



NACURH, INC.

2016 CORPORATE BUSINESS MEETING
UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
JUNE 25-26, 2016

Presiding Officer:

Nathan Tack
Chairperson - NACURH, Inc.

Minutes Prepared By:

Danielle Melidona
Associate for Administration - NACURH, Inc.

Parliamentarian:

Meg Freeman
Director - South Atlantic Affiliate

Recording Secretary:

Austin Lujan
AD-AF - Intermountain Affiliate

SATURDAY, JUNE 25, 2016 | CORPORATE INFORMATION SESSION

1. Call to Order - 8:15 AM EDT
 - a. Doors close at 8:05 AM EDT
2. Roll Call - *NACURH Information Center*
 - a. There are 237 member institutions present.
3. Parliamentary Procedure Session
4. Approval of Corporate 2015 Minutes
 - a. UNLV moves to approve the minutes; seconded by the University of Louisville
 - i. No objections
 - ii. The Corporate 2015 Minutes are approved.
5. Approval of Corporate 2016 Agenda
 - a. University of North Dakota moves to approve the corporate agenda; seconded by Texas Tech
 - i. No objections
6. Reports
 - a. Overview of 2015-2016 NBD Legislation - *Danielle Melidona, NACURH Associate for Administration*
 - b. Overview of 2015-2016 NNB Legislation - *Kaley Van Zile, NACURH Associate for NRHH*
 - c. NIC Report - *Ethan Schwarten, NACURH Information Center Director*
 - d. NSRO Report - *Breta Moore, NACURH Services & Recognition Office Director*
 - e. ACUHO-I (Professional Partner) - *Beth McCuskey, ACUHO-I President*
 - f. NACURH Strategic Plan Update - *NACURH Executive Committee*
 - i. VCU: What are your plans for social media?
 1. Condensing accounts, staying on the cusp of what is popular.
 - ii. University of Houston: For scholarships, it's only set-up.
 1. We have a few scholarships now, but we really want to assess our financial position to see where we can contribute to students.
 - iii. University of North Dakota: How do you plan to implement cross-regional networking
 1. Directors are working through those; utilizing Zoom. It's really difficult. Once you're at NACURH, recognizing
 - iv. University of Southern California:
 1. We recognize the voice of the institution is the NCC, the voice of the NRHH Chapter is the NRHH Representative. For RHA Presidents, we want RHA Presidents to - RHA President Roundtables is our first step. The plan is notWe want - that looks differently for each region.
 - v. Georgia Institute of Technology: Do you have any plans to bring back the RFI and create new resources?
 1. Yes - we have been working to create a new database; we also want to create standardized transition guides
 2. In it's current state, you can request information from the RFI through the NIC. The NIC just finished
 - vi. Loyola Marymount University: When do you see that being finished.
 1. I would imagine that during the next affiliation year that will be a priority for the NIC. The precarious part is finding something that will support our structure and ensure equitable access to all members.

- vii. UMBC: For implementing transition methods, does that include advisors?
 - 1. Yes, that would be included.
- viii. Oklahoma State University: Can you talk more about the leadership development funds and where that comes from?
 - 1. We envision seeking new sources of revenue. We have capital gains and four, long-term investment accounts...a lot of it comes down to pin sales. We do have assets, but pulling from that is not
- ix. University of Alabama: You were talking about future sponsorship opportunities, what does that look like?
 - 1. Zoom is a corporate sponsor; OCM is our only corporate partner. We want to focus with partners that focus on students. We have the new corporate partnership with It's On Us. Looking at current vendors will likely
- x. CSU East Bay: With pin sales fluctuating from year to year
 - 1. It could definitely vary; we want to create a minimum threshold that the account needs to be at in order to not deplete the account. We would like to see more applications for our scholarships and grants.

7. Legislation

a. CORP 16-2 - NRHH Advisor

- i. Authors: *the NACURH Executive Committee*
- ii. Purdue University moves to bring CORP 16-2 to the floor; seconded by the University Idaho
 - 1. No objections
- iii. Proponent Speech
 - 1. This is to put into policy the NACURH NRHH Advisor to not only support the NAN, but also the NNB and the honorary as a whole. As it currently stands, the NACURH Advisor serves as the advisor to both. In the past the NAN has been left with little to no support in boardroom. Based on a resolution passed last year, we implemented a one-year interim term to trial the position. We took the time to assess the need for an NRHH Advisor and where the honorary is going, it is best to put this into practice. This piece affect three governing documents - the NACURH Bylaws, the NRHH Bylaws, and the NACURH Policy Book. We have considered the financial aspects of adding the position
- iv. Q&A
 - 1. University of South Florida: We're asking for clarification if this isn't approved?
 - a. It would run as it always has. The NACURH Advisor would be the listed advisor. They would continue to support both entities.
 - b. Follow-Up: How detrimental is it?
 - i. Within the past couple of years, the NNB has not had a consistent advisor in the room. We've had difficult conversations where no advisor was present. It's necessary to do this. There is little historical context to what happens when there. It allows the students to lead, but also gives the ability to provide that historical oversight and help guide those conversations.
 - 2. UMBC: What does this look like in terms of the highly transitional period NRHH is going through?

