

**Began 10:05am 3/11/2006**

**Roll Call: 27 representatives present, 3 absent, 27 voting**

**Erikka Rosberg present from the NRHH National Office**

**Angie Byers, Georgia Southern University, serving as note taker unless otherwise noted**

**Discussed agenda**

Motion to bring bid to the floor, seconded

## **Student of the Year**

### **1. Timothy Gallagher, Ga Tech**

Pro-Con:

Pro: extensive activities

Con:

Pro: gpa

Con:

Pro:

Con:

### **2. John Bussert, Georgia Southern University**

Pro-con:

Pro: creative

Con:

Pro: volunteer work

Con:

Pro: experience

Con:

### **3. Sean O'Malley, Maryville**

**Point of clarification, NCC allowed, though started NRHH? Not nationally recognized**

Pro-con:

Pro: outstanding leadership

Con: NCC

Pro:

Con: opinionated bid

Pro: experience

Con:

Pro: drive

Con: non-year specific info in bid

Pro: dedicated service

Pro

Con

Pro: created NRHH

Con: wordy

Pro:

Con:

Pro:

Con:

Pro:

#### **4. Timothy S. Jackson, Mississippi State**

Pro: extensive involvement in dif area of campus

Con: bid structure

Pro:

Con: grammar

Pro: RHA president

Con: lacks info

Pro: service

Con: too many letters of support

Pro: experience

Con:

Pro: conference participation

Con:

Pro: regional exp and service

Con:

#### **5. Amy West, N.C. State**

Pro: extensive community service

Con: majority of bid concentrates on one service achievement

Pro: bid theme

Con: no info on conference exp

Pro: academics

Con:

Pro: leadership skills

Con: unprofessional bid structure

Pro: Resident life involvement

Con:

Pro: budget handing

Con: lack of involvement

Pro: online banking created for school IRC

Con:

Pro: gpa

Con:

Pro:

Con:

#### **6. Lauren Petrizlka, Northern Kentucky**

Pro: conference experience

Con:  
Pro: diversity of employment on campus  
Con:  
Pro: set goals  
Con:

**7. E.J. Walicki, University of Florida**

Point of Information: co-NCC allowed?  
Pro: professionalism  
Con  
Pro: structure  
Con: wordy  
Pro: involvement  
Con:  
Pro: detailed  
Con:  
Pro: innovative theme  
Con:

**8. Crystal Henry, University of Mississippi**

Pro: theme  
Con: lacking info  
Pro:  
Con: bid format  
Pro: bullets  
Con: lacking 2 letter of recommendation  
Pro: RHA involvement  
Con: clarity  
Pro: conference experience  
Con: non-year specific information  
Pro: community service  
Con:  
Pro:  
Con:  
Pro:  
Con:

**9. Adrienne L. Strain, University of North Carolina Wilmington**

Pro: community service  
Con:  
Pro: detailed involvement  
Con:  
Pro: GPA  
Con: conference ex  
Pro: table of contents

Con:  
Pro: bid creativity  
Con:  
Pro: community service  
Con:

**10. Mae Burke, University of Virginia at Wise**

Pro: involvement in bid designated to one page  
Con: structuring  
Pro:  
Con: lack of information  
Pro: quality of programs presented at state conf.  
Con: opinionated  
Pro: quotes  
Con: no year specific information  
Pro:  
Con:  
Pro:  
Con:  
Pro:

**11. Ebony Garcia, University of West Ga**

Pro: NRHH involvement  
Con: bid structure  
Pro: bid theme  
Con: lack of information  
Pro: quotes  
Con: no bullets  
Pro: conference experience  
Con: clarity  
Con: non-year spec  
Pro: RHA experience  
Con: opinionated  
Pro: dedication  
Con:  
Pro:  
Con:  
Pro:  
Con:

**Point of information:** Sean and EJ not eligible, but still discuss in pro-con?

Yes, but up to the NRHH representatives' interpretation to make the decision for the winner

Can bid go on nationally? Yes, but would be against policy

Which bids are against policy? Maryville College's Sean O'Malley, and University of Florida's EJ Walicki

**Discussion: (5 minutes)**

Western Carolina, Lauren, both Tims, Amy, and John clearly show involvement  
Morehead, Lauren and John have lots of employment history

**Point of Information:** NC State; Preferable to refer by school name? Yes

NC State, whereas as Ga Tech, Georgia Southern University, nc state, unc w contain a  
wealth of info about what candidates have done, others are more lacking in that area

