

## 1. Old Business

Approve minutes from November 2011 Meeting

Tim Tilley makes motion to approve  
Kenny Bailey seconds the motion

## 2. Any other items carried over from last meeting?

None brought to group

## 3. Contest Items - Group discussion about how the season went

Phaidra discussed things that went better, others that need to be fixed. Check in needs to be addressed, including why independents check in sporadically vs all together.

### a. Proposed Contests for 2013

Jan. 19 - Grand Junction Eval

Jan. 26 - Denver / Springs Eval

Feb. 9

Feb. 16

Feb. 23

Mar. 2

Mar. 9

Mar. 16

Mar. 23

Mar. 30 or Apr. 6 - State Championships - Would like to consider having State at the 1stBank Center

(Easter is on Mar. 31, but RMPA State is on Apr. 6)

WGI is Apr 11-13

Championships could fall on Easter weekend again

Facilities we could have available:

1st Bank Center - better warm up, used to be Broomfield Event Center

Has been remodeled from past, lighting issues

No more hockey, so floor would be cement as same as Coliseum

Not as many seats, but we do not fill Coliseum  
Lighting similar to Coliseum  
Performers closer to audience  
Rob mentioned that the Coliseum more Dayton-like, Vantage point is crucial

Price - we'd have to negotiate the contest sites

Question brought up is has parking changed since 1st Bank has taken over?

Peggy - Parking included is a big selling point, attempt to be negotiated with any facility we use

Discussion about behind curtain at Championships, parts should not be run, only single tosses thrown

Informal poll about date given availability

How did everyone feel about it being easter weekend?

Did we lose a guard from Easter? No, it was a different weekend

We would lose a guard going into next year.

Rob - enjoyed not having a break going into Dayton

Tim - advantage/disadvantage having WGI judges that weekend, perhaps encourage the chief judge to more carefully select the judges, using local judges (no first reads) can be advantageous

Issues with RMPA being the same weekend, band director cannot go to both

March 31 - 0 units

April 6 - 26 units

Tim Tilley motions for April 6th as Championships, Rob Billings seconds

Site Coliseum put in holds if available, explore options

#### 4. Budget Report (End of contest year/review)

Kevin a bit over this year, but more units helped cover  
\$11,000 for Coliseum  
Small expenses due to tie  
Keeping prices low kept us equal  
GJ show pay for hotels and judges fees  
averaged out to be worth it

We are growing! More guard is more money for the circuit

#### 5. New Business

RMCGA picnic - would we like to have it again?  
interaction between guards is nice  
post earlier with more info

##### Grand Junction Show

Francisco - huge help to have that show  
Looking for possible coordination with the Utah Circuit  
Guards traveling seemed to have a great time, rehearsal  
spaces available  
Weather wise - best year yet for traveling  
Contacting other high schools in that area, money is  
always an issue  
Cost to travel is expensive  
Units from Denver area can stay at high schools as an  
option  
Circuit growth can happen on that side if we can adjust  
the fees for their participation  
Fee for 150 miles away from Denver

Can we make a fee for a one time show?

NonMember fee for a show

Perhaps a grand junction show fee to participate

## Regional report -

Jessica Froyen brought up some issues with the Regional, some have been addressed between the board and Clay Stansbury, some had not

RMPA does a "rebate" for some items, may be something we should consider

Regional host covers fees for hotel, flight, food, and WGI fee which ends up being quite a bit

Regional cost - lost money

Legacy feels that the Friday night show before was detrimental to Regional

Francisco - brought the guard/when the weren't in classes allowed, just bumped a class

The cost for the Regional is \$325 for one show

The Friday night show was supposed to be more of an advantage for the regional, not a disadvantage. Many groups used it as a pre-read to the Regional the following day.

Peggy reported that RMCGA - gave Clay \$ in end of March to help pay for those judges \$200

Clay and Kendra discussed a partnership with hosting the regional.

Options discussed to help with the regional:

The circuit host/partner the show

Make available a regional scholarship from the circuit

Add the regional as part of the dues

Encourage units to Bump up for the regional from RA to SA to allow for a possibility of more performance opportunities

We currently have the oldest WGI Regional, we would like to do all we can to keep it

Looking at the meeting attendance, the problem is not here. How can we get those who are not here at the regional?