- a. Putting this into policy provides for accountability, consistent support - we had a vacancy with the NAN and having the NRHH Advisor was critical to helping to support the NNB in that case. This isn't always the case, but you never know what will happen. Beyond general support throughout this transitional period, we want to ensure this individual holds students accounts
 - 3. Marist College: You mentioned the financial implications; what does this look like in practice and is fiscally responsible?
 - a. In considering this, the financial implications come down to travel and conference registration. In the past three fiscal years, the travel lines weren't always being spent. With conference registration we have the ability to change our fee structure.
 - 4. Georgia Tech: Why was this passed?
 - a. As a clarification the NBD and NNB have the ability to pass policies prior to it being heard at corporate
 - 5. Wayne State University moves to end Q&A; seconded by Quinnipiac University
 - a. No objections
- v. Discussion
 - 1. Louisiana State University: We feel that implementing this piece will allow for further advancement of the Honorary
 - 2. GW: We appreciate the thoughtful time and effort of the trial run and the work of the Execs and Board to recognize the benefits such a position brings.
 - 3. University of North Dakota: We feel the NNB needs another advisor beyond the NACURH Advisor; this would be a good change.
 - 4. Penn State: We believe this change creates new opportunities for advisors to be involved on the NACURH-level; allows them to further their professional experiences.
 - 5. Washburn: This will help the NNB to run more efficiently and promote consistency.
 - 6. Texas Tech: We feel this position will keep policies in check and provide that historical context.
 - 7. New York University: We feel this is long overdue - this affords equitability between both boards.
 - 8. Purdue University calls the question; no objections
- vi. Vote
 - 1. *By a vote of 234-0-1, CORP 16-2 carries.*
- 8. Corporate Preparation
 - a. NACURH Corporate Business Session - *Nathan Tack, NACURH Chairperson*
 - b. NRHH Business Meeting - *Kaley Van Zile, NACURH Associate for NRHH*
- 9. Recess
 - a. West Virginia University moves to recess until Sunday at 8:00 AM; seconded by the University of Tulsa
 - i. No objections

SUNDAY, JUNE 26, 2016 | CORPORATE BUSINESS MEETING

1. Call to Order - 8:15 AM EDT
 - a. Doors close at 8:05 AM EDT
2. Roll Call – NACURH Information Center
 - a. There are 231 member institutions present.
3. Reports
 - a. OCM Report (Corporate Partner)
 - b. ACUHO-I Report
4. Legislation
 - a. **CORP 16-1 - Affiliation Dues Adjustments**
 - i. Authors: *Jacob Crosetto, NACURH NAF; Austin Lujan, IACURH ADAF; Nick Cunningham, SAACURH ADBA*
 1. Simon Fraser moves to bring CORP 16-1 to the floor; seconded by Adelphi University.
 - a. No objections
 2. Proponent Speech
 - a. This piece identifies the increase of membership dues for NACURH Inc. One thing that I talked to our NACURH Accountant with is the change of Affiliation Dues. Discussion happened at 2007 but there wasn't a detailed conversation for about 20 years. As of now, affiliation dues for NACURH is \$110.00 and \$35.00. With inflation it has decreased steadily and NACURH has absorbed lost money over time, we have lost about \$7,500.00 over the past couple years due to dues not being increased. In addition, finances should not be in the bylaws due to the changes that may occur within a corporation over time, overall we want to give the NBD the power to change the affiliation fees over time. These numbers are only able to be adjusted when it comes to inflation and there is a cap of increasing it for \$5.00 every three years, but there will be an additional year to give institutions time to transition.
 - b. In addition, there would be a financial memo released to member schools that give them an idea of what and why there will be an increase to these dues. There will be a whole year of adjustment to these dues. As a recommendation from the NACURH Accountant this is something that he thinks is a right approach to moving forward.
 - c. On the NRHH side of things, we will need the funds to be there in order to set up that database for NRHH.
 3. Question & Answer
 - a. Temple University: We were wondering as an institution, why did take a long time for this to come into effect?
 - i. It is very long overdue, when I took over my position I also had similar questions. With this year in particular it matches our strategic plan initiatives.

