we should look to improve our practices online so we can make this time the most valuable it can be.

39. Time expires - MA moves to extend by 15 minutes; second from GL

a) No objections

40. MA: It's easier to hold people accountable in person, we don't feel we can hold people accountable to hold virtual training.

41. NCO Kent: We want to emphasize our point that the difference between valuing electronic vs in person training is a different conversation. NACURH has stated that we prefer in person training and it is more valuable.
42. IA moves to caucus for 10 minutes; seconded by GL
 - a) No objections
43. PA: would like to encourage the boards to challenge culture and look to improve virtual practices such as training. Though we continue to value in-person meetings over virtual meetings, we need to recognize the flexibility virtual conferences offers us to meet limitations and circumstances such as class schedules or budget limitations.
44. GL: The Great Lakes would first like to note the previous statements of Host Institutions willingly paying for their students under a mutual agreement of hosting said individual. It is our belief that in a perfect world, yes, they could be considered. But we also believe that this is inequitable to schools who have different regulations and rules in regards to paying for travel and further the lone travel of students. We also feel it is inequitable to expect those that wish to attend this training to pay out of pocket. We would additionally be remiss to not mention the current financial climate in higher education and specifically that in an age of budget shortfalls they may ultimately not be willing or able to pay.
45. IA: The Intermountain would like the room to refocus and have the all regions reflect on whether they value the intentional, valuable, in-person training that NACURH is attempting to implement as that is the main nature of this piece. The timeline proposed makes the most sense because, assumably, the NACURH leadership would already be together at conference, give or take a few personal exemptions. While we understand the suggestion of virtual training and using resources, finding time outside of conference, where all NACURH leadership could attend seems less feasible than simply extending our time at NACURH by 6 hours on the original day of departure. In terms of the concerns regarding travel, we would like to reiterate the fact that based on the risk management policy that will go into effect at the end of the week schools across NACURH would likely miss work and school on Monday regardless of if this training took place or not. Relating to the training we did some research. If you travel with an airplane (which has average speed of 560 miles) from Maine to California, It takes 4.7 hours to arrive. If you assume an estimation of 3 hours to the airport from the

conference. Factor in that delegations would be gaining 2 hours because of timezones. If you assume three hours of travel from airport to institution that would account for 10.5 hours of travel. From 2pm people will be getting back to their campus at 10:30pm. Regarding finances, fiscal responsibility that will be presented in all regional budgets to be presented on Saturday prevents any concern about this extra time spent for training. Finances should not be a concern regarding this piece.

46. MA: We want to reiterate a point made earlier by NCO Kent. We are off track. We want to remind the room that failing this piece is responsible in the fact that if the goal of going to a virtual training is not accomplished, but we will continue to have unhealthy and irresponsible, and ineffective late night directorship and CO training
47. Kent: Addressing the flight issue, the statement might be misleading, though from a good place. We need to think about booking times, when they are available, where there are layovers, etc. Still in full support of the piece!
48. NE: In the regards of the request of many to realign the conversation, we appreciate the merit of a NACURH-wide transition/training. We are unsure if 6 hours is enough, if right after NACURH makes sense. That being said, with the amendment, we are more comfortable passing this trial piece so that uncertainties can be met with experience.
49. SA calls the question
 - a) Dissent NCO: We have not had a refocused conversation yet.
50. GL moves to extend by 30 minutes; second by PA
 - a) No objection
51. Annual Conference Staff: Talk to the room, not just each other.
52. PA: If there was a plane from Maine to CA I want to be on that plane, but it's not real. Creating a unified transition retreat would be amazing for the corporation, but we feel that there is opportunity through the means we already have available to us.
53. GL: acknowledges the sentiment of the refocused conversation on training. Legal and monetary reasons.
54. SA: Shares sentiment of NE. Best way to test something is to do a trial run.
55. IA moves to caucus for 10; seconded from GL
 - a) Objection from PA - we want five more minutes of caucus time

56. IA moves to caucus for 5 minutes; second from MA
- a) No objections
57. GL: Quick note to remind entities that to keep constituents in mind when voting. Vote how they would vote.
58. PA: With our experiences of practices and cultures of PA institutions, this piece is not sustainable for us nor will it support our students in their academics, especially those bidding for directorship positions. We are not happy how it stands right now
59. CONF: Recognize that this is a trial period. There seems to be a shared sentiment for the value of in person training. Individuals who can't attend can still get trained later
60. GL: We would like to acknowledge the sentiment of refocused conversation on training, but also wish to acknowledge that with implementing such a change, we must absolutely always take into consideration liabilities not just in the legal sense but also in regards to monetary budgets.
61. NE: NE affirms the sentiment that in person training is valuable, but we are confused and conflicted if the opportunity implied in this piece is worth all of this discussion and trouble, even if it's just potential.
62. MA: While this piece isn't perfect, this is a compromise. This is something that allows us to invest in our future leaders.
63. NCO Kent: In regards to the concerns of NEACURH would just like to state that agree with NEACURH's sentiment of making sure that it's worth getting out of it. References comment about value of having the in person training in an hour that isn't unreasonable. It's unsustainable at the current path. Just passing the risk makes it even more challenging. It's just not worth it at that time because of the lack of sleep at the conferences. For the opportunity to exist for the half or majority would be worth the extra 6 hours for those who are going to it. If it isn't worth it, it will come back in the final vote
64. PA: Echoing NE point, 6 hours is not enough time for the effectiveness that NACURH is looking for. Looking at the transition practices that the PA has, we have found it more valuable to have a series of virtual meetings to transition someone because it shows their dedication and that they are organizing that transition with someone. It is more effective to transition with a counterpart than the 2 nights at NACURH.
65. NE calls

- a) No objections
 - b) Secret ballot 5-3-0
 - c) 17-11 passes
66. Recess until morning

XIII. Friday, January 6th, 2017

I. Roll Call

II. MA moves to bring 17-24 to the floor, seconded by CA

A. No ovjwxriona

B. Proponent Speech

1. Policy book refers to something that might have existed, but does not. A hole in the policy book exists and this seeks to create a little bit more process here. Magnitude of other things that could impact Execs makes hesitant to create timelines for the policy book. This gives the chair the flexibility they need, but balances it with a strong timeline.

C. Q&A

1. NE moves to end, seconded by SW
2. No objections

D. Discussion

1. GL: commends the spirit of this piece however we do have slight concerns over a few chairpersons in making the call. It states they are informed, but won't be able to give suggestions.
2. PA: what happens if there wasn't a chairperson?
 - a) That won't happen.
3. NE: Appreciates the concern, but recognizes the way in which the executives are elected.
4. CA: feels this puts practice into policy.
5. NAF: there should be a quick turnaround after conference. Having more cooks in the kitchen to make the decision can actually hurt the decision.
6. PA: appreciates this piece and is in support of this because we are trusting that the chairperson will do what is best.
7. Call to question, no objections
 - a) Vote 8-0-0
 - (1) 17-24 carries

III. GI moves to bring 17-29 to the floor, seconded by MA

A. Proponent Speech

1. Discussions of what ART is. Everyone seems to be in favor of moving towards offering virtual sessions via zoom. Not only does this piece allow us to move online, but it also goes through and edits a lot of the art coordinator position, such as maintaining records and emails and such.

B. Q&A

1. SA: An advisor would have to be at a conference in order to receive art certification is that right?
2. CA: Yes level 1 and 2 at conferences or in person, level 3 must be at NACURH.
 - (1) That means an advisor going through the art session would have attended a conference- would that mean that we'd be taking away from the overall conference experience?
 - (a) There is an experiential component.
3. SW: what levels of art would be offered virtually
 - (1) Levels one and two over virtual means at this point. Art coordinator can make decisions
4. NE: How do you plan on addressing concerns about virtual?
 - (1) The conversation hasn't really been had yet.
5. SW moves to end, seconded by MA

C. Discussion

1. PA : yields question to author: why are we supporting a NACURH Art coordinator financially?
 - a) That's already in policy and the piece doesn't address that portion.
2. MA: would like to commend this author and feels this is necessary to move forward. Ultimately we've seen a need for virtual art session. We appreciate that this is coming to light. Are in favor of the position description being added.
3. IA: as a virtual organization, that appreciates advisors that serve us this is a good adjustment in professional development opportunity.
4. GL: is in full support of this piece because when trying to fill an advisor with the requirement that they be ART certified yielded 8/57 being eligible and made the overall process very difficult.
5. SA offers support to this piece as it provides more opportunity and advisors in the region.

6. NE calls the question
 - a) No objections
 - (1) Vote
 - (a) 8-0-0
 - (b) Motion carries

IV. NE moves to bring 17-30 to the floor, seconded by SW

A. No objections

B. Proponent Speech

1. This focuses on the train the trainer portion of ART. In conversation with regional advisors, it seems we have issues getting people who can present regional ART sessions and were are bottlenecking as a result. With this piece I want to get more people trained for next year to move the program back into a sustainable place. This grace year would not extend past the fall conferences in 2017.

C. Q&A

1. SW: If our advisors aren't already trained for train the trainer, who will be training them for their business conference?
 - a) The NACURH NRHH Advisor would do this
2. IA: Is it the thought of the committee that regional advisors would continue to present art or is it simply to fill the need of the gap year?
 - a) Both. advisors have different responsibilities. It's not fair to ask them to do everything. If they have time, they can do it, but otherwise we need alternative solution.
3. SW: This says that our advisors will be trained in how to administer train the trainer, but if they hadn't gone through this before would they have to go through it fully to get this training?
 - a) That would be ultimately up to Adam. Right now we just want to ensure that those who can present do and that we increase the number of people who can present.
4. IA moves to end, seconded by MA
 - a) No objections

D. Discussion

1. GL: is in full support of this piece as we recognize a huge shortage of presenters and commend the authors
2. IA: echoes the sentiments of the great lakes, the intermountain has struggled with this this year so this will provide support and creates more diverse thought and open communication

3. SW: in favor as we have a shortage of advisors. We did want to address the concern advisors who do not present art, so they would need to be trained and then train
4. GL calls the question.
 - a) No objections

E. Vote

1. 8-0-0
 - a) Motion carries

V. MA moves to bring NBD 17-31 to the floor, seconded by GL

A. Proponent Speech:

1. At pre conference last year, we created the executive liaison position. We've been operating that there is a pseudo chair position as well as someone operating as the new executive liaison. This piece tries to address some of the different pieces with that. Role of committee chair versus ART Coordinator. Also discusses the eligibility and how it operates.

