

No-Frills 2009  
GRHO State Association Business Meeting  
March 21, 2009  
Florida State University  
Call to Order: 8:05 am

Attendance:

- Georgia Tech 2
  - Georgia Southern 2
  - Georgia Southwester 2
  - Georgia State 1
  - Kennesaw State 1
  - University of Georgia 2
  - Valdosta State 2
  - State Director (Ryan J. Hill) 1
  - State Advisor (Dawn Singleton) 1
  - State Advisor-Elect (Keigan Evans) 1
1. Welcome (Director)
    - a. We have a lot to get through so we will have to move quickly. Once the door is opened we will move into our room.
  2. Establishment of Recognition and Review Committee (Director)
    - a. Cindy Ann Kilgo from Georgia Southern was appointed as the Recognition Coordinator for the State and she will head this committee. Members will be asked to review Peach Award submissions and give feedback. Please sign up.
  3. GRHO Listserv (Director)
    - a. We also have a list here for you to sign up for the GRHO listserv if you are not already on it. Please sign it and we'll get it back to Dawn.
  4. GRHO Conference 2010 Bids (Director)
    - a. We have a bid from Georgia Southwestern. They will have 10 minutes to present their bid then we will move into 3 minutes of question and answer and then 3 minutes of debate.
    - b. (Representatives from Georgia Southwestern): Danielle Spain and Ashlund Thomas
      - i. History of the School
      - ii. Timeline
      - iii. We are a small school with 800 residents. We want to get our school out there. We are being supported by the school even though we don't have a large conference committee.
      - iv. Question: What is planned for entertainment on Friday?
      - v. Wii, Karaoke, a Dance, and other things. We will make it fun.
      - vi. Question: What is your plan when no programs are submitted?
      - vii. We will improvise. We can use the RAs. The staff can take it on as well.

- viii. Point of Information (Director): there is an amendment that would require program submissions.
- ix. Question: does your campus require a username and password to use the internet?
  - x. You don't need a password and username.
  - xi. No more questions. The delegates left the room
  - xii. Discussion: Barrett will keep a speakers list.
- xiii. VSU: they didn't have consistent use of the theme.
- xiv. GSU: they are small and aren't as prepared as they could be, they are passionate and want to represent.
- xv. KSU: they haven't fully thought out how such a small school will be able to host such a large conference in regards to facilities.
- xvi. Point of Information (Advisor): they have hosted GRHO two times in the past.
- xvii. Point of Information (Director): the reason we are doing this is because no one bid to host the conference at GRHO in January so Georgia Southwestern put this together so we would haven't have to have the conference online.
- xviii. GSU: the administrators are very supportive.
- xix. Any other discussion? I will entertain a motion to end to discussion. GSU, Seconded by KSU.
- xx. Vote: 9-0-3 Passes

5. Amendment NF09-05

- a. Presented by Nontalie Morrow (VSU)
- b. 3 minutes to present:
  - i. It was confusing at to who was affiliated and who wasn't. I submit that we create an official affiliation roster so there is no confusion. It would be more efficient.
  - ii. No questions
  - iii. GSU: according to the constitution, everyone who shows up is affiliated and is a member. So if you show up you're affiliated.
  - iv. VSU: can we create a roster then just to see who is affiliated at that time?
  - v. Director: there is also an amendment to be considered that would define affiliation. I under this amendment as just created a roster of whose affiliated.
  - vi. VSU: I was thinking more of a consistent list.
  - vii. GTech: the roster would be attendance.
  - viii. Director: it would be in the minutes of boardroom
  - ix. Advisor: everyone in the boardroom was the official roster. The amendment is confusing because does it mean creating a roster or a way to affiliate?
  - x. VSU: I was thinking of something that doesn't change every conference.