- b. Texas A&M Commerce: With the adjustments you are proposing, would that put us within revenue?
 - i. There is about 445 member schools, there will be a gain in revenue for the subsequent affiliation year.
- c. University of Idaho: We are wondering what the reasoning is to round to the \$5.00 minimum?
 - i. Honestly, we have a policy in NACURH that has a rounding to the nearest dollar. With inflation it is about 1.7% each year, it would just be easier to raise it to that five.
- d. Stony Brook University: I know right now it's only a \$5.00 increase - we recognize that this increase could set a precedent. Is this something we can expect to see?
 - i. For the future it would be a \$5.00 increase, for the upcoming time it states about a \$20.00 increase but we are putting a practice in that hopefully reduces the chance to gouge our member schools.
- e. Purdue Calumet: Since this year will include the new change, from the distinction of large school to small school, we were wondering if you had considered this?
 - i. Yes, we are hoping with the additional transition year would give smaller institutions time to acclimate to the increase for the upcoming year.
- f. Ohio State: Regarding adjustments, will these be made every fiscal year?
 - i. It will be a three-year cycle based on the Consumer Price Index. After the end of the third year, the NAF will present these numbers to the NACURH Board of Directors at the Semi Annual Conference which occurs in January. Again it will be every three years with memos being released on the times that they are set to increase.
 - ii. The NBD would vote on it and the subsequent year is when it will go into effect.
- g. College of William & Mary: As of right now, is increasing the amount of dues only by vote of the NCCs or is it in y'all's hands?
 - i. Right now it is in the Bylaws which is in the NCC's decision. Talking to our NACURH Accountant it is not good to have financial numbers in bylaws as a corporation.
 - ii. College of William & Mary - Follow-Up: Are we voting to move this into the bylaws or just voting on the increase?
 - 1. You are voting on both. There is a ceiling that is in place within policy that is at \$120.00
- h. University of Idaho: What is our current deficit and why are we increasing it by so much so quickly?
 - i. Currently there is not a deficit, there is about a \$400.00 excess per year, in the future there may be a deficit due to a new RFI system and NRHH database.

- ii. The higher inflation goes, the lower you can buy of a product of past dollars. This piece adjusts for the future needs.
 - i. Syracuse University: Thank you for your diligence in this piece. If this piece were to pass, would this remove the vote from the NCCs for future voices on this piece?
 - i. Correct. This piece would move the process to vote on these pieces to the Policy Book.
 - j. Purdue moves to end Q&A; seconded by the University of North Texas
 - i. Rutgers University - New Brunswick objects
 - ii. UNT: Withdrawn
 - iii. Purdue: Withdrawn
 - k. Rutgers University -: If inflation were to decrease, would the \$20.00 increase or would the \$5.00 decrease.
 - i. The \$20.00 passed today would not increase but for that three-year cycle if inflation is under controlled it wouldn't be reviewed for another three years.
 - l. SUNY Geneseo: If that passes, does that remove the cap where the dues stand?
 - i. There is no longer a cap as listed in the Bylaws, there is just an amount that NBD sets based off inflation.
 - m. University of Mary Washington: It was stated that disclosing the budget wasn't appropriate; how would you access our budgets?
 - i. We cannot force the schools to share their budgets with us, but it will be expected of the Executive Team of that year to use the census to find that data of those member school budgets.
 - n. Virginia Commonwealth University moves to extend Q&A by five (5) minutes, seconded by Miami University
 - i. No objections
 - o. College of William & Mary: Why is our deficit increasing each year?
 - i. This is in real dollars. What this means is that if dues were adjusted with this piece, it would have about \$7,000.00+ funds to allocate to expenses.
 - p. UND moves to end Q&A; seconded by Iowa State
 - i. No objections
4. Discussion
- a. University of Arizona: We firmly believe that with time comes change, change brings obstacles. NACURH will have to shift when it comes to finances, we look forward to see NACURH in a better financial standing to better support the corporation.
 - b. Ferris State: We are in full support of this document because with time does come change. We should follow through with the inflation prices.
 - c. Stony Brook: We do support the sustainability of the legislation, we have to be mindful of the increase like this may have on schools.