B. Q&A

1. NCO Kent: Is the office advisor left out intentionally?
 - a) Were not, would be cool with adding that in?
2. SW moves to end, seconded by GL
 - a) No objections

C. Discussion

1. NE moves to amend to include office advisors; seconded by NCO Kent
 - a) No objections
 - b) Proponent Speech: Don't leave them out.
 - c) Q&A
 - (1) PA moves to end, 2nd by GL
 - (a) No objections
 - d) Discussion
 - (1) PA calls the question
 - (a) No objections
 - e) Vote
 - (1) 8-0-0; carries
 2. GL: great piece overall
 3. SW call the question
 - a) No objections

D. Vote

1. 8-0-0
 - a) Motion Carries

VI. CA moves to bring NBD 17-38 to the floor, seconded by NE

A. No objections

B. Proponent Speech

1. Purchase annual conference laptops. One for the conference chair and one for the finance chair. They are in poor condition and it would be good to get new ones. Price wise, the most cost effective option would be the Macbook Air, 13 Inch. Purchase of laptop, bag and cover, as well as any software.

C. Q&A

1. SA: Would like to know what are the requirements when looking for the most comparable laptop?
 - a) The requirements by NACURH policy are to present three options. There are no specs or features outlined in policy, but this was framed out of Christina's laptop proposal at pre conference. I've tried to look at things between most cost effective to more expensive.
 - b) SA: Were macbooks the only cost effective option?
 - (1) Considering what the CRC uses and Macs weren't the only option. Because we have google drive and other ways that we can store information, I would be open to looking at other types of options. For the finance chair specifically, a lot of finance officers have non Macs because of the historical context of Quickbooks and Xero. Annual Conference Finance chair doesn't have access to Zero. This is a recommendation by the CRC.
2. GL: We noticed that option 3 mentioned storage size, but option 1 does not...what is the storage of option 1?
 - a) 500 GB, but was accidentally deleted
 - (1) GL: So this is cheaper than the air, correct?
 - (a) Yes but this is Amazon vs. buying from Apple itself.
3. SW: Just out of curiosity, does this cover insurance for the computers?
 - a) Like appcare? Yes, the overall allotment is inclusive of additional needs (software, etc.) and leftover could be

considered for insurance, especially because as these change hands they can be broken.

4. IA: Most cost effective is Air from Amazon, but the one from Amazon is the pro...is that a typo?
 - a) It's supposed to say Pro
5. MA: Curious...you've cited that we do a lot of things virtually and we operate on a cloud type system, when will we move from buying actual computers to more "space" type options?
 - a) This is to demonstrate the support that the execs give to the annual conference staff. Yes things can be stored on the cloud, but a physical resource is helpful.
6. CA moves to end; second from NCO Kent
 - a) No objections

D. Discussion

1. GL acknowledges and is in favor of replacing technology, however we do have concerns with only apple products and PCs not even being considered. We do acknowledge that many PC options are most cost effective. Our host institutions within our region would question this as well
2. PA is in support of this piece as well. We support supporting conference staff with technology, which promotes inclusivity in the positions and removes the barriers of having your own technology. We encourage sticking to apple products.
3. NAF: A big reason for laptops is that the Annual Conference Staff gets a lot of personal information from delegates so if this is on NACURH property rather than personal it makes us more comfortable.
4. NCO Kent: food for thought: NACURH policy is suggesting three things. This puts comparable prices in order to approve the funds. What specific book they like, they can do whatever they want anyways. We also hesitate with NACURH's culture of buying Macbooks when they may not be needed, but we would caution the room drawing the line. But we shouldn't draw the line with the annual conference who are repeatedly overlooked.
5. SA: Supports supporting the conference staff, we are concerned with just choosing a Macbook since we have found comparable PC laptops that are substantially less expensive.

6. MA: Despite original hesitations, I feel the point that the NAF added about risk management moves this into a conversation about this is a valuable resource beyond the reasons already cited. We know that this will be used wisely and therefore stand in support of this piece.
7. CA: echoes the sentiments of the NAF and the Midwest in regards to information protection. It's important to recognize that loss of information could happen. This has been voted on in the past. Central Atlantic has always had PCs and we have, as other regions, felt that they haven't always been long lived. The difference here might be long term versus short term investments.
8. IA: appreciates NCO Kent and NAF point from earlier. We want to reiterate that this is not a comparison of laptops but an approval of funds and we trust the NAF to make a responsible decision.
9. SW calls the question
 - a) No objections(1) Vote
(a) 8-0-0

VII. MA moves to bring NBD 17-23 to the floor, seconded by CA

1. No objections
- B. Proponent Speech
1. We've had a hard time holding ADs accountable to submitting their financial reports, and have had to elect a new AD since then because of that lack of accountability and ability to perform. First we wanted to separate monthly and annual financial reporting and then simplifying the policies a bit to make the process and procedure clearer. The NAF and Accountant will communicate to the finance officers what is needed to be included in the monthly finance reports. This was deliberately made more general/vague to address future needs of the corporation. If you fail to meet deadline, you will get a warning. Second warning goes also to Director and Advisor. 3rd time your accounts get frozen. Beyond that, you will be formally evaluated. Should the finance officer be removed, we also wanted to keep the region accountable for submitting eventually. For the annual report, the deadlines are hard deadlines so that accountant can get it on time and that the corporation can get our tax returns in on time. There are possibilities for extensions, but for specific reasons. Because they will be doing monthly reports, the annual report should honestly be easy. Even if FO does not do it, it

still must get done by someone so there is accountability of the entire region. We are accommodating for business days vs. holidays and weekends. No matter what, annual finance reports will be submitted by the 22nd, even if it has to be the NAF and chair who do it. This is worst case, but important to keep in mind.

C. Q&A

1. NE: Would you say this piece is more change of policy or adding current practice in policy
 - a) A little of both. The practice for annual reports was always in policy, but was adjusted to fit practice. The infraction section was also added to policy completely, but practiced this year
2. NCO Kent: Our question is about the last section of this piece. The NACURH Executive committee is allowed to appoint the regional officers who may have had to resign or be removed. What's the intention here?
 - a) We did consider removing all account signatories, but that was extra. If this violation were to occur, we would assess the people responsible so we are not punishing those who are unrelated or who have been doing their due diligence. There is the possibility that advisor, director, and AD would all be removed so then the question is how would the group of COs figure all of this out?
3. SW: can you elaborate on regional advisor liability (what would occur if they were or weren't involved in this process)?
 - a) They are an account signatory for every region, so they should be at least participating. They are liable since they are the signatory, hold the card, upload receipts, etc.
4. NE: In regards to removal of Director AD AF Advisor, would AD NRHH fill the role?
 - a) In terms of having people on the account, we need all three honestly. That being said, it could be a conversation with them but we need to make sure that whoever fills the roles are eligible and no one is forced into anything. From the policy perspective, this policy trumps regional policy, but we would not be doing our due diligence if we appointed someone without examining regional policy. We would be open to an amendment since we didn't necessarily include gavel order in this piece.

5. CA: does the utilization of "reserve the right" mean that perhaps the executives do not have to appoint and could allow the region to elect
 - a) Ultimately it's the goal to do what is best for the region at the time
6. GL: Does this piece affects the NACURH by laws, specifically referring to positional recall?
 - a) I see where you're coming from, but this comes from a new area/perspective. Perhaps the by laws could be examined, but this is separate and that could happen at a later date. Those recall process are explicitly structured for someone not doing their duties, not going to conferences, etc. But when people are invested in the finances, we need to ensure we have special situations to tackle that.
7. MA moves to end, seconded by SA

D. Discussion

1. IA: the Intermountain really appreciates the amount of work and thought put into this piece we believe that this holds everyone accountable.
2. CA: feels that our region views our finance officers very differently from other positions as the board. They are grounded in the present and past qualifications rather than the future. Finance positions are different than other positions on the board; tied to a huge stake of the region and the corporation. The process is tailored with the benefit of the corporation in mind and we appreciate that.
3. PA: In support of this piece. Finances are tricky, scary, no joke, etc. When they get confusing and we have to refer to the policy book, this helps to clarify the next steps and can protect the corporation and the region/constituents. We need to respect the finances of the institutions that pay us.
4. GL: complete and full support, echo sentiments previously made.
5. NE: moves to amend the piece via "taking into account any current gavel order that exists in any regional policy and in collaboration with any remaining members of the Regional Board of Directors or Office Staff." in part of the removal section.
 - a) 2nd by SA

- b) Proponent Speech: the northeast loves this piece and feels as though this provides an additional opportunity to respect regional policies, especially as NCCs generally elect their RBD
- c) Q&A
 - (1) MA moves to end, 2nd by GL
 - (a) No objections
- d) Discussion
 - (1) NCO Kent calls the question, CA objections
 - (2) CA: feels although this amendment may not be in good spirit. We should have faith in our NACURH Execs as it is and we believe that the intention of the NACURH execs is to preserve. Gavel order may not be the best based in context.
 - (3) PA: supports this amendment because it promotes discussion with the remaining board and it suggests to take into account gavel order and still gives final say to NACURH Execs. When people refer back to policy, including this section will remind them that there are still some people left. They are the advocates for this region. It's an encouragement to utilize resources.
 - (4) GL: feels the interpretation is not to move ADNRRH into finance position, but rather if there was a sweeping of Director and ADAF, it makes sense for the next AD to take the director position.
 - (5) NCO K: In support. We want everyone to think about future interpretations (20 years from now), this crisis may yield a quick decision and this reminds them of regional policy in that decision.
 - (6) GL calls the question, no objections
 - (a) Vote
 - (i) 7-1-0
 - (a) Amendment carries

6. IA calls the question, no objections

E. Vote

1. 8-0-0

a) Motion carries

VIII. CA moves to bring 17-32, 2nd by SA

A. Proponent

1. NACURH took a step last year to disassociate themselves from state associations, but there are some references here and there. In the award description of some awards, there includes state involvement and we would never want to encourage that so this removes that.