- xi. Advisor: I think you're looking for a roster. If you want an affiliation that would come with the later amendment. An affiliation roster would be different because it implies a fee.
- xii. KSU: motion to table to discussion until we consider the affiliation amendment. 12-0-0 PASSED

6. Amendment NF09-01

a. Presented by Brittany Zwald (UGA)

- i. This is from the original GRHO constitution committee. It addresses membership fees, without which we have no roster, affiliation or funding. There is a division for large and small schools (\$50.00 and \$25.00) respectively. Large schools are 2,000+ residents. These are open to amendment. It also reduces the number of votes to one Communications Coordinator (CC). This is because we don't really have NRHH in the state room so it's pointless to give each school two votes.
- ii. Director: will you give a brief overview of what is being changed so everyone is clear?
- iii. UGA: one CC and it adds a membership fee and distinguishes between large and small schools.
- iv. Q&A: (GSU) what would the money go to? (UGA) That is up to the state board, but it could be used for awards, costs for board members to travel, grant to help new schools, etc... But it is up to the discretion of the board. There is no way to raise funds other than the conference add-on fees and there is no affiliation. How do you have a state meeting when there are new people at every state meeting? Who is in this organization at all? (KSU) Could this cut conference costs? (UGA) That would be up to the discretion of the board. (Advisor) Conference costs would be different because that is based on the prices the hosting school gets. (Director) The state could offer conference grants. (UGA) You can also consider reducing the conference add-on fee which would reduce costs but that would have to be more legislation. (GTech) If affiliation fees deter schools from coming to conferences, will we have difficulty meeting quorum? (UGA) That is an always an issue getting more people to join. If you don't have money, you have no benefits, if you don't have benefits, people don't join then your back in a circle again without quorum. We are restructuring and trying to build membership, but we need money to do things for GRHO. (GTech) If we eliminate recognition votes then how will they have a voice on the state level? (UGA) Technically, NRHH is not recognized at the state level. We can't use the names NRHH and NCC on the state level because the associations are not nationally recognized. We have no voice in NRHH anyways. We contribute to NRHH through Peach Awards and they can be voted on at-large. (GSU) When would the affiliation fee be due? (UGA) GRHO to GRHO. That's when our elections are. (Director) Any other

questions? Are there any amendments to the amendment? Seeing none, we will move into discussion.

- v. Discussion: (GSU) I propose to split this into two amendments, one for the voting representatives and one for the affiliation fees. (Director) There is a motion to split the amendments, is there a second? GA State. All in Favor. Motion Passes unanimously.
- vi. (Director) we will now consider Amendment NF09-01A. This will reduce voting reps to one vote per school in GRHO boardroom. Discussion? (VSU) I'm confused on the wording. This would reduce the number of votes to one per school as opposed to the two we have now, correct? (Director) right now we have an NCC representing RHA's and then a Recognition's Coordinator representing unofficially NRHH's. So every school has two votes. This would change it to one vote per school (VSU) That isn't what it is saying here. (Director) That's the current reading. (Advisor) If you look under the "whereas" that's the change. (VSU) Okay, I understand. (Director) Is everyone clear? The top is how the constitution currently reads and the bottom is what Brittany proposes it be changed to. Anymore discussion? (VSU) We feel it is important that if we are pushing Peach Awards, then it is important for us to have recognition reps there in discussion. (Director) Everyone that comes has speaking rights. (VSU) Yes, but I feel that a recognition coordinator is specialized in recognition whereas the communication coordinators may not be. It's like sending the NCC to do the NRHH's job. (GTech) I'm not fond of one voting rep because that is not how we do it at No-Frills and even though we're not associated with NACURH, I feel like it would be taking that away from NRHH. (UGA) Schools never have two votes in business meetings. The way we have it now means that each state has two votes in business boardroom. (GSU) We really don't separate business for the CCs and the RRs so it is redundant, however I do see that it is a good idea to have recognition there at GRHO especially if we are moving towards the Peach Awards. (VSU) Seeing as we only have one vote per school in that boardroom, what if we separate the boardrooms and made one RRs and one CCs and the RRs can take care of Peach Awards annually at our conference and business can be taken care of the CCs, like we do at No-Frills. If we are going to work to make the Peach Awards grow and be worthwhile, that would require the RRs to work on it. (Director) I think it's a good idea, but I don't think we have to consider that as part of this amendment. We can still discuss this amendment and consider that later. For this current amendment, we can move forward and consider that later. (VSU) Withdrawn. (KSU) I want to clarify that the RRs are voting on awards. (Director) Not as it stands now. Each state has two votes in boardroom twice. (KSU) That's what I'm saying, that's the intent. (Director) The intent is to make so each school has one vote on everything, recognition and legislation. Then we can consider