- d. Webster University: We rise to remind NACURH that small schools dues have been increased. We find the double dipping completely unacceptable.
 - i. POI: This will take place during the 2017-2018 affiliation year.
- e. ASU - Tempe: We are in full support of this piece especially with following through with the NACURH Strategic Plan and get our resources such as the RFI back up and running.
- f. UBC: We would like to note that this change will strain our budget; but we are ins support because of the sustainability for NACURH as a whole
- g. NAU: We are in full support of this piece, this increase is long overdue. We do understand the concerns that schools have but the membership dues will be able to support these schools further with NACURH.
- h. Indiana University: We are in full support, if we wish to be sustainable leaders, we must make sustainable decisions.
- i. West Texas A&M: Though it may be frightening, the dues increase has backed up data and is not set controversially. We see this as necessary.
- j. Saginaw Valley State University: We are in support, but we are concerned with the idea there is no longer a ceiling cap.
- k. Ohio State: We are in full support of this legislation, smaller schools may have trouble but the lack of a ceiling cap is impacted by inflation so we want people to keep that in mind.
- l. EIU moves to end discussion; seconded by Weber State
 - i. Grand Valley State University objects
 - ii. Weber State does not retract
 - iii. Vote on Objection
 - 1. 79-150-1; objection carries - two-thirds not met
- m. GVSU: We think it is important to consider sustainability, but we are concerned that it takes away the voice of the NCCs. Yes, we are represented by the NBD, but it is a monetary decision.
- n. Marist College: We should put full faith in our NBD members since we elect them to make the best decisions for us.
- o. UC-San Diego moves to end Discussion; seconded by U of Hartford.
 - i. University of Idaho objects
 - ii. Hartford: Withdrawn
 - iii. UC-San Diego: Withdrawn
- p. University of Idaho moves to amend CORP 16-1; seconded by Northern Illinois University
 - i. Proponent Speech
 - 1. We believe that if we're going to be increasing dues every three or four years, we shouldn't just expect a memo; we should have a voice in these matters.
 - ii. Question & Answer
 - 1. Washburn: We would like to know of what way the NBD votes, will all member schools see the memo?

- a. The memo is still sent out, but if the NBD does not adjust the dues, the confirmation vote by the NCCs would not exist.
2. ASU - West: What would happen if NCCs do not agree with what the NBD votes on?
 - a. (U of Idaho) If you don't agree with the increase then it won't but we should have a voice to saying yes or no. It is smart to adjust for inflation, if you don't agree then you will have a chance to state that.
 - b. NAF: If this were to happen and the voting reps didn't pass, it would put NACURH in a precarious situation. We have a policy that says we cannot have an unbalanced budget in NACURH. This would effectively do that.
3. U of Maryland: College Park: YIELD
4. SUNY Geneseo: If NCCs voted at NACURH Corporate when would the increase happen?
 - a. It would be assessed every three years, brought forward and be implemented the following year (year four). The process would then start over.
5. UND: So the NBD would vote on the membership dues, and the NCCs would vote at the NACURH Corporate?
 - a. University of Idaho: I believe so, yes.
 - b. Chair: It would be a confirmation vote of the NBD's decision.
6. Ohio State: Is the \$5.00 amount arbitrary chosen compared to the adjustment for inflation?
 - a. It was chosen for basic ease, looking at inflation for the past couple years it increased at about \$4.00 so we would increase it by \$5.00.
7. Ohio State: Wouldn't it always be in our best interest to always vote against dues increases, which in turn would be detrimental to NACURH?
 - a. I would strongly say no, it would be in our best interest to vote for every single adjustment. Ultimately, we are voting for the wellbeing of NACURH as a whole. This is something that provides an opportunity for a crisis if we have member schools that are struggling with a situation. Most of the time, I would advise for increasing regardless.
8. Pacific Lutheran moves to end Q&A; seconded by Washington University of St. Louis

- a. Syracuse objects - would like to exhaust the speaker's list with
- b. Wash U St. Louis does not retract
- c. Vote on the Objection
 - i. 45-184-1; Q&A ends

iii. Discussion

1. Bowling Green: We feel that we elect our representatives and we should put the trust in our reps to make these decisions. Mainly, this is still our student voice. This amendment defeats the purpose of the original piece.
2. Louisiana State: We do not feel that this amendment helps and complicates everything. We do elect our RBD, also along the lines if the NCCs did vote against it then it would hurt NACURH in the end.
3. ASU-Tempe: We are strongly against this amendment due to the fact this budget is presented for approval by the NBD and that an out of balance budget is not only against policy, but is detrimental to the corporation.
4. Virginia Commonwealth University: We are in full support of the amendment, it will promote the checks and balances and promote transparency.
5. Arizona: We are against this amendment as we are not in support of financially unsound practices.
6. University Mary Washington: We are in strong favor of this amendment, as NCCs we should have a strong voice to this matter.
7. Florida: We support this; maintaining a confirmation raises our voice as institutions and not only statistics.
8. Texas A&M: We stand in full opposition of this amendment, the purpose of the NBD is to vote on matters of where we are not informed. They are our representatives when we cannot be our own.
9. FGCU: We support this because we are One NACURH. There needs to be a balance of powers.
10. U of Idaho: We would like to make a point of clarification, if the vote is against the NAF's budget then they will have a whole year to adjust the budget. We are not proposing unsound financial changes.
11. Arkansas: We are against this; with this happening every three to four years, this boardroom will look different and will continue to have this discussion.
12. Ferris State: We are in full opposition of this amendment, it was earlier stated that every year it was mentioned that we would vote yes.
13. UNC - Charlotte Calls to Question