B. Q&A

1. SA moves to end; seconded by CA

C. Discussion

1. SA: Appreciates this piece to realign with policy
2. IA: This also reduces confusion of schools who may not have access to state involvement
3. PA calls the question
 - a) GL objects
4. GL: Yield question to author - Would putting this in policy, it removes it from what is required of a bid...would it work negatively against them?
 - a) Probably not because it's just additional information. The majority of the bids that would be apt to include state stuff would be chosen by COs, also. Not a violation.
5. PA moves to vote; seconded from GL
6. Vote
 - a) 8-0-0

D. GL moves to grove, 2nd by CA

IX. IA Regional Presentation

A. Q&A

1. SA: We have some problems with live zooming, how did you do that in the general boardroom setting?
 - a) We have positional laptops and usually one of us doesn't need two computers and we'll donate that one. We broadcast the zoom link on facebook. We don't have lecture style boardroom, so we have microphones which offsets sound issues. Set up is just a little bit different, but we haven't had any major concerns so far. Our schools really appreciate it
2. Kent: Wondering about the success of your office hours?
 - a) In week 3, meaning that we're still exploring. 1:1s can feel restricting, but people always need more information. Brainstorming, interacting, etc. Not much data yet.
3. MA: could you elaborate on the regional buddy program?

- a) Goal is to have an informal way to work with people. Specifically designed these based on institutional differences. Polled region asking what people want to see from this. Chats perhaps, personalized emails, mini fun challenges. Share with other schools in your cohort what your meeting styles look like to promote engagement. Data gathering this past semester.

X. MA moves to bring 17-27, seconded by NCO Lincoln

A. No objections

B. Proponent Speech

1. As a a corporation we claim to offer an accessible RFI service, but we do not. We would like to fix that by purchasing an affiliation database. We have broken down what we feel would be most suitable for this service. This is important because we need to do what we are telling our member schools we're doing. People don't understand why they have to submit an RFI if it is later inaccessible. *Tour of Potential New [member] RFI* There are a lot of really important and convenient feature that could be made available to us with this software. This software is basically the pinterest for RFIs. We can also examine traffic in this database which is helpful for assessment. This company has also been very cooperative and helpful. This overall helps to show improvements in schools throughout the year while removing actual duplicates. Flight is giving up as trial year for \$5.900. In the future if we pursue this permanently, we will have to pay double, but we would have this until Jan 18. NACURH will not be funding this, just the office's budget, but since this would be huge for them we will be funding the trial year and move from there to figure it out in the future. We do not feel that regions should be paying for this because they already pay for so much and because the NCO, especially with the merge, should be able to fund this themselves. Both halves of the NCO were consulted on this. We have notes from different companies as well.

C. Q&A

1. GL: based on what you just said, there was a search process for multiple companies?
 - a) Yes
2. SW: Would this only be used for RFIs that schools submit through affiliations process, or other info as well?

- a) Yes, but not info that you may be alluding to. No jotform or personal info...only award bids, reports, etc.
- 3. IA: Per this pieces passing, what does the timeline looklike for access for member schools? What is the idea of promoting this to schools?
 - a) They will have access during FY 17, but there is a lot of labor moving 60 years of RFI files, plus there is a 2 hour training from administrators. They likely won't see it prior to business conference, but it will be there. The office basically just needs to figure out what is feasible for us. The goal is to have something viewable by the end of the transition. We also have to come up with searchable tags.
- 4. GL: We know services like this have size requirements/caps
 - a) Yes...a terabyte and all NACURH drive documents is less than half of that.
- 5. NE: Does flight offer asset protection so we won't lose it all again?
 - a) Yes, they have backup servers. Nick the Flight Guy says they have many backup servers. We are talking to them right before they "take off" and their one priority is protecting information in case of emergency. They have background serves and multiple encryption systems. We could also have a physical backup hard drive
- 6. SW: I know there is a long list of topics for RFIs, but will this be changed?
 - a) We do want to reach out and figure out what is relevant to your regions. We want to make sure that if regions have specific things they value and want to write about and search about, they can.
- 7. NACURH Advisor
 - a) Having seen RFI in file cabinets as recent as NYU, this makes me very happy. Have you talked to your flight attendant about things like OTMs?
 - (1) Yes there are many capabilities and add-ons
- 8. IA: If a region is looking for specific information to be found here, they have to go to the office to find that or will we have access to number of clicks and stuff like that?

- a) There are different levels of access. Schools will never see back end data. If you have back end access, it would be mainly that. But I would recommend that you talk to the office or an Exec.
- 9. SW moves to end Q&A; second by NCO-Lincoln
 - a) No objections

D. Discussion

1. GL: The Great Lakes would like to commend the authors and the hard work that has gone into not only writing the piece but the extensive research and time that has gone into this. We also would note that we are in favor this piece especially due to the fact that we "offer" the RFI as one of the largest selling point affiliating with NACURH and our regions. The value of this is completely worth the price, especially the consideration of all of the integration tools with things such as Google Drive and MailChimp which we acknowledge multiple regions use. We anticipate the hopeful launch of flight.
2. NE: The northeast applauds the authors of this piece for rising to the challenge of addressing a major issue that our member institutions have been calling for us to address for multiple affiliation years. The northeast fully supports the adoption of flight due to it's appearance as a user friendly, cost-effective option. The northeast believes that flight not only addresses the current demands of our RFI system but will remain adaptable as the purpose and the benefits of the RFI system grow with our corporation. The northeast feels extremely confident in the amount of data protection and security this software provides to our corporation, we believe it not only resolves the problems of the past but ensure history not repeat itself in the future. The northeast fully supports the passing of this piece as we believe it is an example of putting the needs of our member institutions to the forefront of NACURH business.
3. MA: Applauds the time put into this piece. This is extremely important as this is a service that we provide, but know that we haven't in the past
4. IA: We want to recognize the benefits we receive in the corporation from the behind the scenes data. This will support further strategic plans and growth and collection of information about our corporation.
5. SA: Appreciates the authors and offices that have put in all the work in this.
6. CA: Agree with everyone, also goes with corporate brand standards!
7. SW calls the question
 - a) No objections

E. Vote

1. 8-0-0
2. Motion carries

XI. NE Regional Update

A. IA: In regards to the checklist, are there negative impacts on the perception of their roles?

1. No, it's more of guidelines. Serves as one location for all resources that a person might need in the next month

B. GL: Subregional meetings?

1. Northeast and New York. It spawned out of the fact that over 50% of our member institutions come from New York, especially SUNY schools. We believe in the purpose of pre-conference meeting to help people more competent, but don't want to do the travel. Promote collaboration and communication between regional conferences. An in person educational opportunity is most beneficial to them. It is at minimal costs. We do have a back up for virtual option. The most important is that regional business is never conducted. It's an opportunity for collaboration, connection, and preparation rather than business.

XII. Annual Conference Budget Presentation

A. Q&A

1. IA: what is break even?
 - a) 1900 is break even
2. Ia: What sponsorships are you still trying to seek out?
 - a) Before the bid, we went to over 70 small business and we are working no to gather that information more
3. NCO Kent: What is with the non-AC sponsorship?
 - a) University Residence is covering the difference so that we can have AC room for the non AC cost
4. MA: How does Semis reimbursement work?
 - a) They just need to share all of the information and we pay for that so that cost is not reflected in the total, final cost
5. SW: Under the transportation section for the vans, will the new risk management expectations that be reflected in that cost?
 - a) It's hard right now because we haven't passed it quite yet. We haven't had time.

6. NE: Will regions see the \$45/\$110/delegate fee for Directorship members who have to be picked up at airports? Or will NACURH cover that, since NACURH covers the registration of the boards?
 - a) We're going to have to figure out what the travel situation will be. With delaware there was an expense from NACURH for those types of additional fee.s NACURH would pay for these in the case that we need to, but it's hard to figure that out now.
7. PA: Really well put together. Just because we are throwing hard questions doesn't mean we are not impressed.
8. IA: So we set the price?
 - a) Yes
9. GL: For the exchange rates that we use in this budget, once we pass this is this what is used the entire time?
 - a) Yes, per policy we use the exchange rates the date the cost is set so that would be today, yes
10. NCO Kent move to end Q&A, seconded by GL
 - a) N objections
- B. GL moves to approve the budget, seconded by the MA
- C. CA moves to set the maximum delegate cost \$258.00, seconded by GL
 1. Discussion
 - a) MA calls the question, no objections
 - (1) Vote
 - (a) Delegate Cap approved

Saturday, January 7th, 2017

- I. Call to order at 9:10 AM
- II. Presentation of NACURH budget
 - A. Q&A
 1. IA: Under travel, general emergency travel from 0-\$500.
 - a) We are doing that in the case of inclement weather types of things or other related expenses.
 2. GL: How do you estimate each region's transfers in?
 - a) Transfers in and outs are calculated via spreadsheet. Guidebook is done off of final paid delegate. We round up for all of them. Accountant fee is always the same. NCO and NACURH take the other remaining part. Zoom is also something we allocate. The

actual numbers of expenses are going to be found here. Jotform has decreased because we got the non profit discount.

3. NCO Kent moves to end, seconded by NCO Lincoln

a) No objections

B. Discussion

GL appreciates Austin for putting all the work in this budget and we feel as if it looks sound

PA echoes. Austin nice job

IA is also in support of this budget and appreciate's Austin's willingness to take in feedback and apply that

NE moves to approve, 2nd by IA

a) No objections

(1) Vote

(a) FY18 Budget passes 8-0-0

III. NCO Proposed FY18 Budget

A. Q&A

1. GL: IS the travel based on sending one person or sending two people?

a) One person per each region. For Semis, just Director and AD

2. PA moves to end, 2nd MA

a) No objections

B. Discussion

1. PA: Appreciates combining the two and appreciate the cooperation demonstrated here

2. GL moves to approve the NCO Budget, seconded by CA

a) Vote

(1) 8-0-0

IV. NACURH Corporate Support Chart

A. Q&A

1. NAF: Why isn't NAF where Chair is at because NAF works closely with NACURH advisor as well?

a) With that particular position, it was more less direct support and more of a close relationship. From what I researched, a lot of what the CRC does is with conference finances and it was more fitting the CRC with someone. It does still show that NACURH advisor gives a lot of support to all execs since you're all right after chair. If you have better ideas of how it will work, let me know.