splitting the boardroom later. (Advisor) Are you asking if the intent of an RR is just to vote on awards when they were written into the constitution? (KSU) I'm trying to figure out because it feels like the RRs were meant to vote on awards. (Advisor) I'm going to let Jesse and Brittany answer that because they were there when the Constitution was restructured. (UGA) When we did this, the Peach Awards had not been functioning. But that is irrelevant right now. You can bring your NRHH rep to boardroom, but this is bringing up the fact that each school has two votes on business and it is unlikely that the reps from one school will vote differently from each other so it's redundant. It would save time in counting ballots as well. (VSU) Withdrawn.

vii. Vote 8-3-1 PASSED

b. Amendment NF09-01B

i. Discussion: creating affiliation fees

ii. (GSU) We've had a lot of problem identifying who is a member and we need to target as members. I think it's a good idea. (VSU) I think funding is important, but with budget cuts, I think some schools may not be able to work it into their budgets. (Director) Anymore discussion? If not, I will entertain a motion to end discussion. (GTech) If you have affiliation, are you going to have a set number of paid members that will have to show up to conduct business? If only one school that shows up to No-Frills that was at GRHO, how are you going to do business? Is there a quorum? (Director) Point of Information: we have another amendment that will define quorum. (VSU) I think a fee is a good idea because schools will be more invested in the organization.

iii. Vote 8-2-2 PASSED

7. Amendment NF09-02

a. Presented by Brittany Zwald (UGA)

i. Adds to officer qualifications that will go into effect next GRHO. It adds that a state officer will have attended one state meeting prior to being elected and must be able to attend one regional during the duration of their term. You have to attend a SAACURH, GRHO or No-Frills prior to be elected and you have to attend either a SAACURH or No-Frills during your tenure. I think is necessary because the GRHO board needs to be able to run boardroom and if no officers can come to state meetings that makes it hard on the rest of us.

ii. Q&A: None

iii. Discussion: (VSU) I agree. I think it's appropriate that if you want to be on the state board you have to know what you're doing and you have to be able to guide your organization. (GSU) I agree and I would like to thank Brittany for clarifying the point of CC role as a member of the GRHO executive board. You can't be the voting rep if you're on the board.

iv. Vote 11-0-1

8. Amendment NF09-04
  - a. Presented by Brittany Zwald (UGA)
    - i. This gives an order of succession to clarify what happens when the GRHO director resigns. It was unclear if there was a succession or if an election had to be held. That is the order in the constitution if the Director and others start leaving. (VSU) Would B and C stay the same? (Director) Yes, B and C would stay the same. (UGA) If the director leaves, this serves the others going down the line. Before, there was no line of succession if the first two people left, who would become director. (VSU) Would they all move up? (UGA) Just that one person. If the Director quite, the AD of Promotions would be the next director and that spot would be open. If the AD of Promotions quite, then the Recognitions Coordinator would be the next director and the two positions would be open. (VSU) Then is there no way to fill the positions? (UGA) The appointment process is in the constitution. (GTech) I don't see the need for B and C. (UGA) It's because if a position becomes available other than the director, those positions need to be filled. The director is the only one allotted succession.
    - ii. Discussion: none
    - iii. Vote 11-1-0 PASSED
9. We will recess until lunch at 12:45.

