



## WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS

### Proposal #1

**Reinstate double adjudication panels for all WGI World Championship FINAL events.**

*Submitted by Byron K. Valentine, Zydeco*

**Rationale:** As the director of a World Class Colorguard I have the responsibility of hiring a number of talented people to work with my group. Without the multiple sets of eyes designing, cleaning and evaluating our production on a weekly basis we would be much less successful. I feel that WGI should approach the Championship Final Events in the same manner. In a finalist event you have (hopefully) narrowed the playing field down to the "best of the best." I feel it is the responsibility of WGI to provide these units the best amount of adjudication as well. It is quite unlikely with the depth of composition and multiple layered responsibilities that most finalist groups possess these days that one person could responsibly evaluate the programs and leave no stone unturned. Specifically in the IA captions where there are so many events being offered!

I firmly believe that with a double panel on finals (of any class) that the risk of being rated and ranked inappropriately would be lessened; and would provide these units that work so hard throughout the season peace of mind knowing that a "mild buffer" has been provided in the event that one judge sees things differently than his peers, as well as the reward of being evaluated by the best of the best in the most important competitive event of their season.

**Financial Impact:** The cost of paying a double adjudication panel for the six finalist events, as well as the standard meal, travel and housing fees is the main financial impact. I understand the severity of that financially and appreciate you taking the time to consider my proposal.

### Proposal #2

**Use a double judging panel for all 2010 WGI Championship "finals" competitions.**

*Submitted by Jeff Wroblewski, Warren Central HS*

**Rationale:** Accountability. Integrity. Consistency. This will hold adjudicators accountable and reinforce caption integrity and consistency of the WGI scoring system.

**Financial Impact:** TBD.

### Proposal #3

**All Finals & Semi-Finals contests at World Championships will utilize 10-person judging slates.**

*Submitted by Angela Culot, Salem Blue*

**Rationale:** A 10-person judging slate will ensure that no one judge is able to single-handedly influence or alter the results of a round and/or contest. Any personal bias or opinion of a particular judge can be offset by a 10-person panel. This will guarantee the accuracy and integrity of the results.

**Financial Impact:** Cost of additional judges for all Finals contests and those classes that have Semi-Finals contests at World Championships.

### Proposal #4

**At the WGI World Championships, have a double panel of judges for all finals competitions and all semi-final competitions. If a division does not have a semi-finals round, then their preliminary round would have the double panel. (for example: at the 2009 World Championships, SW/IW/IO had no semi-finals round. In this case, they would then have had a double panel for prelims.**

*Submitted by Becca Sullens, North by Northwest*

**Rationale:** This would ensure that any adjudication discrepancies that are extreme to the rest of the panel would be less severe. It would create a balance with the overall score using the double panel. Over the past two years, we have seen groups not make finals as well as be bumped out of a medaling spot because of one judge having placed that group much lower than the rest of the panel. A double panel would help keep any of these instances more balanced with the rest of their fellow adjudicators.

**Financial Impact:** This would require more pay for judges at these contests.

### Proposal #5

**At the World Championships, each contest that utilizes rounds to determine units advancing to Finals, such contest shall utilize a double panel of judges.**

*Submitted by Chris Putnam, Odessa HS*

**Rationale:** In semi-final contests (or preliminary contests large enough for rounds, but not large enough to warrant a semi-finals contest), the contest dynamics make it possible for individual judges to determine which units make finals and which do not. For example, this past season, the 2<sup>nd</sup> through 18<sup>th</sup> place units in Scholastic A semi finals were separated by a total of 3.9 points. Clearly one judge can make a call in a contest of this nature that will determine which unit performs in finals and which unit does not.

By limiting this to only rounds of larger size, the financial impact is lessened and the goal of ensuring the "right" units make it to finals is fully supported.

**Financial Impact:** This past season, this would have required an additional panel for IO prelims, SA semi's, IA semi's, and SO semi's. This would have meant an extra panel of judges for Thursday and two extra panels for Friday (the IA semi's and SO semi's panels could be the same).

### [Proposal #6](#)

#### **Double panel all analysis captions at World Championships in contests the result in units making finals and World Championship Finals**

*Submitted by Randy Nelson, Northeast Independent*

**Rationale:** Provide a better sense of trust in the judging process at World Championships

**Financial Impact:** Approximately 5400.00 based on 2009 WC.

### [Proposal #7](#)

#### **Reinstate the block score and post block score for all classes at all regional contests. This would directly seed you into prelims at the world championships as it did in the past (no longer using a ranking system for seeding into prelims at the world championships)**

*Submitted by Becca Sullens, North by Northwest*

**Rationale:** The block score hypothetically ranks you in the top third of your class. It also gives the adjudicators a range for that specific week to base their scores off of. The top ranking units, no matter what regional they attend in one weekend, would get a similar score. This would in turn, set you up to be seeded into prelims at the World Championships with a decent open draw for the top spots. Post block would be the next level of groups seeded with non-blocking units seeded last. Just this year, we watched one panel decide at an east coast regional that a 90 is the correct number for being at the top of that regional, where at another regional it was an 85. When there is no "basis" for a score besides the box on the back of a sheet that has such a wide range, we will see scores range from one regional on the same day as another be drastically different with similar ranked units. This changed the rankings for units drastically, which in turn changed the draw for many units going into prelims at the world championships. A block score/post block gives a basis for all judges each weekend as to where their highest numbers should be based, where their middle numbers should range, and how to keep a consistent scoring pattern for all units in each third of their class.