2. NE: Thank you for doing this and being here to answer questions! Was there a reason why you omitted conference chairs and advisors on the regional level from this chart?
 - a) When we did this we were thinking of NACURH corporate structure and execs, but we didn't only want the people in blue. It needed to be more far reaching, especially because boards make corporate decisions and we needed to find a limit to that expansion. What will be our more corporate face? What do people NEED to know about our structure? I can see where including advisors into the structure is beneficial because it shows corporations that we have more than 3 professional advisors and that we do get more support than that, but I don't know where I would put them because they would be over reaching over all of the grey boxes. We also wanted it to look nice. If you have ideas I would love to talk with you more to fit them in. Not too sure about regional conference chairs, but it is a possibility.
3. NCO Kent: When we look at it, it's obviously just one frame for looking at the corporation. Why is this frame the best to show our corporation?
 - a) When we were drafting the different ideas that we were having, we got the idea from Emily very early on to flip the structure from one person at the top to one person at the bottom giving support to everyone else at the top. We wanted something to speak to our core purposes and values. In the end we had to go with something both simplistic and aesthetic so it would be easy to follow for anyone who doesn't know NACURH. We are more of a corporation of support than report.

V. SA Budget Presentation

A. Q&A

1. MA: Do you know what led to an RLC Excess of \$26,000?
 - a) They ended up below budget for a lot of their lines, which led to a lot of excess. Cole can answer further.
2. IA: With that large excess, is that carrying over to refill the funds lost last year? Why wasn't it refunded to schools?
 - a) Where the South Atlantic is account wise, this will help them a lot with replenishing their checking account.

MA moves to end; seconded by everyone

VI. CA Budget Presentation

A. Q&A

1. What's the reasoning for CO travel justification?
 - a) Carpooling is essential to our operations, but we believe in paying equitably for all positions.

VII. IA Budget Presentation

A. Q&A

1. None

VIII. GL Budget Presentation

A. Q&A

1. None

IX. MA Budget Presentation

A. Q&A

1. None

X. NE Budget Presentation

A. Q&A

1. What's the difference between recognition and general recognition?
 - a) I intend to combine those two line items
(1) NAF: Extremely proud with this budget

XI. PA Budget Presentation

A. What are the travel sub-line items about (specifically reimbursements)?

1. These are all reimbursements that are broken down in the budget.

XII. SW Budget Presentation

A. Q & A

1. None

XIII. SW Regional Presentation

A. MA: How do you utilize jotform for ¾ year service pins?

Jotform is forwarded to the NCC and the advisor and they have to read and then have another form and they confirm with that.

B. NE: What are your plans for getting in contact with Mexico?

Schools in Mexico are very different in their institutional differences. There aren't organizations that make sense.

C. SW: How many regional awards do you have?

1. 18ish:
 - a) How did you go about deciding for the region?
(1) As SWACURH, we don't highlight service much, so we needed to refocus that

XIV. MA Regional Presentation

A. Q&A

None

XV. GL Regional Presentation

XVI. CA Regional Presentation

A. Q&A

SA: Are you changing logo, and colors, and fonts, etc? Will all be changed?

- a) Realize and acknowledge that branding is actually good and having to incorporate a lot of things. Want to make sure we're streamlining, but still make something pop

XVII. NCO Kent Presentation

XVIII. NCO Lincoln Presentation

A. Q&A

PA: Tell us more about placards.

- a) We had to use a different laminator machine and it wasn't as good. We're fixing them.

SA: There were misspelled institutions. We can get in the backside and fix that for you all.

XIX. PA Regional Presentation

A. Q&A

SW: Have you ever had any schools affiliated from Australia?

- a) No

XX. Advancement Society

A. Chair Open Nominations,

1. MA moves to nominate Austin Lujan, 2nd by CA
2. NE moves to nominate Scott Singleton, 2nd by CA
3. GL moves to nominate George Pap McClellan, 2nd by NCO Lincoln
4. CA moves to nominate Coty Behanna, 2nd by SA
5. NAA moves to nominate Sam Wilton, 2nd by NAF
6. GL moves to nominate Julie Goodwin, 2nd by CA
7. NE moves to nominate Regen Smith, 2nd by SA
8. Chair moves to nominate Benjamin Klinker, 2nd by NE
9. PA moves to close nominations, 2nd by the NE

B. Proponent Speech:

1. MA: on Austin Lujan. MA feels that Austin has dedicated multiple years of service to NACURH. Commitment to the betterment of our financial situations, out standing has helped us to grow. He has taken the time

this year to hold all of the regions accountable. Additionally, we do feel that his commitment and love of NACURH has impacted people in this room

2. NE: on Scott Singleton. When a full time professional commits multiple years to a non profit student organization, and Scott continuously demonstrates commitment and support to NACURH. Really impressive and OCM as an entity is so supportive and Scott is a driving force continuing that support
3. GL: on George Papp McClellan : stems from years of service specifically. Integral to moving towards one corporate office. Integral to creating gains for the office. He also won finance officer of the year last year.
4. CA: on Coty Behanna: Coty has been in service to the boards and NACURH. Two terms for AD-NRHH, non consecutively. Part of integral changes and served as a NAN for some time. Continued to contribute to the organization at least the central atlantic. No matter what happens, he's always here for others and that's what he embodies.
5. NAA on Sam Wilton: The transition to one office is challenging and has been a change in perspective for many involved. For his work and direct service to NACURH I feel he is deserving of this recognition.
6. GL on Julie Goodwin: kind hearted leader. She is the person that anyone in leadership can go to. We can also specifically note that she is truly committed.
7. NE on Regen Smith: Regen has contributed so much to NCO Lincoln. What is most significant is that she doesn't allow the description of her position to confine her. She has involved herself thoroughly in NACURH and she is an integrated part of the entire organization She is so spirited, involved, and there was a point where I had not been to a conference with Regen.
8. Chair on Ben Klinker: I think it is very notable when someone elects to serve as a conference chair. The annual conference is challenging and Ben has done an excellent job meeting NACURH and expressing what he needs. Creating an innovative conference and really just do it very, very well and how he will continue to give service.

C. Discussion of Nominations

1. SA: Fully supports Ben Klinker being nominated with the knowledge of what it takes to plan a national conference and how his board has truly come together through his leadership.

2. SA: fully supports the nomination of George Papp McLellan. George has been around for a while and has made strides in the combination of offices. He does it with flair, which is necessary for boardroom setting as well as respectful.
3. CA: CA would like to speak about the consistent support that Coty Behanna has provided to NRHH within the region, which has been non-stop support, asking reps, delegates, and the AD-NRHH and has offered continuous aid. Volunteering in more ways than one to help advise boardrooms in any capacity. His touch even this year has extended far beyond what is deserving of this honor.
4. CA: Speaking on the consistent support Coty has provided for NRHH, it has been nonstop support for reps, delegates, our AD NRHH, etc. He is consistently offering any kind of aid and volunteers in more ways than one to advise boardrooms in any capacity, including through emotional support. His involvement this year moves far beyond deserving of this award.
5. SA: has fully supports Scott Singleton. He ha made conferences memorable and respectful.
6. GL: Would be remiss not to mention Austin's commitment to NACURH as an AD AF and the vacant NAF position. Additionally, without his help a non deficit conference budget would not have been possible. He helped us through a scary situation, and still managed to support the other regions equitably.
7. PA: would again show support for Scott Singleton. He is absolutely amazing in NACURH and makes it so that everyone feels included. Shows tremendous support and is always willing to offer help.
8. NAN: I wanted to bring some more context to the nomination to Coty Behanna. A lot of where NRHH will be wouldn't be here without him. Integral portion of pillars to values, served on the NACURH Strategic Planning commision. One of the original authors on the NRHH Advisor piece of legislation. Integral to support. Through his time as NAN, set the foundation for the strategic plan
9. MA: Speaking on behalf of Regen Smith. Regen is also very involved and supportive of the NNB. She is onvolved also on the regional level in multiple capacities. She was served NACURH in a multitude of capacities that are worth recognition.

10. NCO Kent: NCO would like to support the nomination of George. Being able to work with him, I've gotten to see he is very passionate about NACURH. His love of NACURH is unmatched and he always helps people find the answer.
11. MA: MA would like to speak on behalf of Julie Goodwin. Having the privilege of working with her last year, she is truly a kind leader. Has done a lot to move the organization forward.
12. NE: also speaking on Julie Goodwin. She was around at the Northeast Conference and was a great guidance for finances and has full support in her ability to be inducted into this
13. CA would like to speak on behalf of Sam Wilton. Many of us represented here haven't been to a conference where Sam was not at. To describe the support that he offers us is unmatched. The NCO is typically there to serve a certain purpose, but Sam always steps up and goes above and beyond. Always serves a broader perspective. Truly supports the in boardroom experience through support of knowledge and resilience.
14. CA: would like to speak on behalf of Austin and second the GL's sentiment about Austin's support. CA was supported via phone calls for a financial concern in the CA and it was truly appreciated.
15. NE: would like to also speak on behalf of Austin. Helped give me the confidence of changing the conference and finance culture. Has been a huge support and very quickly became the NAF that the Northeast needed for the year. Confident he is not the only one.
16. SA: would like to speak to a different aspect of Austin, he stepped up to recognize students when they were in a time of struggling. HE went out on the line so that he could give the students what they needed
17. SW: Also speaking on Austin, when I transitioned into the position he spent countless hours making sure that I had everything that I needed. He has supported us financially and physically so much throughout the process.
18. SW: moves to narrow the field to 6, seconded by GL
 - a) No objections
19. SA: would like to mention again how Austin was there in a time of need for our board. He's been a great support for me since I am the only one who was originally elected left on the board