Call to Order at 12:23 pm  
 No-Frills 2009 Florida State University  
 GRHO State Association Business Meeting

Roll Call:

- Georgia Tech 2
  - Georgia Southern 2
  - Georgia Southwester 2
  - Georgia State 1
  - Kennesaw State 1
  - University of Georgia 2
  - Valdosta State 2
- GRHO State Director (Ryan J. Hill) 1  
 State Advisor (Dawn Singleton) 1  
 State Advisor-Elect (Keigan Evans) 1

1. Amendment NF09-07
  - a. Presented by Nontalie Morrow (VSU)
    - i. We are looking to create a system where we know how many people we need to vote once we create our official roster. Basically it will be 50% + 1. That means we're allowed to vote with this quorum.
    - ii. Q&A: (GSU) If we have a vote that is 2/3 thirds, how is this going to account for that for like constitutional amendments? (?)“Then the business would be tabled and put off until the next state meeting

where quorum could be met.” (VSU) Article 7 Section 3 – this brings up the question of what is a member school if we don’t have an official roster? (Advisor) You did have a roster because you were going off of attendance at the conference. (VSU) Now we will have an official roster based on dues. (Advisor) So that means you have to go back and change that. (VSU) So with the dues you get speaking rights and voting rights at the GRHO conference, and here at No-Frills and at SAACURH. (Director) Your affiliation will be from GRHO to GRHO. (VSU) So quorum will be 50% of member schools in good standing? (Director) Yes. (KSU) I want to clarify that the bid we had before to make everyone get one vote passed? (Director) Yes, that was passed. The only thing that hasn’t passed so far is the amendment we tabled about the roster. The affiliation dues did pass. (UGA) When will the amendments go into effect? (Director) At the end of this conference.

iii. Discussion: (GSU) What did we decide? Did we decide it was 50% of the voting members present or 2/3? (Director) The constitution says that 50% of affiliated schools is how it is defined. The Constitution says “participating” schools, which may have to be worded to say “affiliated” schools. (Advisor) I think they are asking if this amendment should be changed to be 2/3 to match the constitution so it’s not confusing. (Director) No, this is just to define quorum. In order for us to move forward with any business, we would need 50%+1 of affiliated schools present. (Advisor) That is the question then that if this passes, would you have to go through and change the constitution and make everywhere it says 2/3 say 50%+1. (Director) Only on amendments would you 2/3 of the vote to pass it. On other pieces of legislation, you need a majority vote. Without 50%+1 of voting members present, or quorum, legislation cannot be passed and to pass an amendment, 2/3 of those present (as long as it’s more than 50% of affiliated schools) have to vote in favor of the amendment. (GTech) I think the confusion is 2/3 of members present or is it 2/3 of all members. (Director) I think that the word participating schools would have to be changed. (UGA) Motion to add a friendly amendment that would add a clause defining “participating” as “affiliated.” (Director) Seconded by (VSU) Motion passes unanimously.

iv. Discussion with the friendly amendment: (Director) the amendment will be passed as written including a friendly amendment that would change the wording of the constitution as it is now written from participating schools to affiliated schools. That will be changed in defining what is need to pass a constitutional amendment. (VSU) You can still affiliated and not be in good standing. Those schools would then not be included in the quorum. (Director) Yes you can be affiliated and not in good standing but they would still count towards quorum because they are affiliated, they just wouldn’t have voting or speaking rights. (VSU) If you pay your dues, then you’re in good

standing though. (Director) But there are other ways to be not in good standing. One of the amendments we will consider next would do that. (GSU) The friendly amendment would change the wording in the constitution, but don't you need to submit a formal written piece of legislation? (UGA) The friendly amendment will just add a clause that will reflect what we've done in defining "participating." (Director) Is everyone up to speed? Is there any more discussion?

v. Vote 11-0-1 PASSES

2. Amendment NF09-03

a. Presented by Ryan J. Hill (Director)