UNC Wilmington: UVA wise, University of West Ga, and U of Mississippi concentrated  
on character of bid candidate, while that is not criteria of student of the year

**Point of Information:**

Possible to have a vote, narrow down, and discuss remaining bids; rundown vote? Yes

What is specific narrow down point? Chair will decide

Motion, seconded, passed

Take a vote, Bill and Beth will tally by name of school; vote for continuing to consider

Vote for three schools wish to keep in on ballot, tally, and come back

<b>Student of the Year</b>	Vote to narrow options (each school votes for top 3 choices)
<b>Voting Round</b>	1
<b>Votes Cast</b>	81
<b>Necessary For Election</b>	n/a
<b>Georgia Tech</b>	18
<b>Georgia Southern</b>	13
<b>Maryville</b>	2
<b>Mississippi State</b>	10
<b>North Carolina State</b>	8
<b>Northern Kentucky</b>	8
<b>University of Florida</b>	1
<b>University of Mississippi</b>	0
<b>University of North Carolina Wilmington</b>	14
<b>University of Virginia at Wise</b>	3
<b>University of West Georgia</b>	1
<b>Abstained</b>	3

**Narrowed down to 4 candidates: Ga Tech, Ga Southern, Mississippi State, UNC Wilmington**

**Discussion: (5 minutes)**

Tennessee Knoxville: UNC Wilmington and Ga Tech have clear and concise bids

FSU: While Ga Tech and UNC will included gpa's, GSU and Mississippi State did not

U of Alabama: Whereas Tim Gallagher's (Ga tech) bid is first time delegate friendly, others are not

South Florida: Both Ga Tech and UNC Wilmington both have extensive leadership w/in respective areas, whereas others do not.

Morehead State: Ga tech has a huge amount of RHA involvement

NC State: Whereas Ga tech and UNC Wilmington include tables of content, other do not

East Tennessee State: UNC Wilmington states future goals

UNC Wilmington and Ga Southern have sense of community service, others do not

FSU motion to end discussion, seconded by Columbus state

Motion Passed

<b>Student of the Year</b>	
<b>Voting Round</b>	2
<b>Votes Cast</b>	27
<b>Necessary For Election</b>	14
<b>Georgia Tech</b>	7
<b>Georgia Southern</b>	4
<b>Mississippi State</b>	3
<b>University of North Carolina Wilmington</b>	11
<b>Abstained</b>	2

Candidates narrowed to 2 candidates, GA Tech, UNC Wilmington, vote again.

<b>Student of the Year</b>	
<b>Voting Round</b>	3
<b>Votes Cast</b>	27
<b>Necessary For Election</b>	14
<b>GA Tech</b>	9
<b>University of North Carolina Wilmington</b>	15
<b>Abstained</b>	3

## **First Year Experience**

### **1. Chris Riley, Georgia Southern**

Pro: concise and organized essay  
Con: discusses things irrelevant to award  
Pro: conference exp  
Con: lengthy introduction  
Pro: gpa  
Con: font and presentation  
Pro: campus involve  
Con: distracting border  
Pro: pres exp  
Con:  
Pro: program exp  
Con:  
Pro;  
Con:

### **2. Jessie Ajluni, Mississippi State**

Pro: involve  
Con: lack of letter of good standing  
Pro: service  
Con: clarity  
Pro: fundraising  
Con: grammar  
Pro: conference experience  
Con:  
Pro: two page bulleted list  
Con: clarity of essay  
Pro:  
Con:  
Pro:  
Con:  
Pro:

### **3. Brian Mathis, NC State**

Pro: RHA involvement  
Con: too many typos  
Pro: innovative theme  
Con: lengthy personal letter  
Pro: future goals  
Con:  
Pro: bid structure  
Con:

Pro: academics

Con:

**Jonathon Sheffield, U of Florida**

Pro: RHA involvement

Con: presentation

Pro: executive board as a freshman

Con: non-bulleted

Pro: leadership experience

Con: only one letter of recommendation

Pro: specific goals

Con: no letter of good standing

Pro:

Con: letter not addressed to NRHH boardroom

Pro:

Con:

Pro: innovative theme

Con: typos

Pro:

Con:

Pro:

Con:

Pro:

**Matt Grub, UV Wise**

Pro: conference experience

Con: too many letters of recommendation

Pro: involvement

Con: lacks letter of good standing

Pro:

Con knowledge of where SAACURH was held

Pro:

Con: inconsistency w/ bid theme

Pro: 2006 co-conference chair of SAACURH

Con: grammar and overall bid presentation

Pro:

Con: lacks information

Pro:

Con: opinionated

Pro: personal quotes

Con:

Pro:

Con:

Pro:

Con:

**Discussion: (5 minutes)**

Eastern Tennessee; Ga Southern and NC State have letters of good standing, whereas others do not

University of Alabama Birmingham; University of Florida has good presentation, whereas others do not

UNC Wilmington; miss state has experience in housing and outside of housing

University of Tennessee Knoxville; Mississippi State and UVA Wise both appear that there has not been any proofreading, grammar and punctuation

University of Florida; move to remove three schools that lack required letters of good standing from consideration by vote

Columbus State seconded motion.