20. MA: George is the most worthy candidate of this recognition. He has the heart and betterment of NACURH in mind in everything that he does and is uniquely qualified for this.
21. CA would like to speak on George as well. We often get caught up on the NACURH level too. He's also the RHA President on campus AND is active in his region. He is also why Kent chose to extend to host an extra year for the NCO. Huge obligation and commitment within the corporation.
22. IA: would like to speak on behalf of Scott. Wonderful bridge between alumni and professional staff. The fact that he works to advocate for us and is willing to truly share a partnership and active advocate really makes him stand out in a way of serving NACURH
23. GL: would like to speak on Ben Klinker. The annual conference is the largest thing you can do for NACURH. This is the capstone to the year and inspires a generation of student leaders as well as NACURH leadership positions. While being NACURH annual conference chair, and continuing to be involved to the regional level.
24. CA: would like to speak on Regen in regards to working through NRHH affiliation. Direct support and constant communication that Regen maintains. Specifically within the AD-NRHH role, Regen is available at all times of day. I can't imagine what it looks like from her end on a Friday when conference check in is happening. Cannot imagine the dedication and commitment.
25. SA: Again we would like to speak on Scott for his personal connections to students outside of just those of us here, but also in all of the host institutions via personal phone calls.
26. NE: What is most impressive is Austin's willingness to navigate an extremely difficult situation while calmly and selflessly balancing another situation. Equally helpful and calm and also the most energetic and enthusiastic person in the room. Austin's spirit alone could be good for this organization, but his tangible contributions to the corporation is undeniable. He has been so supportive of us as a region and as a friend. Regen is active and attends CO chats AND NNB Chats. The fact that she is equally as productive and helpful in both of these roles demonstrates a lot of commitment and we are impressed.
27. CA: On Regen. One of the most challenging things about being here, is feeling like you have the same role as everyone else. Her role is very

different and though she is not always in here with the NBD, she did not hesitate to make me feel welcome. She has energy, enthusiasm, and positivity that spreads to all around them.

GL calls the question, no objections

a) Vote

(1) Clear majority reached

XXI. Intermountain moves to reconsider 17-34, seconded by CA

A. No objections

B. Proponent Speech from the original authors

1. The risk management piece as it stands right now would go into effect at the close of this meeting. Problems: we would ask the regional conference to enforce risk management policies when they've already started to pay. This creates a couple problems for planning activities, space planning, and travel. Additionally, there were a lot of desires to amend certain sections and additionally provide different feedback. The piece was published anyway, however after discussions this a little bit more with shannon, we talked about how when talking to corporate partners- to present a risk management policy when is represented several times throughout the semester seems really unprofessional. The point is to implement something that the corporation entirely supports. Inconvenience and problems come from immediate support at this moment. Also, we're putting ourselves into a situation . I, as an author, would ask you to move to table the piece back to us for the opportunity to review and edit.

C. Q&A

1. NAF: Out of curiosity, how much time was put into the original writing of the piece and can you take us through that timeline?
 - a) The risk management taskforce was created whenever the first taskforce meetings schedules came out. Our first meeting, we identified things we knew were liability in NACURH that were noticing. We then researched regional policy books for sections about risk management and other corporations in similar size/ business models. From there we compiled notes and the research took a while. We met again as a group a month and a half ago, maybe a little less. We put into what we wanted to present. From there, we worked on this piece up until the deadline (approximately two weeks). There were points where

we were working on this piece on an entire day. We met as individuals and each had a committee and a partner. Over that period of time, we worked on it for many hours and now here it is.

- b) NE moves to end, seconded by SA
 - (1) No objections

D. Discussion

1. NAF: I appreciate the recall of the piece, I am concerned that the writing and I am concerned that the time allotted for the piece reflects a rushed authorization of risk management for NACURH.
2. GL: the great lakes is in favor only so more time can be spent. Time makes perfection. We acknowledge the ability of conference staffs.
3. SA: We started writing the piece on the taskforce on October 21st. Writing the piece all together, for a piece this large, it was definitely an extended amount of time
4. CA: agrees with the sentiments of both the GL and the NAF and do believe that this piece may not give the full justice and time that this takes also concerns as it takes and has concerns. Would like to see the piece tabled back to the others.
5. PA: so, I'd like to start off by saying and appreciate that the author of this piece is willing to take this back. This goes back to everything we're talking about. Would like to see this yield back to the committee and have heard a lot of positive feedback.
6. SA: appreciates that the author's recognize more could be done and appreciate it was brought in the first place to better NACURH.
7. GL: moves to table the piece back to the risk management taskforce with additions to be heard by the end of pre conference and the caveat that an executive also sits on the taskforce, second by MA
 - a) NE object
 - (1) Objection not withdrawn
 - (2) 3-5-0
 - (3) Motion does not carry
8. NE: I just want to make something abundantly clear. The taskforce is not withdrawing this piece because we think we didn't put time and energy. There were days in a large period where we spent the entire day on this piece and there were multiple times we did that. We feel that this could go in immediately, but did that not appear to be the

sentiments of the boardroom. We want to entertain concerns. The risk management taskforce is proud of this work. I support a NACURH Executive sitting on the committee, but that wasn't a requirement, so that does seem pointed which hurts my feelings. Want to respect my honesty. There was a little bit of confusion and want to say my piece.

9. IA: echo the sentiments of the author. Time is subjective, we would encourage the room to move forward. It takes a lot of confidence and humility to be willing to entertain a motion. It takes some time to admit that the decision was rushed and not as well thought out. We don't believe that sticking on the decision and the point of how much time is going to move us forward. WE support all the efforts happening and believe we should keep in mind how to move the corporation forward

PA would like table the piece back to the taskforce to be seen at pre conference

- a) 2nd by NCO Lincoln
(1) No Objections

Piece has been tabled and will be heard by the end of pre conference

E. PA moves to bring 17-39, 2nd by MA

1. Proponent Speech:

- a) So this piece would allocate money to pursue the purchase of an NRHH membership database. This was outlined as part of the NRHH strategic plan. Why we really need it is essentially we don't know who our members are. This is a problem because we don't have a way to distribute information to all of our members. It's fairly difficult to be able to do much without contacting our members or keep track of them. We would be able to keep track of alumni at a campus, regional, and NACURH level. Allow people to be contacted, will be great for alumni. We will be able to market more NACURH resources and merchandise to all of our members (267 affiliated chapters overall, ranging from 25 active members per year on average. There is a pretty good chance to bring in a lot more revenue for NACURH and NRHH in general. It would also allow us to have a greater understanding for our membership. NRHH already has a problem with recruitment and retention. Data driven decisions will come from this. And then, I would just like to hit on the point of communicating with our members. Try to think about how you

would be able to do with you do without having email contacts for all of your schools. Having this database would be able to have us contact about affiliation to alumni retention and everything in between. This first year, we would be using NACURH's money to fund this database to allow our chapters to interact with it and see if the database is worth their own time and their own chapters money. Then, the NNB next NACURH (2018) would find a way to propose the database either through a chapter affiliation fee and it would be up to the NNB next year to evaluate on their own, which is more realistic and attainable for their chapter. Ideally, we would be able to include all aspects of NRHH affiliation within this so that NRHH reps have their own autonomy way to affiliate, which is important because NCCs often do this themselves. We would like to see an integration on flight so that we don't have to add new technology, but rather improve what we already use. Again we don't want to add new if we can't enhance what we already if. If it cannot be put into flight, then the 3,000 would be a cap. This isn't approval for a database, but an approval to explore a database. NNB's voice is built in.

F. Q&A

1. NCO Lincoln: Was curious what features or different items in Flight are you thinking of that you think would be useful towards this?
 - a) I think in terms of depending what the NNB/NAN are looking for, if there's a way we can create a portal for NRHH specific items or OTM specific type things, this is long term though. It is going to be a conversation that is going to happen between now and pre conference. The conversation me and Aaron had is pretty recent in terms of introducing in terms of a database. In December, we met to talk about the finances of things.
2. NCO Lincoln: Who would be in charge of maintaining this database?
 - a) Currently there's nothing said and we would be able to talk about that as an NNB/ If we are fitting affiliations then it would be CO-NRHH and the NAN collaboration
3. SA: Because membership status aren't finalized, how would this piece be utilized if membership statuses do not work?

- a) Either way, we'll still have a database because we could still find ways to change memberships status within the database
 - b) Follow Up: Besides membership statuses, what exact information would be in the database?
 - (1) It would be up to the NNB in collaboration with me. Maybe name, graduation date, personal emails, current membership type as well as incorporating membership forms and general contact information. Everything would be in collaboration with what we can get in Flight and what the NNB deems as necessary. \$3000 would be the budget for the project, and this would come up again. That's why we put the timeline in there so that all the research that we do between now and pre conference needs to be approved by you all. We just want to budget and then you will see a proposal for an actual database by tpre conference
4. SW: So what we see before pre conference will be the actual database?
- a) Treating like the technology request, we could look at it different options and this is preliminary to allocate funds. There will be more details of what this may or may not entail so. We wanted to build in multiple levels to get as much feedback as we can because we realize the weight of this investment.
5. IA: Is it possible that if flight can only handle some tools for NRHH bt bot all, there could be two different database
- a) Our preferences would be to have one. Member schools will help explore. We don't want to have something messy and confusing
6. CA: We are interested in the financial aspects of the piece...are we setting aside funds for safe keeping that would need to be utilized elsewhere? Would these funds need to be eventually reallocated away from this?
- a) If the funds are not approved, the remaining will go back into the technology fund. NACURH actually has four accounts including our checking account, our reserves, the ADA account, as well as technology. We only tap our technology resources when there's an identified need for technology.