For the Friday night show, have it be hosted by Legacy, or allow units who attend the Fri Show a kickback to the regional

## 6. Judges Report

Kevin is at work, did not mail report  
He was overbudget, but costs were covered

Judge discussions?

Tim Tilley - we the circuit, (Tim resigned from position as VP and is now back to his role as a judge) emphasis placed on creating and growing from within was successful, some may have been weeded out and may not be back this year. Many WGI judges needed to be "babysat", others were positive influence on new/returning judges within the circuit. Championships was a tragedy from the who of was on the panel, there is a sense of power with WGI behind the name, but we need to support local judges. As an example, Roger went above and beyond even some of the local judges we've had in place due to the training and help he received from others within our circuit. One shot looks from WGI can be helpful, but are nearly always a first read. Many sitting here are capable of being fantastic judges but for whatever reason you do not choose to be. At least to have tried will be better than none at all.

Rob expressed frustration with judges, and heard a lot from others within the circuit. For 3 years we've expressed concern with specific judges who are not qualified and poor performance is well documented yet they continue to be assigned as judges. They are kept and allowed to give us poor reads. Also, Championships as a first read was a horrible idea. Why wasn't it a double panel with local judges, if budget controls it and we have grown perhaps we can increase the judges budget.

Greg asked if judges were approved through members or wasn't that the advisory panel/task force's responsibility.

Heather Mesite commented that it was something that had been done in the past, not able to comment on current season.

Kendra was unaware of how judging decisions and assignments were made

Tim added that it is unfair to pay a judge from out of town when they leave us no better off than we were on Friday night

Rob commented that from the quality of judging we had at Championships, we have the same quality from our local circuit judges if not better.

Greg agreed that first reads at championships, from any judge local or WGI, is unfair to the units and asked that the task force be utilized in the review and assignment of judges in the future.

Phaidra commented that Kevin was attempting to do what we had asked, trying to fix something the circuit complained about in the past

7. Proposals / and or Discussion of those items (included at the end of this document)

## 8. Elections

Up for elections are the offices of Secretary, Contest Director and Vice President

26 voting member units were represented

Secretary - Floor: Rob Billings nominates Shauna Hodges,  
Shauna named secretary with 25 votes

Contest Director - Jen Carrasco nominates Phaidra Reed  
Phaidra named contest director with 23 votes

Director of Training/VP - Vince Hodges nominates Tammy Hobson  
Tammy named VP/Director of Training with 18 votes

All votes were in the majority of member units present

## 9. Open Forum

Thoughts on how to run state (prelims/finals) and to cut the day shorter or how to fit everyone if we continue to grow

Several units offering summer opportunities, they will be listed on our Facebook page as the board receives information.

Motion to adjourn - Tim Tilley  
Second - Katie Manhart

Proposal submitted by Tim Tilley, adjudicator.

**Proposal: Define voting eligibility for members of the circuit: "All paying members, whether primary or secondary and regardless of amount of dues, who fulfill completely their performance obligations for the previous season will be afforded a single, valid and binding vote during votes taken for the circuit at the annual meetings. Guards/teams that become inactive will lose their voting privileges until such time as they are active again and fully paid up for dues and responsibilities to the circuit. In accordance with current rules of the circuit, each voting organization will set its primary representative or a proxy representative in writing to the circuit elected secretary before each meeting where votes will be cast. Failure to designate a proxy in the absence of the primary representative will result in forfeiture of that guard/teams eligibility to vote during the meeting. In order to vote, the guard must have been active for the past season. A bona fide guard that does not participate during the competitive season will not be afforded voting privileges."**

Rationale: This eliminates the friction regarding whether or not a unit can vote based on their status as primary or secondary.

Discussion: The current policy does not encourage growth of the circuit if only the primary guard can vote. All guards that took the time to participate in the season should be able to vote, not just primary units. This makes no sense in a circuit that is experiencing growth, both in number of performers and number of guards. Power to influence change and progression should be shared by all guards who field a competitive unit, not just the primary guards who pay a larger fee.