**Point of clarification:** Suggested criteria, does not require letters

Vote on whether to remove three bids b/c lacking letters of good standing

**Point of clarification:** Radford; says must have letter in criteria

**Point of information:** University of Florida; lack of letters something that would eliminate a bid at national level? Judged at national level as judged here, will be considered, suggested criteria, will consider bids. Up to NRHH representatives to use judgment, so in your opinion, what is the best option?

**Point of information:** Radford; will schools have an opportunity to add a letter before bids move onto the national level? Yes

**Point of information:** University of Florida; able to include a new letter? Yes

Move into vote to eliminate three bids from consideration,

<b>First Year Experience</b>	*move to eliminate candidates that did not have letters of good standing
<b>Voting Round</b>	1
<b>Votes Cast</b>	27
<b>Necessary For Election</b>	n/a
<b>For</b>	16
<b>Opposed</b>	8
<b>Abstained</b>	3

Motion Passes

**Discussion between Ga Southern and NC State: (5 minutes)**

Mississippi State; Ga Southern has a gpa whereas NC state does not

Florida State; NC State included future conference expectation whereas Ga Southern didn't

Murray; Ga Southern had extensive campus experience, whereas NC state did not.  
University of Tennessee Knoxville; Ga Southern provides extraneous info makes distraction

Appalachian State; NC State objective and how accomplished them

UNC Wilmington; NC State presents information in an innovative and intriguing way, keeps reader interested

NC State; Ga Southern was a student prior to fall 2005

University of Tennessee Knoxville;

**Point of Information:** Where was that found? In transcript

University of Florida; transcript says admitted and matriculated 2005

Valdosta State University; Motion to vote, South Florida seconds

<b>First Year Experience</b>	
<b>Voting Round</b>	1
<b>Votes Cast</b>	27
<b>Necessary For Election</b>	14
<b>Georgia Southern University</b>	16
<b>North Carolina State</b>	9
<b>Abstained</b>	2

Discussion of resources inside of voting placards.

Motion to recess for lunch, seconded

### **Call to Order**

**Roll Call:** 27 present, 3 absent, 27 voting

### **MAIN MOTION X:**

Motion to bring Main Motion X to the floor: motioned and seconded.

Motion to wave the reading: Murray, Mary Washington 2<sup>nd</sup>

### **Questions: (5 minutes)**

NC State: additional ad-NRHH duties...(1) because intention of more duties in the future?

Ad-NRHH: Yes

UNC Wilmington: Additional ad-NRHH “may call meetings at their discretion”. When discretion?

Ad-NRHH: at conferences when ad-NRHH feels need to discuss things out of NCC boardroom.

**UNF friendly amendment:** section III article one; “his” to “their” discretion”

**NC State friendly amendment:** section III, article one; “their” to “his or her” discretion”

**Mary Washington friendly amendment:** section VIII article b “though” to “through”

**Morehead State friendly amendment:** Section XI article f; delete repetitive “of the conference”

**Radford:** section IV “status shall be” determined rather than “shall determined”

UF: How are positions in Section VII appointed?

AD-NRHH: Chair in conjunction with the SEC will choose whom to appoint.

UF: Have parliamentary assistant rather than having it sound like “official” positions.

**Murray State friendly amendment:** Section VII, article a, part 1. “Shall work with the AD-NRHH *to provide parliamentary procedure* training to the NRHH Representatives at all SAACURH conferences.”

**UNC Wilmington:** Section VII, add “The positions are as follows:” to the end of sentence and erase NRHH in front of both parliamentary and secretary

**UNC Wilmington Motion amendment, University of Florida seconds.**

**Discussion of Amendment:**

Radford: SEC says regional on it, shouldn’t make it more lax because it is boardroom

University of West Ga: leave NRHH on it to distinguish

:Section already says NRHH on it, so is distinguished

Western Car motions to vote, VSU seconds vote

Yays: 14

Nays: 10

Abstaining: 3

Motion passes.