7. NCO-Lincoln: I'm still trying to get a clarification about flight. Flight is very much document storage, from what I understand...are your needs for the database purely to collect member data and maintain it? Would it not be as efficient to do something like AAFN which is just a constant rolling list?
 - a) Yes, mainly collect and hold data and then secondly affiliation if it would fit in. Would it not make sense to do something like a spreadsheet. It wouldn't make sense to utilize something like a simple spreadsheet if it's own one or two people rather than a system that could potentially do it for us.
 - (1) Will the housing information be easier stored somewhere else and you could edit it and change it as you wish versus Flight (which is a lot of different membership lists).
 - (a) If you wanted to edit it, you'd have to take it down, edit it and reload it. With flight, we're not saying it's going to fit perfectly into there, and it doesn't this piece allows us to search for other options rather than waste time with something that won't work.
8. NE: Why did the authors decide this amount of money instead of doing prior research, find an amount, and then proposing the piece?
 - a) Originally that was the intention, but with the membership data base special project, we were working on it for the first part of semester and then paused it for regional conferences. We resumed it after thanksgiving break. At that point, we researched different possible hosts. Through that, we identified a couple of potential hosts, but one of them who deals with requests and quotes took time off and we were unable to get information fully together. We wanted to focus in on this prior to the FY 18 budget beginning, especially. We have some partial quotes from places. Really when deciding our ballpark rance, we want to make sure it's attainable for our chapters to fund this. We don't want our chapters to not be able to affiliate because it is too expensive.
9. MA: Thankyou for this piece and for your research so far. Could this research be done without this allotment? Do we need to set this aside for the process to happen?

- a) I think the research can happen without the allotment, but this helps us move forward with the strategic planning goal. We can work with the idea, if it gets approved, we get a timeline for how to hold everyone accountable. IT allows check ins to move forward from it.
10. SA: how much do you think we would be charging our reps for the database?
- a) It all depends how many affiliate with us and how many members they have. Funding wise, we wouldn't implement funding for this coming year, but the year after that. Asking member schools to pay more would be bad. Would need to be approved by NBD, NNB, and the NRHH Business Meeting. I think it's more attainable to charge an affiliation fee. If we retain chapters, it would be about 11 dollars.
11. CA: Are we saying that the cost would not stay standard from year to year or would have fluctuation depending on where we're at?
- a) We have years of trends and data. We have past data to approximate these costs. We would know whether or not it would impact our chapters, but asking. With more recruitment, this could go down. Recruitment is the end goal of strategic plan. We would share in a memo what the consideration happening is so that we can let people know about what is happening generally.
12. PA: Where is the 3,000 coming from?
- a) NACURH Technology fund
 - (1) You're adding to it?
 - (a) We're taking 3000 from NACURH Technology fund for the purpose of this project
13. IA: Can you please clarify about what would happen with the 3,000 allotted if we couldn't make our needs worth within flight. Is this allowing money to be spent outside of flight.
- a) The first approach would see if it would work within the new affiliation data. The second would be to find a new thing. We wouldn't make a purchase until it's approved prior to pre conference. Then, if approved we would purchase and implement before Pre Conference
14. NE: You are moving 3,000 out of the technology fund where?

- a) Into the FY18 budget. Not comfortable putting it into this fiscal year because we're already purchasing this Flight trial year.
15. SA: move to end Q&A, seconded by MA
- a) PA objects
 - (1) Has two questions
16. PA: You might add fees for NRHH affiliation?
- a) It wouldn't be responsible to purchase something without a way to fund it. NRHH doesn't generate revenue, we'd need to find a way to generate a fund. This would be approved by everyone. If next year's NNB approves it, NRHH reps can still say they don't want it
17. PA: How much is in the tech fund?
- a) \$40,000 without the \$3000 being taken out yet
18. SW moves to end Q&A, seconded by MA
- a) No objections

G. Discussion

1. SA: the idea is important, but the concerned with the lack of information presented here about the cost for NRHH chapters.
 - a) NAF: None of us are responsible for that per this piece, the next year would explore and finalize these things to bring to the NRHH Business meeting. This piece just gives us a budget. The conversation about affiliation fees doesn't enter this piece
2. PA: We recognize the need for NRHH database to continue moving the honorary forward but feels uncomfortable that at this time we are allocating \$3000 for this in a budget that has been balanced without wiggle room, since we should all be maintaining zero deficit budgets. While the budget in the end will look balanced, but the money NACURH uses is being spent and lost. We want to find a way to fund it first before spending or allocating.
3. PA: the pacific affiliate believes that a membership database is incredibly important, but feels uncomfortable with charging NRHH chapters as not all chapters receive funds.
4. CA: Again, we recognize the need. While the NNB is built into the piece, but we weren't included in the authoring of this piece or research so far. We weren't totally aware how the database was selected or research of other databases prior to this week. We don't want to set

aside funding to get a database when we have access to it to figure out if it works.

5. NCO Lincoln: The NCO understands and respects the needs of NRHH to be able to maintain a membership database, not only to track changes in the entire membership of NRHH but to better provide the services NRHH is capable of. However, we are greatly concerned with this being set up as a separate system. This would require each school with an NRHH chapter to have unique accounts for their RHA and NRHH, and could prove a logistical nightmare for the future Corporate Office and their ability to accurately provide accurate affiliation data to the regions, especially in relation to the conference check-in process. In addition, we feel it would be irresponsible to try to establish this database during the next affiliation year, as asking the incoming host institution would be in the position of taking over everything both of the current offices do, continue the work being done on the new RFI, and manage a trial version of an NRHH database all upon inheriting the office. We fear this could result in one or more of these tasks being left by the wayside.
6. GL: would like to note in reference to approval that nothing would actual be purchased until a later approval. If appears there is confusing as this is simply a preliminary step. We want discussion to be on this piece
7. NCO-Lincoln: Echoing CA point for funding for projects/researching NACURH usually has forethought of finding funding before projects really kick into gear. The timing here is off.
8. SA: is concerned about introducing a new membership type system in the same year as considering a membership database due to the fact that we haven't fully created the membership types and we feel as though with time, this can be done. IT should be held off until we finalize the membership statuses after preconference.
9. CA: is concerned that we are in a system of implementing new membership types, and these membership types being in a first year may be a poor time to fully implement a new membership database. Along with testing a new database, involves having information to test with. In not having a full system of membership types anywhere near being fully confirmed, thus, the specific data in which we need to collect from each member or member type, the central atlantic is concerned that this may lead to an over-collection of data of thousands of individual, thus simply leading to increased concerns about how we as a corporation are protecting that information and maintaining FERPA guidelines, and would advise that more development into the

membership types and the data collected from members prior to selecting and funding a specific system.

10. IA: moves to caucus for five minutes, 2nd by SA
 - a) No objections
11. PA: The pacific would like to encourage research without funding considering we are already starting business with flight. We we encourage discussions start and a plan be developed prior to requesting any allocation of funds. We understand that for now no money is going to be sent, but still don't want to move forward allocating without plans for future funding.
12. NE: understands that the author set the amount in good faith, however the NE is concerned that the precedent set by arbitrary amounts to projects sets bad precedent going forward. Would like to have a quote and have a set amount
13. NAN: So, as NAN and co-author of the NRHH Strategic Plan, a database is crucial to the success of the honorary. The NRHH STrategic plan was passed by all NRHH members, which stated both the editing of membership statuses. I find it hard to put off creating this database because of the membership status change on the grounds that there is no 100% chance and we can take this into the account. I don't find it good practice to put off the development of NRHH in lieu of something that might not happen.
14. SW: We would like to comment on some of the concerns that were raised about possibly charging chapter affiliation costs, etc. By gaining contact information and being able to contact members, it may start to create more revenue and other ways we can make money through NRHH. Right now all that NRHH does is provide services and obtain the Non Profit status, which helps have NACURH money. The revenue that could be created could offset the needs for dues
15. IA: concerned about the implications and failure of this piece. The timeline of the database would be in jeopardy. There is a delicate line between risk and reward. The risk to align the needs outweighs the risk of the budget suggested by the NAF. If this piece passes, the NNB would have to start again which would push it back more than just one year.
16. CA: We understand the cruciality of creating this database, but it's important to consider intent vs. impact. The intent is good, but the

impact...we have concerns about introducing a new database. We want to think about implementation and effects as they start to adopt the new membership types. We would suggest this entire process be shifted by one year. We want to table the piece back to the authors and NNB to be reviewed and revised to be brought back to the NBD by the end of pre conference.

17. GL: The Great Lakes is in support of this legislation and commends the authors. Simply put this is a trial run, and as previously noted by many of the regions, in order for any changes or innovation to occur we must try new things as a corporation. Although we acknowledge that funding could be a concern, we also acknowledge that you cannot very well research products without know your budgetary limits. We feel that in order to move NRHH forward as an official branch of NACURH we must allocate them the resources that will ultimately set them up for success. We encourage other regions to hold trust in the NACURH Executives and additionally acknowledge that we as an NBD will have ultimate approval after the research process has commenced. To say that we cannot work on multiple projects at once, such as developing a new database and researching a new database is like saying that all things NACURH does should be done individually with full focus which would bring the productivity of the corporation and its branches to a halt.
18. NE: The Northeast recognizes the importance of honoring the NRHH strategic plan and the benefits of adopting an NRHH database. However, the Northeast does not believe that by failing this piece at this time, the potential for this successful completion of project is lost. The NAF stated that the continued research of databases and the advancement of this project will not cease if the funds are not allocated. With that in mind, along the underlying fact that we remain unsure if our newly implemented database flight may also account for the needs of NRHH, the Northeast believes it is more responsible to the finances of NACURH to wait until an actual database proposal is presented to the NBD for future approval.
19. PA: The pacific would feel more comfortable if a presentation was put forth that stated what the honorary needed in the database, with a quote to request allocation instead of presenting an idea without tangible backing. Additionally we would hope NACURH as a

corporation can work within their budget without dipping into their technology funds as is expected by the regions.

