

NRHH Meeting No Frills 2004

Comments – Friday 2/6/04:

Criteria for judging awards?

- will help limit discussion
- save time since know what looking for

- Chapter of the Year:
 - Regional and National involvement -- looking at point values -- one of the things not really looked at in the criteria already
 - difficult to judge since every school is different
 - states, clearly “define their purpose” -- thus are they doing what they set out to do
 - they should be going above and beyond --- but what about the small chapters that are getting back on their feet --- wouldn't building block cover these chapters?
 - how clearly are their goals stated

- Building Block Chapter
 - only covers for a year NACURH to NACURH, is that enough time?

- difficult to set up criteria because things are different from year to year -- bids just have to be compared to each other
- also have to consider how the bid is written --- a school that has done great things, but has a poor bid - may not be judged as highly
- No Frills is supposed to be for NRHH training -- difficult to do since everyone at different levels

Brainstorming:

- candy bars to those who write and go on to the regional level (writer & winner)
- giving spirit points to halls for winners
- recognizing bid writers - they get points based on what they win - silver, gold, etc --- get plaques that list names in hosing office
- community bucket for the community campus winner --- the groups gets a \$20 prize
- banquet just for writers & winners
- t-shirts for all the winners
- everyone recognized, whether they win or not - ROSE award
- do a leadership seminar & NRHH does a session on OTMs - for all res life leaders
- actually walk HGBs through the process in a computer lab
- how do you publicize what a OTM is??
 - web page is getting updated to actually have more info about what an OTM is --- not just for submission
- excellence reports (ROSE)
- recognize service on campus
- Out of the Blue (RAOK) --- have them at the front desks
- spotlight awards at the meetings
- "White Rose" awards -- anyone
- nominations of teachers

- faculty/staff "U" rock
- good luck grams that went to professors
- select locally faculty/staff OTM
- presentation of certificates
- regional award night
- news release

FYE Category:

- first yrs are already nominated enough
- if you have a 1st yr award, then you need upper class award --- thus ends up mimicking what we already have
- too many questions about who qualified
- should recognize the experience, not the age
- positives: would encourage writing of older students for other categories -- also, would give 1st yrs something since they won't have traditional leadership roles
- will exclude them from other categories
- what happens to this category over the summer? When are they no longer a first year students?
- if reading an OTM, and you are reading a bid by someone who is a first year student -- then that is something you consider already because that is impressive ----- would we then need first year category for every kind of award?

NCC OTM:

- GLACURH wants to delete as a category
- maybe their NCCs aren't going above & beyond, so not recognized
- what's the difference between NCC & Executive OTM?
- what' makes them so special that they get their own category?
- don't have debate over at campus level, because only 1 -- is an issue of did they do enough to be recognized
- schools can nominate NCCs at other schools --- doesn't happen a lot --- we need to encourage this more
- most people don't know what a NCC does in order to say that they have gone above and beyond --- - only other NCCs really know what they are doing
- what do they do when they are doing great with their executive responsibilities --- where do you nominate them?
- it is something very cool when they do win at the regional & national level
- OTM chair job to make sure they are in the right category --- if that region feels they are in the wrong one, then they should adjust accordingly --- sounds like a problem of how they are placed in a category, not whether or not this is a valid award
- big difference between NCC & the rest of the executive positions --- can't compare
- why doesn't NRHH board member get their own award? ---- response would be, NRHH gets recognized as a chapter
- how can we distinguished what they do on campus with their reg/natl work
- do NCCs see it as pointless?
- put criteria that can only nominate someone from another school
- tell NCCs to nominate, so that would help the situation ---- encourage the nomination of other schools --- they should be the ones writing ---- would mean that the NCC would have to write an OTM every month - is that too much pressure for them?

- more of an issue of is it being used correctly, not an yes or no on keeping the category ---- can we take a vote & add a resolution?

National Office:

- is it fair that individual schools votes for national office ---- break into regions & they would tell RADs how to vote --- equal representation -- passed at RAD conference

Saturday, February 7, 2004

Building Block Chapter:

- Mizzou nominated & seconded, SLU nominated & seconded

Mizzou:

- Pro: service projects, good things for their community, shows initiative
- Con: letter of references, less credible since they are not signed
- Pro: recognition for OTMs, press releases, t-shirts, etc
- Con: none
- Pro: none
- Con: lots of outdated information, some does not fit timeframe of bid
- Pro: went through a lot of changes with their OTM process, willing to adapt, working hard
- Con: none
- Pro: none
- Con: none

SLU:

- Pro: found a way of expanding membership that works --- now are during people away after only a few semesters
- Con: like they are wannabees
- Pro: done more than previous 2 yrs
- Con: their numbers don't add up
- Pro: showing how active individual members are
- Con: pg 5, 2nd paragraph -- talked about at MACURH and how does inactive/active work
- Pro: none
- Con: none
- Pro: none
- Con: pg 5, whining that they want this, less professional
- Pro: none

Discussion:

- review of inactive number discussion -- difficult to understanding wording of SLUs --- had been done before discussion at MACURH
- voting

Member of the Year:

- Nominations:
 - Drake: Lacey Merica, SLU 2nd

- USD: Ben Coe, Drake 2nd
- Mizzou: David Spinden, Wash U 2nd

Lacey Merica:

- Pro: outstanding presentations as well rounded leader
- Con: none
- Pro: presentation -- easy to read & understand
- Con: did lots of community services, but could that have gotten NRHH to do more community service
- Pro: none
- Con: none
- Pro: none
- Con: none

Ben Coe:

- Pro: pg 6 letter of ref (comment unclear)
- Con: bid doesn't give enough substance to know the person & their achievements
- Pro: pg 3 promotion of NRHH on campus so can be noticed, good logo that is recognized – great!
- Con: bid is only 1.5 pgs, ref say more than the bid itself
- Pro: none
- Con: cover page nothing about chapter or institution, hard to figure out what school he was from
- Pro: none
- Con: none
- Pro: none

David Spinden:

- Pro: pg 1, 4th paragraph --- all the OTMs!
- Con: pg 3, some conference info out of date
- Pro: taking the initiative to take members on a trip to see what others are to be doing
- Con: none
- Pro: good overall involvement, bringing RHA & NRHH together
- Con: none
- Pro: pg 2, shows support for members, write personal letters to them about leadership conference
- Con: none

Discussion:

- if David's is out of date, then why is it being considered --- not consistent -- disregard old date info

Fund Raiser:

- pink flamingoes: get list of people, annoy them until they give money -- get paid to leave
- sell cakes to families
- t-shirts with sayings & sell them to students, i.e. "I survived my 1st finals week"
- pay \$1 for Karaoke, if you are called on & you don't want to sing, pay \$1 not to sing
- holiday bizarre: community organizations come in & sell things, keep their profits, but charge them for their tables, raffle as well
- finals kits

Chapter of the Year:

- mentioned yesterday of what criteria should be.....
- Mizzou: UMR, 2nd
- NDSU: UND, Drake 2nd

UMR:

- Pro: pg 5 list out goals & showed how achieved goals, & showed how recognize goal achievement
- Con: none
- Pro: different types of programs, geared at a variety of people
- Con: none
- Pro: none
- Con: none

UND:

- Pro: well written & organized & letters were signed
- Con:
- Pro: nice to see fall & spring budget
- Con:
- Pro: pg 2 showed members, alumni were impressive
- con:

Discussion:

- in comparing them, UMR gave a lot of good examples, explanations, etc.

Questions:

- induction banquets:
 - information in packets
 - do meal exchange for the food
 - went off campus -- family style restaurant ---- cost was \$5 per person, then chapter picked up the rest
 - don't do meal, just simple desserts
 - candles -- each new member gets one, joining the light/leadership
 - go out to dinner -- full meal, with a choice of options, new inductees don't have to pay, old members do --- do ceremony there
- honor cords:
 - give them to all grads, even if live off campus -- no ceremony -- May & Dec
 - strict rules on who receive, off-campus have to help with the banquet in order to receive, others have attendance policy ----- president of university allows for 5 yrs, if organization keeps good status, will be renewed
 - all seniors eligible, give out at spring induction, only those there & who are involved get them. Judgment call on behalf of NRHH president.
 - not allowed to wear at graduation -- give to off campus --- have separate, less formal ceremony, good-bye social, don't track down people, if not there, don't get one
 - thinking about special ceremony, only active members
 - national office trying to have cords that can be bought from them
 - have to distinguish from other honor organizations on campus --- untwisted

Interaction with RHA/ARH:

- sister organization -- people are in both
- liaison to ARH -- Relay for Life together, other things to support
- Pres of NRHH sits on executive of ARH
- not really connected -- want to add position on hall boards to serve as recognition person --- RHA position that would report to NRHH
- have executive board that is an assembly, work with them for writing OTMs
- NRHH pres rotate who goes to RHA meetings, talk to communication reps to get info out
- NRHH has voting privilege at RHA & share an office, but don't do a lot activity wise
- most NRHH members are staff members, thus don't have liaisons because they take care of it.
- develop relationship with RA staff, do bulletin boards per month for them
- have food at every meeting to get RAs to the meetings
- work hard to find a time that works for everyone, have committees, so if they can't get to the meetings, then they can be active on their committee
- NW has \$7 dues per semester in order to have voting status --- also get \$1 per resident --- most of budget goes toward scholarship. Dues go toward donations usually.

NCC OTM:

- same discussion came up a few years ago
- most NCCs don't seem to care one way or another --- if do keep, what makes them different from executive board
- vote on whether you are going to revote & it has to be 2/3rds vote
- SW - motion that hasty vote, so vote to reconsider, Mizzou 2nd, no descent to the revote
 - motion fails
- percentage of the first vote is what is getting shared with NBD
- topic is now dead
- criteria change ideas:
 - is it obvious that they can write one for another school
 - the way we plug it needs to be changed, not the criteria itself
 - not a lot of people are eligible
 - have cover more than 1 month
 - can nominate from other schools for any category
 - all comes back to communication
 - half of the criteria is for your own school, which is diff for each school - back to how they compare
 - have yet to hear something positive for keeping this