- a. Webster objects; would like to exhaust the Speaker's List
- b. UNC-Charlotte does not retract
- c. Vote on the Objection
 - i. 45-182-3; moving into a vote on the amendment

iv. Vote

- 1. By a vote of 62-162-6, the amendment fails.
- q. Syracuse moves to exhaust the Speaker's List w/ additions; seconded by Florida International.
 - i. No objections
- r. Oklahoma State: Fundraising is always a possibility. We as members of NACURH believe it is important to keep up with inflation to keep NACURH financially solvent. We support NACURH so NACURH can support us. People helping people.
- s. Texas A&M: Again, we stand in full support of this piece of legislation. If we look historically, we have lived under archaic views and we need to support an organization that further supports us.
- t. University of Windsor: yields question to Author - with schools lying outside of North America, did you look into how this affects those institutions?
 - i. It is focused on US Inflation, so no I did not look into the impact on other currencies.
- u. Washburn: We are in support because we believe it will make us sustainable. The money will be used to fund pertinent initiatives like the RFI and NRHH Database of which NACURH needs both.
- v. UW Oshkosh: We are in support of this piece because it is sustainable, we appreciate that you put a monetary amount on it compared to percentages. We think it is fine that you put monetary amounts.

5. Vote

- a. *By a vote of 216-13-1, CORP 16-1 carries.*

b. CORP 16-3 - Office Updates

i. *Authors: the NACURH Executive Committee*

- 1. University of Houston moves to bring CORP 16-3 to the floor; seconded by Temple University
 - a. Texas A&M objects for a fifteen (15) minute recess
 - b. Temple University does not retract their second
 - i. Vote on Objection
 - 1. By a vote of 72-158-1, the objection fails.
- 2. Proponent Speech
 - a. This piece essentially focuses the merge of the NIC and the NSRO to the NACURH Corporate Office (NCO). Both offices are a vital resource to NACURH, Inc. so this piece allows you as the voting members of our

corporation to give the NAA the power to make those sweeping changes within the Policy Book since there are many times that the NIC and the NSRO come up. This gives the NAA the authority to change all references and inferences of the NIC and NSRO to NCO.

3. Question & Answer
 - a. Rutgers - Brunswick moves to end Q&A; seconded by Loyola Marymount University.
 - i. No objections.
4. Discussion
 - a. Penn State calls the question; no objections
5. Vote
 - a. *By a vote of 225-2-1; 16-3 carries.*
5. Recess
 - a. Syracuse moves to recess for fifteen (15) minutes; seconded by University of Nebraska - Lincoln
 - i. Objection from Dalton State for five (5) minutes instead of fifteen (15) minutes.
 - ii. Opinion of Chairperson: it will be fifteen (15) minutes
6. Call to Order
7. Finance Presentation - *Jacob Crosetto, NAF*
 - a. Q&A
 - i. Rutgers University - New Brunswick moves to end Q&A; seconded by University of Colorado Colorado Springs.
8. Executive Host School Acknowledgement
 - a. Daniel Ocampo, NACURH Advisor - University of the Pacific
 - b. Christina Aichele, Conference Resource Consultant - University of Wisconsin - Whitewater
 - c. Adam Schwarz, Florida Atlantic University
 - d. Kaley Van Zile, NACURH Associate for NRHH - Mississippi State University
 - e. Jacob Crosetto, NACURH Associate for Finance - University of Illinois Springfield
 - f. Danielle Melidona, NACURH Associate for Administration - The Pennsylvania State University
 - g. Nathan Tack, NACURH Chairperson - Old Dominion University
9. Announcements
10. Recess
 - a. University of Delaware moves to recess until Closing Ceremonies; seconded by Wayne State University.
 - i. No objections; we stand in recess.
11. Adjournment
 - a. University of Delaware moves to adjourn until the 2017 NACURH Annual Conference; seconded by Purdue University.
 - i. No objections.