Tim – groups that compete regardless of primary or secondary should be allowed to vote. IF they showed up they should be allowed to vote.

Secondary units do not get other badges

We should more clearly define secondary unit,

Current definition of primary/secondary is that 2nd unit from same organization/school

Vote to accept – 23

Vote to not accept – 0

Secondary Units now have the ability to vote as long as they fall within the secondary unit definition. Units that wish to have all of the rights as a Primary Unit must pay the full amount of dues and become a full Primary Unit regardless of affiliation with another unit.

Motion to define Secondary Unit – Made Jen Carrasco  
Seconded by – Rob Billings



Secondary unit definition – A secondary unit is of the same organization or school. A secondary unit may attend half of the regular season adjudicated competitions and state to qualify for the lower rate. A secondary unit has the option of paying the full amount to gain all of the benefits of a Primary unit.

For – Jim  
Second – Jen Carrasco

In favor– 22  
Against– 0

Discussion on how this affects Novice units, novice units are defined differently than Primary or Secondary Units and will remain as they have in the past.

Proposal submitted by Tim Tilley, adjudicator.

**Proposal: Set board meeting minimum responsibilities: "Elected board members and members of the advisory board task force will meet a minimum of three times during the competitive season. This meeting is defined as face-to-face, not telephone or online conference and will be conducted ICW previously scheduled contests. The meeting will be open forum style. All guards, in order to maintain their voting privileges, must attend at least one board meeting during the season. The first meeting will occur during or after the first regularly scheduled competitive contest. The Second meeting will occur after the first meeting, but before the third meeting. The third meeting will occur before the State Championship weekend competition. Minutes will be taken by the RMCGA secretary for each meeting and posted not more than 5 calendar days after the meeting is concluded. Members unable to attend may, at their discretion, nominate 1 proxy representative, in writing and designated for the meeting in question only. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the business of the circuit as it stands at the time of the meeting and to ensure that a voice is given outside the regularly scheduled meetings for all members of the circuit. "**

Rationale: provide for in progress updates regarding the business of the circuit from the elected board to the members and vice versa.

Discussion: Many members have valid concerns that can be dealt with during the season instead of waiting until the May/November meetings. During the 2012 season, many concerns were brought to the board from the membership that were not discussed. With a season in progress meeting, most of the issues could have been dealt with that would be impossible without a formal meeting of the circuit. Having regularly scheduled meetings gives the circuit more confidence that the board is working to solutions for the issues brought to them by the membership.

(Skipped to Advisory Board proposal first, revisited this proposal and then it passed)

For – 26  
Against – 0

Proposal submitted by Tim Tilley, adjudicator.

Proposal: Redefine the seeding process for RMCGA Championships: **"Seeding for championships will occur after the last regular season performance based on the entire season average of bottom line scores. All other RMCGA participation requirements (number of shows, fees, etc) will apply. The averages will ONLY be used to arrange the performance order in RMCGA Championship prelims performance and will NOT be released as a scoring rationale for adjudicators or for the general public. This information is publicly available on the RMCGA website in the recaps of each show. The lowest average score guard would be scheduled to perform first in prelims with each performing guard corresponding to their season average through the highest overall season average performing last in a particular class. Guard performance order for semi-finals will be drawn in groups of 4. Each group of four guards derived from the seeding process will be randomly drawn and placed in their draw order within their "group" for semi-finals performance. Previous year's champion can elect to perform last at Championships Prelims."**

Rationale: the current seeding process benefits individual color guards and puts others at a disadvantage going into the championship weekend.

discussion: The current policy puts guards, especially those with low funding or support, at a considerable disadvantage. An example from the 2012 season would be a middle school that would have to travel over 115 miles to the last regular season show unnecessarily when a season average of their score would be a better indicator of where they should be seeded for championship prelims. It was a thoughtful recommendation for the 2012 season to have a different formula for determining prelims performance order, but it would be better for the circuit and for all guards to have a system that benefits all and is set prior to the season.