- i. It is an amendment to the conference bylaws which would require each member school to submit a program proposal to the host school per 5 delegates. If you noticed at GRHO this year, one school submitted a program. (VSU) Columbus State did submit a program but they weren't able to couple. (Director) Still, only a couple of schools submitted programs. (Advisor) Advisor is included, but the advisor can't vote. (UGA) I don't think the 5 should include the advisor. (Director) Would anyone like to amend the amendment to not include advisors in the count? GTech seconded by Valdosta, Motion PASSED unanimously.
- ii. Discussion: (GSU) Being on the GRHO conference staff, it was very difficult to come up with programs because we didn't have any submissions. (UGA) We have exec training at our school and we run into the same problem but I don't think this is the way to go about doing this because what happens is still nobody submits programs and then you can't do business because everyone is in bad standing. (GSU) I agree with both Brittany and Jeffrey. It was difficult at GSU to put programs together but I agree with Brittany that I think it's harsh to demand people to put on programs. I understand the need for it, but I don't think it's necessary on this level. (Director) point of information, it requires them to submit a program proposal and not put on a program. (GSU) Taking that into account, since we are asking people to affiliate with us, I don't think new schools would be ready to submit a program. (KSU) SAACURH was my first conference and three of our first time delegates submitted programs. I don't think it's that hard to submit a program. (GSW) I agree. How can you get experience without doing it? I think that it's better that everyone puts on something so the host school doesn't have this burden placed on them in addition to hosting the conference. (UGA) The NCC is responsible for everything during conference time that programs fall by the wayside. This will just stress NCCs out even more. (VSU) Withdrawn. (GA State) I think we're at a new stage in the organization and this might make it too hard to affiliate. (GSW) If your group is supporting you it shouldn't be too stressful. (GSU) I agree with GA State. At a point, we are making it hard to participate in GRHO, but at the same time, we are raising the accountability of those

in the organization. I'm torn between making it too hard and responsibility and accountability. (GSW) Withdrawn. (KSU) If there are 5 in a delegation, there should be one who can put on a program. I understand making it hard, but if we have no requirements, how are schools ever going to experience these conferences? The only way to learn is to ask questions and to be here. (Director) Time is up and we have one person on the speakers list. (KSU) Motion to exhaust the speaker's list, seconded by Valdosta. Vote 10-2-0 Motion Passes. (UGA) It would also place more stress on a school that is bringing a larger delegation to make a bid. (Director) We'll go into a vote. (VSU) Motion to extend by three minutes, seconded by (GSU) Motion PASSES unanimously. Three minutes. (Advisor) We have to be back by one, not one thirty. (VSU) Some requirements can push people away, but sometimes it can motivate people. This is just tough. If you want to be a good NCC, you have to work with your delegation on all parts of a conference. (GSU) Withdrawn. (KSU) Motion to amend the amendment, from "per every five delegates" to "delegations of 5 or more have to submit at least one proposal." Seconded by GSU. Motion Passes unanimously.

iii. Discussion on amendment as amended: (GSU) I think that is a good idea because if you are bringing a large delegation, just requiring 1 as opposed to 3 or 4 is good. (Director) We are at 3 minutes again. (UGA) How many are on the speakers list? (Director) 3. (VSU) Motion to exhaust the speaker's list. Seconded by GSU. Motion PASSES unanimously. (GTech) I've never been to GRHO, but this amendment as amended sounds like a good compromise. (KSU) In response to the large delegation problem, this is a way so that you'll only have to submit at least one. It equals out to about one program proposal per school. (GSU) I think this is a good compromise. We have the conference in February so most will have already put on a program by that time so anyone can submit something. (Director) With that, the speaker's list is exhausted. (UGA) I thought we were on the speaker's list. (Director) Go ahead and say it if you need to. (VSU) If this passes, we need to remind people. (UGA) I think we might be sacrificing quality over quantity. (Advisor) How is that different from the past five years? If you are true student leaders, then you wouldn't just throw something together the night before and if you do, then maybe you should... (GTech) Point of order, the speaker's list has been exhausted. (Director) We'll move into a vote.

iv. Vote 7-4-1 FAILED

3. (Director) We still have two amendments. I will entertain a motion to table them until SAACURH or we can do them online.
  - a. (GSU) Will the affiliation fee start at the end of No Frills? (UGA) No, this one will have to be enacted at GRHO next year. (VSU) Will you bring a check to the conference? (Advisor) I think we can add it into the conference costs.

That will be most appropriate. (UGA) Also the officer qualification and the two people voting and the affiliation won't be enacted until GRHO.

4. Motion to table the other two amendments until they can be brought up per email, KSU seconded by GSU. Motion PASSES unanimously.
5. Adjourn at 12:58 pm