20. PA moves to vote, seconded by NE
 - a) MA objects; feels things to say still would like to see more discussion, talk more about concerns as the harm of putting this in now
 - b) Withdraw
 21. NCO Lincoln would like to remind the board that while NACURH is working on many projects the office itself is a limited number of volunteers. The upcoming year it looks like we'll have a large plate to cover as it is.
 22. CA would like to echo NE. Research does not require funding. We have a relationship with Flight, there could be better options to explore the program. The best interest would be to have those conversations and explore all options. It would be a better option and see one piece to approve it all later one.
 23. NE: In reflecting back, substantial funding has already selected tangible items. We don't want to set a precedence to set funds to ideas rather than finalize plans. We do not think we're asking too much of someone to find the project and come back with that evidence so we can trust the best decision was made
 24. CA move to table the piece back to the NNB, the authors, and the NCO, including both Kent and Lincoln campuses to be reviewed, revised, and brought back to the board for consideration prior to the end of Pre-Conference.
 - a) Seconded by PA
 - b) Dissent from NCO K: the squeeze is not worth the juice to have NCO Kent in this group
 25. CA moves to table the piece back to the NNB, the authors, and the NCO-Lincoln to be reviewed, revised, and brought back to the board for consideration prior to the end of Pre-Conference
 - a) 2nd by PA
- XXII. GL moves Bring 17-37 to the floor, 2nd by NE
- A. Proponent:
 1. The committee was unable to reach clear consensus is how to make acceptable compromises outside of making FY18 budget being where it starts.

We also struck the conference expenses section (section 5, point 1)

B. Q&A

1. NE moves to end, seconded by GL

a) No objections

C. Discussion

1. PA moves to amend, 2nd by NE

a) Proponent Speech

(1) We all recognize that at this moment we can't, however this may not always be the case. It would be responsible to reassess the funding aspect of this piece after FY 2018 and bring it back to the table

b) Q&A

(1) NE moves to end, Second from NCO-Kent

(a) No objections

c) Discussion

(1) NE: appreciates the spirit of this amendment, but is unsure the difference between this amendment and is conflicted overall about this

(2) GL: does not think it is ethical in any sense to fund swaps now or in the future and do not support

(3) PA: My thought processes on this was that right now is that it's not fiscally responsible and it does not align with certain regions views. Taking a look at the bigger picture, that may not be the view of the future and it should be up to their discretion. This is assessment. This is different than writing an assessment. The spirit here is good, especially right now.

(4) NAF: We fund NACURH for member schools

(5) NE: So regions do not provide travel funding of any kind, so a scholarship for swap travel may be the only small form of compensation that a region may provide

(6) PA: this is on the amendment right now, and let's reel it back in. Right now, we're not looking to discuss scholarships right now, we need to keep it on the amendment and we can reevaluate this piece yearly is the point right now

(7) NE calls the question, no objections

(a) Vote

(i) 4-4-0

(a) Chair does not cast to break, the piece dies

(8) NE: is in support of this piece as it stands and appreciates being involved in the conversation. We feel like at this time, we agree that we're not in a place fiscally and we respect and understand morality

(9) CA: we also support this piece and believe this is a good thing.

(10) IA: The Intermountain region fully supports this piece as it promotes fiscal responsibility in all regions. As this is the first year for regional budgets to all be proposed with a zero deficit, the finances in NACURH are still not fully stable. With that, money should not be spent on an item that is a privilege and not a right with any RBD position. Until there is full confidence from all regions and the NAF for regions and NACURH to fund swaps travel, we believe that finances should be emphasized in other areas of budgets in order to provide for the best interest of our institutions we represent.

(11) PA is in full support of this piece at this point. We would like to continue to support NACURh in all of our regions, maintaining and supporting our zero deficit

(12) GL moves to end, 2nd by CA

(a) No objections

XXIII. SW moves to recess, 2nd by the GL

XXIV. NCO Kent Move to bring 17-40 to the floor, 2nd by SW

A. Proponent Speech

This piece is a journey. NE, among other regions, had confusion over when the ADs for NRHH need to be affiliated. We still believe that NRHH Chapters need to be affiliated at the same time as everyone else, but a piece written for this was not entertained at the time and a contradictory piece was passed by the NNB. I disagreed with this and tried to express that opinion through my ADNRHH. The NACURH policy book states that extensions can be granted by Chairperson in consultation with Directors, but we were not consulted and feel that this breaks policy. We recognize that this overturns a decision by the NNB.

We have consulted with various ADs for NRHH and have determined why Oct 15 is the date to be set. We understand now that it is necessary. This piece makes the deadline consistent among all NACURH leadership with a caveat for NRHH leadership as outlined in the piece. This piece respects deadlines but eliminates confusion, whereas one position having a different deadline will provide confusion. This piece provides middle ground incorporating the voice of the NNB with respect to policies set by NACURH. Clarifying NAN involvement; when I was approached about a piece to overturn the NNB decision, I wanted to ensure that the NNB's voice would be heard in some capacity, especially since the vote was 8-0-0. I wanted to ensure that the spirit of the NNB piece that exact deadlines be set for NRHH officers and allow for inclusivity of anyone on the quarter system.

The original deadline is early because we want to ensure people are affiliated before they attend a regional conference and this gives everyone time to get everything done.

We wanted to have an oct 15th deadline for everyone, but that appears to be unreasonable for the NCO so we want to make sure that we have a consistent policy

B. Q&A

1. GL: Do you believe that by overturning an NNB, it will perpetuate the little sister role and ultimately undermine the NRHH as a branch of NACURH
 - a) I can validate why those concerns may be confirmed in this action, but I feel that the piece passed in NNB has an effect in overall NACURH policy and should have been discussed here in the first place. I want the voice of the NNB and NBD together. If NBD heard without NNB, they would be upset and the opposite is also true. If the timing is unfortunate, we recognize that this collaboration could have happened earlier.
2. GL: Which ADNRRH's were consulted prior to this piece?
 - a) On the original piece, CA and SA and NE all were collaborated and signed. There was initial ADNRRH support to this. This incorporates those pieces of feedback.
 - (1) CA withdraws collaboration in the original piece
 - (2) GL: Why were not all ADS reached out to?
 - (a) I have had limited access to them in the last two days and I felt as though it was unreasonable to

sit down with all of them. I was trying to include all voices through Aaron. I do not believe that when pieces are authored I ask all Directors how they feel, but I did feel as though I was honoring best I could with the access I had in this setting.

3. CA: Would like to know: seeing that NRHH based positions have a unique requirement in that constitutions can be denied that that is an additional, sometimes multi week step. Other materials can be denied, but typical membership lists, census data can be revisist by one member. Constitutions sometimes take multiple weeks to get amendments made, changes made, to make sure that it can be approved. How do you feel that this timeline standardization- how do you address that topic since standardizing that piece can have an hinderance to ADNRRHs?
 - a) A few parts, one, we can deny any piece of affiliation. Generally a few people work on an RFI, and that could be denied as well. If we push it to the 15th, schools won't turn in their first copy until close to the deadline.
 - b) Pushing the deadline back encourages a later start to the process. I would entertain an amendment that in the instance that a constitution is denied there can be an extension. I just don't want to seek a two week extension for one position and promote a culture where others can when the office has expressed that this is unreasonable.
4. GL: was the original NNB viewable prior to Semis?
 - a) Yes it was. It was shared on the 25th of December.
5. MA moves to end question and answer, seconded from GL
 - a) No objections

C. Discussion

1. SW moves to caucus for 3 minutes, seconded by IA
 - a) No objections
2. IA: Does not agree with this piece. We believe that there are additional implications to our member schools other than just those schools working on the quarterly system. In terms of ensuring that everyone is affiliated, we think this is a detriment to chapter development to rush the process due to a change in the NRHH constitution checklist. Having

only the exception with the quarter schools is not enough; it's a detriment to other schools as well

3. CA moves to amend the piece

a) Seconded by SA

b) Proponent Speech:

(1) Feels this is a better option because with standardization with dates, above this section, when it talks about payment pending. This reflects standardization and seeks to be equitable. While the October 15th deadline sets a standard date, we think that standardization of when everything, but "until" leaves it open to the discretion of the region and the Chair. Standardization of the date to reflect the payment options.

c) Q&A

(1) SW: This now includes all NRHH officers?

(a) Yes. Same spirit, but we wanted to ensure that both options were included (semester and non semester) by making it come out of point B and it's own point C

(2) NCO L: Is this equitable given that it gives some regions an extra 3-6 weeks to approve their constitution?

(a) This would because typically there's standardization within a region. This takes into consideration some chapters who are used to not having to affiliate until later. If you're used to affiliating beginning/mid October versus the end of November, this standardizes across years for chapter practices and timelines spent on affiliation.

(b) I'm asking that different NACURH officers will have different timelines to perform the same task/

(i) There is an ability for discretion to be applied to reflect different needs. The situation for every chapter/institution is not the same. Also, we should consider the payment piece when talked about equitability because some officers have

much longer to pay by this same argument.

(3) NE: The extension by the NACURH officers RLC, how does that apply to the NAN?

(a) I would be open to a friendly amendment to define what that means for someone unaffiliated from regions. I would also want to yield that to the chair who would interpret that.

(b) I would interpret that as the region of the hosting institution of the officer.

(4) NE: Point of Clarification: Does this amendment do what it says it's going to do? The extension exists for quarter system schools and it still does? Agreed?

(a) Yes.

(b) NAA interpretation: it's easier to interpret as requested if brought out another level - and so it is.

(i) PA: What?

(a) Previously the extension process was nestled under students who go to schools not semester based. It also stated that it could be open to Oct 15 OR opening of RLC. For standardization we wanted to move the language for one date over a "this or that" option. Moving it to the other section addresses structural stuff.

(5) IA moves to end Q&A; seconded by SA.