Arranging the performance order by overall season average also encourages guards to do two things: 1) come out strong, as close to finished as possible with as complete a package as possible and 2) improve during the competitive season. Embracing these two ideas will not only simplify the seeding process, it will help create stronger and more competitive early season guards.

Changes up the way guard are scheduled into prelims. Schools out of 150 mi range, 2 highest scores averaged.

amended to be last 3 scores for unit averaged for each unit. Include last week. Previous year's champion can elect to perform last at Championships Prelims.

For – 25  
Against – 0

Proposal submitted by Tim Tilley, adjudicator.

Proposal: Define what an act of god is in relation to units unable to compete after being scheduled for a contest. **"For the agreements between the Rocky Mountain Color Guard Association and participating units, an act of God is interpreted as an implied defense under implied rules of impossibility or impracticability. If the circumstances are determined to be Act of God, the promise or agreement is discharged because of unforeseen occurrences, which were unavoidable and would result in delay, expense, or other material breach. Each situation where the circuit or a unit feels that an act of god prohibits them from discharging the agreements they have entered will be reviewed and voted on by the RMCGA elected board and necessary actions taken to dismiss any penalty or enforce any rule concerned as soon as possible after the situation is discovered."**

Rationale: There is no current definition of an Act of God in the RMCGA contest rules.  
discussion: The current situation allows for no real before the fact determination of what an Act of God is. The proposal helps to define this and gives guidelines for how a dispute over whether or not the situation is an act of god can be remedied. During the 2012 season, a member of the circuit asked to pull from a show after it was determined that on the day of the show the members spouse would undergo surgery. There was no way to determine, before the fact, for neither the member nor the board whether or not the incident could or could not be determined to be an Act of God.

Unavoidable circumstance would be an act of God.

For – 26  
Against – 0

Proposal submitted by Tim Tilley, adjudicator.

Proposal: Define board member titles: **"Current board member titles to be changed from/to as follows: President to Circuit Director; Vice President to Training Director; Treasurer to Finance Director."**

Rationale: This accurately aligns titles to responsibilities and brings circuit organization more in line with most color guard organizations.  
discussion: If the circuit needs to maintain current legal titles for by-law considerations, that is not a problem. Just as many in business assume multiple titles and responsibilities, we can better align within the RMCGA the titles to the position. The title "President" or "Vice President" sets individuals on a level that does not promote communication with all within the circuit. Having served in a position on the RMCGA Board, I believe we need to make the titles more representative of what the membership wants/needs the board members to do.

Look into state regulations if the terms President, Vice President, etc must be in state paperwork but to the circuit, on the website, on any other literature, use these terms

For – 22  
Against – 0

Proposal submitted by Tim Tilley, adjudicator.

Proposal: term limits for board members. **"Board members will be limited to serving two consecutive terms (4 years total) in their elected position and will not be eligible for reelection for a third term. Exceptions will be the treasurer and contest director, who must possess specific skills and background for the proper and professional execution of their financial management and duties. No exceptions will apply for the position of President, Vice President or Secretary. After the absence of 2 years of a former President, Vice President or Secretary, that individual may be nominated for a position on the RMCGA board and can serve another 2 terms in the elected position. All past board members become a member of the advisory committee unless a specific vote of no confidence is rendered. "**

Rationale: Ensure that there is not a stagnant board position within the circuit.  
discussion: The current system allows for the possibility that there can be stagnation and lack of new, fresh and progressive ideas within the RMCGA board. The proposal would eliminate this and provide for fresh leadership in touch with the members of the circuit.

If voted on favorably, this proposal will open the door for a new approach between current and future leaders of the RMCGA and stimulate leadership mentoring by the current leadership of the next leadership of the circuit.

Opens the door for future leaders, no my way or the highway, mentor for future positions. If it comes through that a board member wants to be kept by the circuit, an amendment can be proposed.

For – 20

Against – 0

Proposal submitted by Tim Tilley, adjudicator.