Western Carolina friendly amendment: Section VII, article B part 2 “that minutes *are* posted”

University of South Florida; motion to pass Main Motion X as amended, University of Tennessee Knoxville seconded.

Yays: 26

Nays: 0

Abstaining: 1

**Main Motion X passes.**

VSU motions to bring NRHH member of the year to the floor, seconded.

**Roll call: 26 present, 4 absent, 26 voting**

## **NRHH Member of the Year\***

**1. Cara Bernstein, University of Florida**

**Pro-Con**

Pro: Conference Inv

Con: Wordy Bullets  
Pro: GPA  
Con:  
Pro: Theme  
Con:  
Pro: Layout  
Con: Title Page  
Pro: Successor Training Plan  
Con:  
Pro: Regional Involve  
Con:  
Pro:  
Con:

## **2. Angie Byers, Georgia Southern**

### **Pro-Con**

Pro: GPA  
Con:  
Pro: Theme  
Con: Design  
Pro: Bid Breakup  
Con:  
Pro: Experience  
Con:  
Pro: Clear list of Accomplishments  
Con:

## **3. Brandie Hewett, West Georgia**

### **Pro-Con**

Pro: Bullets  
Con:  
Pro: Conf Experience  
Con: OTM  
Pro: Conf Co-chair  
Con:  
Pro: Bid Layout  
Con: lack of info  
Pro: Academic  
Con: Emphasis on outside act  
Pro:  
Con:  
Pro:  
Con:  
Pro:

#### 4. Samantha Wendel, Appalachian State

##### Pro-Con

Pro: Involvement

Con:

Pro:

Con: Service

Pro: Non RHA focus

Con: Table of Cont

Pro:

Con: No goal discussion Pro:

Pro: Confusing Quotes

Con:

Pro: Departmental Collection

Con: Legibility

Pro:

Con: Wordy

Pro:

Con: No Goals

Pro: Recognition at all levels

Con:, Opinionated

Pro:

Con: Awkward Structure

Pro:

Con:

Pro:

##### Discussion (5 minutes)

FL State; whereas GA State and Florida have the GPA others do not

UNC Wilmington; whereas FL and West GA stay true fillers other do not

TN Knoxville; Whereas FL included letters from higher housing officers other did not

Radford; whereas West GA was clear others were broad

NC State; Motion to vote, App State Seconds

<b>NRHH Member of the Year</b>	
<b>Voting Round</b>	1
<b>Votes Cast</b>	26
<b>Necessary For Election</b>	14

<b>Appalachian State</b>	4
<b>Georgia Southern</b>	4
<b>University of Florida</b>	14
<b>University of West Georgia</b>	3
<b>Abstained</b>	1

Columbus State motion to bring bid to floor, University of South Carolina

**Roll Call: 23 present, 7 absent, 27 voting**

## **Building Block Chapter of the Year**

### **1. East Carolina University**

**Point of information: Virginia Tech**, selection says that no member of bidding school shall be present, all schools, or just ECU?

AD-NRHH: Ask all bidding schools to step out during selection process. Rule includes anyone at schools.

#### **Pro-Con**

Pro: increased otm's by 300%

Con: missing signature

Pro: collaborations

Con: non year specific

Pro: conference attend

Con: no constitution

Pro: explanation of improvements

Con: explanation of chart on pg 3

Pro; bulleted list of accomplish

Con methods of measurement not described (plans of measurement)

Pro: completion of goals

Con: format

Pro:

Con;

Pro

Con

Pro: attendance at conferences

Con:

### **2. University of Florida**

**Pro-Con**

Pro: theme

Con: possible copyright

Pro: detailed

Con

Pro: goals

Con: wordy

Pro: monthly table of OTMs

Con:

Pro: constitution

Con: structure

Pro: appendix

Con

Pro budget

Con

Pro: working w/ other orgs

Con:

**3. University of South Florida**

**Pro-Con**

Pro: bullets

Con: unfilled space

Pro:

Con: distracting theme

Pro:

Con: constitution

Pro: membership increase

Con:

Pro: changes denoted in red to constitution

Con:

Pro: measurable goals

Con: one letter of support

Pro: 3 pillars

Point of clarification: actually 3 letters

Con:

Pro:

Con

Pro records for future members

Con bid layout

Pro descriptive

Con

Pro: University, inclusion of regional OTMs

Con: grammar

Pro

Con

Pro

Con: inclusion of OTM  
Pro

#### **4. University of West Georgia**

##### **Pro-Con**

Pro: accomplishments

Con: vague goals

Pro: hosted no frills

Con: layout

Pro: letter from president addressed to NRHH representatives

Con

Pro layout

Con:

Pro: inclusion of OTM

Con:

##### **Discussion (5 minutes):**

Kennesaw State; U of F included const, whereas others didn't

**Point of clarification;** University of West Ga also included constitution

University of Alabama Birmingham, University of West Ga included letter from president whereas others didn't

Florida State University, whereas University of Florida and University of South Florida had letter of support from RHA, others did not

University of Tennessee Knoxville, University of Florida included appendix, others did not

Radford motions to vote, Valdosta State University seconds

<b>Building Block Chapter OTY</b>	
<b>Voting Round</b>	1
<b>Votes Cast</b>	27
<b>Necessary For Election</b>	14
<b>East Carolina University</b>	1
<b>University of Florida</b>	12
<b>University of West Georgia</b>	11
<b>University of South Florida</b>	3
<b>Abstained</b>	0

Not a majority, vote again, narrowed to University of Florida or University of West Georgia.

<b>Building Block Chapter OTY</b>	
<b>Voting Round</b>	2
<b>Votes Cast</b>	27
<b>Necessary For Election</b>	14
<b>University of Florida</b>	14
<b>University of West Georgia</b>	11
<b>Abstained</b>	2

U of Florida motions to bring bid to the floor, South Florida seconds

**Roll call: 25 present, 5 absent, 27 voting**

## **NRHH Chapter of the Year\***

### **1. Georgia Southern University**

**Pro-Con:**

Pro: service

Con: Numerous incidents of U of Denver appear in constitution

Pro: Programming

Con: Numerous grammatical and structural errors

Pro:

Con: Leadership Development

Pro: Organization

Con:

Pro:

Con:

Pro: Appendix

Con:

### **2. University of Mary Washington**

**Pro-Con:**

Pro: Integration of theme

Con: No constitution

Pro: National involvement

Con: Grammar and spelling

Pro: Inclusion of constitution

Con: No attention to detail

Pro: List of OTM  
Con: Format  
Pro:  
Con: Membership changes  
Pro:  
Con: Unspecified Table  
Pro: Retention Plan  
Con:  
Pro:  
Con:  
Pro: 3 tiers  
Con:

**Discussion (5 minutes):**

U Southern MS, whereas Mary Wash has 3 levels of involvement others do not  
UNC-Chapel Hill, Both bids need intense editing  
UNC-Wilmington, Mary Wash has a national OTM Reader  
Kennesaw, Both bids need to utilize bullets  
Morehead, Constitution of Mary Wash belong to Mary Wash whereas GA Southern's  
belongs to the U of Denver  
Extend time 5 minutes.

**Discussion (5 minutes):**

UT-Knox, Both need work to represent region nationally  
**Point of Clarification:** U of FL, If given feedback they can make changes  
South FL, Egregious errors in the bid, no time taken to proofread is unacceptable  
Maryville, Check sheet doesn't call for a constitution, however it app  
**Point of Clarification:** UNC-Wilmington, It is clear that everyone either voted no  
confidence or abstained. Please make your thoughts heard and clear so we understand  
what was your reasoning  
App State, Some mistakes in bids are bad, but it is a learning experience.  
UNC-Chapel Hill motions to extend time for 5 minutes, Valdosta seconds

**Discussion (5 minutes):**

UNC-Chapel, Neither bid met the criteria  
U of Southern MS, Winners will be able to revise  
Murray State, Understand that this is for a regional award and must show effort  
W Carolina, GA Southern Constitutions' reference to U of Denver questions time put into  
bid preparation

**Point of Clarification:** AD-NRHH, Schools will be able to send bids for SAACURH to  
the NACURH Conference with approval by the SEC for this award

**Point of information:** Kennesaw, will two bidding schools be able to resubmit to the  
SEC their bids for approval in addition to other schools that may submit bids? yes  
Valdosta State motions to vote, U of South FL seconds, NC State Objects

**Point of information:** UT-Knoxville, Bidding schools will be able to resubmit their bid  
if no winner is chosen? Yes

**(TIME) Moved to Vote**

<b>Chapter OTY</b>	
<b>Voting Round</b>	1
<b>Votes Cast</b>	27
<b>Necessary For Election</b>	14
<b>Georgia Southern University</b>	5
<b>University of Mary Washington</b>	14
<b>Abstained</b>	1
<b>No confidence</b>	7

**Motion to close NRHH Boardroom, seconded  
Unanimously approved, 5:31 PM**

**\*Ron Hamner served as note taker**