(a) No objections.

d) Discussion

(1) PA moves to caucus for three minutes; seconded by SW

(a) No objections

(2) SA: supports this amendment and believes that allowing an extension until the open of the RLC gives ad nrhhs the ability to approve host constitution's due to not being able to communicate with them

- (3) PA: While this piece is not equal, it is equitable for schools who start on different times.
- (4) IA: We have concerns with the amendment for the aspects of policy that are not shown explicitly in this in that it is contradictory. We believe that it does not align and in fact contradicts the intention of the rest of the piece
- (5) SW: Would like to state that they worry that this changes the piece and makes it still seem to conflict with what the NNB was working towards and creating a whole new thing in general and we are not sure how we feel about that.
- (6) NCO-Lincoln: We are concerned because of the next part of that article regarding affiliation deadline, because if that is not completed by that deadline they can automatically cannot serve at the start of that conference. With October 15, the region still has time to come up with an alternative time.
- (7) GL: does not support the amendment or piece because it does not support NRHH.
- (8) PA also recognizes what IACURH said with some of the contradictions.
- (9) CA: Feels that the board is getting caught up in the org and structure of policy so it would be a better step to make action on this amendment and to make other amendments that are better
- (10) CA: Calls the question
 - (a) No objections

e) Vote

- (1) 2-5-1
- (2) Amendment fails

4. MA: we see and understand the spirit behind this piece. Our biggest concern is that there's an expectation prior to this. As a Director, putting faith as a person elected into this position as ADNRRH is important. We are concerned with the culture that this piece promotes mainly because a piece was already a piece. I personally don't feel like I was not a part of that piece. I do have full respect and faith in the

decision my ADNRRH shows and I trust their decision. This promotes bad culture.

5. GL: The Great Lakes, specifically the NBD voting portion, does not support this piece as it undermines our region's trust in our ADNRRH. It additionally undermines NRHH elected officials across NACURH that were elected by constituents. We also note this due to the NNB approving this piece unanimously with a vote of 8-0-0. We would also like to acknowledge the statements of one of the original authors, in that this piece does not maintain the spirit of the original piece. To say that this piece is submitted while maintaining full confidence in NRHH would be an insult to the branch of the corporation which should have overall say on their affiliation timeline. We fully intend to and would encourage other NBD voting members to vote down this piece and restore the trust we extend to our honorary branch.
6. NCO Lincoln: In the initial piece, the NCO which is a huge portion of affiliations was not consulted of the change which does affect the way that we work as an office. We are not able to cast a vote in any boardroom and I did make sure that my office was at least heard saying that it does complicate our office process.
7. PA: recognizes that if we were to pass this piece that yes it does contradict the NNB and as was stated and it doesn't show good faith in our NNB. We recognize that we did have time to view the piece before hand. We would also like to state that we didn't have time to be consulted with the amendments. Given what is in the piece, they have implications that affect not only the NNB, or NRHH, but have Direct affect on NACURH Leadership. It is our understanding that NACURH Leadership decisions are decided by the NBD and given that now we are all here together as an NNB and NBD, we can have consultations about these discussions instead of just saying that we're not trusting each other.
8. PA: moves to amend the date listed as Oct 15 in Section E to Oct 31.
 - a) Seconded by no one, amendment dies
9. CA: with the approval of chair and authors request to yield a question to authors
 - a) Was census data consulted in the creation of these deadlines, specifically pertaining to the fact that constitution approval

requires a chapter meeting given that this is crucial to the understanding of the creation of a deadline?

(1) Author: No. But reminder, this does not affect all NRHHs, it affects 22 Chapters at most. To obtain the data of all NRHHs does not serve the purpose of this piece.

10. SA: would like to express that an ADNRRH can respond almost immediately to RBD host, but the RBD host may not give the same communication
11. PA: moves to caucus for 5, 2nd by CA
 - a) No objections
12. GL: would like to call attention to the NNB minutes which are public. The discussion that NCO NRHH had mentioned had raised a point in consideration of possible alternative outcomes that were not favorable, but this was not the case.
13. CA: We are entering a rabbit hole of talking about the deadline for affiliation. The piece puts into question if all NRHH chapters should have until Oct 15th or not. We need to figure out what we're talking about
14. PA: moves to amend as before
 - a) Seconded by no one, motion dies.
15. NCO Lincoln: Echoes sentiment of CA. Also recognize the concerns about the deadlines. That being said, if due diligence is done to get things on time it makes it easier for all involved, especially the NCO.
16. IA: disagree. More than just the schools on the quarter system need to be considered when thinking about providing extensions. We would rather revisit the piece from NNB rather than passing a new piece in NBD. We want to find a solution to this problem. We want to revisit rather than recreate the wheel
17. SW: recognizes that some chapters may need more time. We recommend our ADNRRH host schools to affiliate as early as possible. We respect the opinion of the NNB understanding that they have the most perspective to provide and therefore do not support this piece at all.
18. PA calls the question, no objections
 - a) Vote: 1-7-0
 - b) 17-40 fails
19. CA moves to recess until the morning at 8 am, 2nd by GL

Sunday, January 8th, 2017

I. Call to order at 8:00 AM

II. Roll Call

III. Conference Roundtable

A. Group 1 : we discussed timeline, and having the conference chairs from the past year give a presentation about their experiences so the benefits don't stay with just the institution but the region as a whole. We also talked about where the idea of hosting a conference starts from - the reps or the delegates. Who are we reaching out to to give information about hosting? We decided that the idea to host often comes from the delegates, but they often struggle finding support. For conferences in general, it would be useful to have a comprehensive list of things that we need to host the conference that you might not think about. Such as, everything is in the bid. It's different between regional and annual conferences. Lists may not help recruit, but it would give a better idea of what it takes. Talk less about the bidding process, but because we already talk enough about the bidding. We do less to explain how to build a bid team, find support, make sure you're talking about the housing department. The foundations of a bid. Encouraging schools to not be intimidated about the culture of conferences. We find that everything is generally the same. We need to sell the schools that we can make the conference unique.

B. Group 2: Overarchingly, this is a point of access. Do students feel they are prepared? Do advisors feel like they're prepared? Do we have the facilities? We understand what facilities we would even need? We talked about the specifics of how we market to on campus advisors (how to host conference stuff prior to that are advisor specific- what does it mean to be a conference advisor). Moving that to a level I in ART Training rather than Level III. Make learning more accessible. A lot of conference chairs while they serve during their third and fourth year, they start bidding the first or second year. Target the groups about the future. We need students to be on board, we need the conference advisor, we need the pro staff. Incorporating into professional associations. Conference hosting to be included in presentations, etc. Building relationships overall and ensuring everyone knows that it is accessible. It's not "how to bid" its "why you are ready to bid". Instead of saying, "afterwards". Creating standardization of bidding practices.

- C. Group 3: Marketing for a Coordinating Office Position: created clothes pins with information. With that, we found huge success in that interest. It's infiltrating back at the institution. Active marketing. Having a follow up fact sheet or a now what sheet that would be follow up and expectations that is more than just policy. Be available. Capitalize on the conference hype. Be transparent- what, so what, now what. These are the resources you will need to gather this material. Reach out more- now what. Provide different conversational guidance for the different people. We talked about how it's a concept, you phrase it the wrong way and that school is no longer interesting. Make sure you have conversations as a board.
- D. Group 4: Pre-Bid Feedback. Multiple Perspectives (Marketing your school vs. providing a service). Work with advisors to get in contact with Department. Resources and Education: Utilize Flight and consider changing wrap-up report policies so there is less of a delayed release. Small school education and empowerment. Properly thanking and supporting current conference staff so they, in turn, want to encourage other campuses to host. Take advantage of conference high within 2 weeks. Have a how to host a conference chats with the CRC. Personally reach out. Marketing Collaborative Conferences- we don't explore this avenue enough.
- E. NAA: We need to consider the way in which we interact with current conference staff. A negative conference hosting experience directly impacts the way people react in the future, especially as it relates to pursuing a conference. We have a cycle of complaint. As a former conference chair, I will tell you it has been hands down the greatest experience I've had in NACURH and I'm assuming that for many here, that's also true. But there are staffs who leave with a really bitter taste and that's up the t. Are you providing the correct kind of conference support? Are you policing policy or creating an environment of collaboration for them? How are you ensuring that their experience is positive throughout? What kind of transition are they being provided? What is the culture you are creating around conferences within your region? In addition, encouraging current conference chairs to be directly involved with the recruitment and even if they aren't on your "board". In addition, Christina does a lot of work on this topic, but she does not have direct contact with our first time delegates, member schools who might be interested. This is one of the things that a regional board has to really pursue.
- F. CA: It's about giving them more than just the facts. Take advantage of the resources. Work collaboratively to solve problems. It's about all of us; no

matter what is going on, we need to work together rather than it being one person's responsibility. At the time, the accountability may not be the most important, it might just be getting through and then have conversations to debrief and move forward

IV. NNB Membership Status Presentation

- A. Reevaluation of membership status as it relates to identity of NRHH
- B. Driven by NRHH Census
- C. Proposed Types
 - 1. Candidate Member
 - a) Formal intent of pre-membership from student to chapter
 - (1) Includes member education and member selection
 - (2) Does not change member selection processes
 - 2. Student On Campus Member
 - a) Campus level executive board member within the institutional structure
 - b) Voting member
 - c) Lives on campus
 - (1) Must engage with the values
 - (2) Possess GPA requirement
 - (3) Meet expectations of chapter
 - 3. Student Off Campus Member
 - a) Members of NRHH Chapter who are living off campus
 - b) This is for chapters that have a lot of first year students living on campus. This status is up to the discretion of the chapter.
 - c) Up to 15% of a Chapter Cap can have campus level executive boards and voting rights as long as they submit a pledge for accountability.
 - 4. Lifelong Member
 - a) Lifelong is no longer a student at the institution due to either graduation or a discontinuation of education
 - b) If you leave in good standing, you are a member for life
 - 5. Processing Post-Semis
 - a) Memo to share with chapters
 - b) Standardized presentation and feedback form for us at our spring business and leadership conferences
 - c) Ensure that AD-NRHHs get enough time
 - d) Online webinars

- e) Code assessment, evaluate, and make changes to accommodate for trends
- f) Formal piece to NACURH Pre-Conference. If passed, it will be brought to the NRHH Business meeting for a formal vote.

D. Q&A

- 1. For all of these decisions, all of the ADs agreed and came to the conclusion together. We talked about this extensively; over 50 pages of minutes. This group has worked on this and it was a big undertaking. We spent a lot of time on it and it's going to be changing the honorary and our chapters.

V. Adjournment

- A. AC moves to adjourn until the 2017 Annual Business Meeting; 2nd by GL
 - 1. No objections
 - 2. Meeting adjourned at 11:20 AM EST