Proposal: Removal of non-performing board members. **"Board members are subject to adjudication of their performance, on an on-going basis, by those that elect them to lead and manage the circuit. As such, board members who do not perform to the satisfaction of the members may be called on to resign by a 2/3 vote of the membership. This vote may be called by any active member of the RMCGA circuit or the RMCGA board. The members of the RMCGA may also call for a vote of "no confidence" by the voting members of the circuit. If 2/3 of the membership vote no confidence, nominations are immediately taken to fill the remainder of the former board members term of office as defined in the by-laws. elections will then continue on the schedule as defined in the by-laws. Voting format will be by secret ballot. Any board member or member of the RMCGA may call for a by-name vote of confirmation to validate the secret ballot if questions arise regarding it's validity. "**

Rationale: Ensure that there is a mechanism to remove non-performing board members.

Discussion: The current system allows for the possibility a non-performing board member may be able to remain in office past a point where their management or leadership is no longer a viable option for the circuit. The circuit requires a remedy for non-performing board members to better balance the power of the board and the power of the members of the circuit.

For - 22  
Against - 0

Proposal submitted by Tim Tilley, adjudicator.

Proposal: Define the selection, members and roles of the Advisory Committee: **"All voting members of the circuit will be eligible to nominate individuals to serve 1 year terms, defined as from the meeting they are voted into the Advisory Committee until the next meeting where a vote is taken to elect new members of the Advisory Committee, to serve on the RMCGA Advisory Committee. This committee will act in an advisory role within the circuit in order to ensure that the needs and voice of ALL guards is communicated to the RMCGA Board. The elected members of the Advisory Committee will appoint a spokesperson and alternate spokesperson who will conduct the business of the Advisory Committee and confer with members of the RMCGA elected board on matters of concern within the circuit. Each competitive class for the previous season will be represented on the advisory committee as long as that class continues to exist as determined by changes/member vote at the regularly scheduled membership meetings. The Advisory Committees recommendations will not replace a membership vote. Advisory Committee members will assume responsibility for issues and concerns within their particular class and will maintain communication with the guards from their represented class. All past board members become a member of the advisory committee unless a specific vote of no confidence is rendered. "**  
rationale: Eliminate the friction regarding the Advisory Committee with the circuit and establish guidelines for what the advisory committee does/does not do within the circuit.

Discussion: The current policy does not encourage communication between the advisory committee and their members nor the elected RMCGA Board. In their current role, some members of the Advisory Committee perform their roles based on their individual guard needs with very little to no communication.

Nominations will be due prior to the voting meetings. (Exception would be if this proposal is approved at the May 2012 membership meeting. At that point, the procedures would be used to elect an advisory committee for the 2013 season. If the elected Advisory Committee member can't fulfill their responsibilities, the membership will elect a new representative at the next voting meeting.

The member elected can be the winner of the previous seasons championship for their particular class, but does not have to be. The members should elect who they feel can professionally discharge their responsibilities and best serve the future of the circuit.

Summed up as – Instead of being the winner of the class, the class selects a representative

Clarification of advisory members, board and winners does not define.

Voted on at May meeting within the classes

Change committee to Board

Tim added – If a board member resigns, they are not a part of the “Advisory Board”

Kenny – Task force renamed and not done properly. Kenny, it has always been given to the 2nd place unit

Kenny motions to reinstate the original as voted on by members Task Force. Winners of the class, president, contest director and chief judge, Secretary to , second place takes responsibility if 1st place cannot

Tim seconds, withdraws proposal

For – 26

Against – 0

Phaidra – was supposed to be the “President’s Task Force”, presidents was removed.

Proposal submitted by Tim Tilley, adjudicator.

Proposal: Define a quorum for the RMCGA: **"A quorum, with respect to meetings and votes within the RMCGA, is defined as 1/2 or greater of the voting membership. A quorum is required to conduct a binding vote and a vote will not be taken at any RMCGA membership meeting without a quorum representing 1/2 or greater of the voting membership present. "**

rationale: Establish, without question, a solid definition of what constitutes a Quorum for voting purposes in the RMCGA.

Discussion: encourages those guards that can't be present to designate an official proxy to represent them at membership meetings.

Establish what a quorum of an RMCGA meeting will be.

Motion to allow each person may represent more than one unit if they are the primary

For - 1

Against - 20