**Financial Impact: None.**

### [Proposal # 8](#)

#### **Scholastic World Preliminary contest will be held on Thursday night.**

*Submitted by Ruth Ann Medworth, Northview HS*

**Rationale:** This would give performing members an opportunity to perform at their best. When prelims begin at 8:00 AM, many groups get little or no sleep.

Financial Impact: None.

### **Proposal: #9**

**Add a World Class Semi-Final for both Scholastic & Independent World Class, regardless of number of entries.**

**Example:**

**Thursday: Prelims for SW and IW (all units)**

**Friday: Semi-Finals – top 20 in SW and IW**

**Saturday: Finals – top 15 in SW and IW**

*Submitted by Michael Lentz, Onyx*

**Rationale:** Moving prelims for both World Classes to Thursday evening and holding a semi-finals on Friday followed by a Saturday Night Finals would add another performance opportunity to our top classes and create more excitement throughout the weekend as well as an opportunity for change in who will/would advance to finals.

Both DCI and BOA offer prelims, semi-finals and finals.

**Financial Impact:** Cost related to venue.

### **Proposal #10**

**World Class performance order will be determined by random draw.**

*Submitted by Ruth Ann Medworth, Northview HS*

**Rationale:** This will give each group an equal opportunity to make finals based on their preliminary performance.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### **Proposal #11**

**For World Championships, make the prelims draw for World Class a Webcast event with the performance order determined by a live draw.**

*Submitted by Randy Nelson, Northeast Independent*

**Rationale:** Create an excitement for the upcoming World Championships.

**Financial Impact:** Not sure

## Proposal #12

**CHOOSING SEMI-FINALISTS FROM MULTIPLE SITES** – For prelims at multiple sites, choose an equal number of units to move into semi-finals from each site, plus a set of the next highest scoring units from across both sites. For example: for the SA semi-final of 48 from two sites, the top 12 scores from each site would automatically move into the semifinal. Then, the next 24 highest scores, regardless of site, would move into the semi-final.

*Submitted by William Chumley, Judge, Legacy HS (SO)*

**Rationale:** The current system moved an equal number of units from each preliminary site into the semi-final regardless of score. From the SA preliminary, 24 units from each site moved into the semi-final. (And, due to a three-way tie for the 24<sup>th</sup> spot at UD Arena, 26 teams advanced.)

There is a perceived inequity in the semi-final when units scoring lower from one site move into the semi-final while higher-scoring units from the other site do not. This year, several units from the Nutter Center site scored higher than units at UD Arena but did not move into the semi-final. This would have had less impact but for a tie at the 48<sup>th</sup> place for the semi-final which caused two additional units to make the semi-final.

To address the immediate concern about comparing scores across sites, I will make a few points. In general, the judges worked within number neighborhoods to choose the semi-finalists. These neighborhoods generally look like: definitely in (17-18+), bubble groups (16-17), most likely out (14-16). The magic of the rounds is that the system will sort out the groups while the individual judges work on their own rankings and ratings.

Most judges at the SA prelims sites worked with a 16 being a marker for a potential semi-finalist (the guard would score 80 or higher if all judges agreed). There was a demarcation at 80 at both preliminary sites. However, more units scored 80-82 at Nutter and yet did not move into the semi-final.

Granted, this is just another “spin” on the same issue – choosing who moves into the semi-final. However, I believe with common awareness in the judge and instructor community this is a more equitable and understandable system.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### **Proposal #13**

**SEEDING TIED SCORES – When seeding semi-finals, seed units with “tied” prelim scores back-to-back ONLY when the tied scores come from a single preliminary round.**

*Submitted by William Chumley, judge, Legacy HS (SO)*

**Rationale:** Determining the semi-finals schedules this year raised questions due to the tied scores from several preliminary rounds.

We must remember that the overarching goal of the prelims is to choose the units that move into the next round.

The preliminary process sorts the groups into neighborhoods of scores. There is no direct, rating comparison between units across rounds.

While two units from different rounds (or different sites [with a different judge panel]) might be awarded identical scores, there can be no direct comparison of those scores across rounds. The judges assign unit ratings within the paradigm of one round. These ratings can not be directly compared from round to round and should not be seeded back to back in the semi-final phase of competition.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### **Proposal #14**

**When a unit checks in at Championships, they draw a number that will determine tiebreaking for the rest of the weekend, similar to how BOA handles this situation. For example, for Scholastic A this past year, 102 numbered slips (numbered from 1 to 102) would have been placed in a “bucket” and each time an SA director checked in at Headquarters, he/she would draw a number from the “bucket.” If that director drew 57, and then tied with a unit that drew 24, the unit with the 57 would be seeded lower than the unit with a 24 for the next round of performances. This helps in seeding for semi finals and order of performance for finals events.**

*Submitted by Chris Putnam, Odessa HS*

**Rationale:** This eliminates the time and concern of finding directors after rounds to break ties and also eliminates the issue of coin flips for three-way ties. Since all directors have to check in at headquarters anyway, this is a fairly easy solution and leads to the fairest way to decide these matters quickly.

**Financial Impact:** \$0

### Proposal #15

**Assign Open Class guards to championships prelims rounds randomly without using previous ranking order.**

*Submitted by Robby Overvliet, The Pride of the Netherlands*

**Rationale:** Deciding prelims performance order based on scores from previous Regionals, or in case of international entries based (at times) on a video performance of a local show earlier that season, can put these units at a disadvantage. The level of performance (on these videotapes) can be significantly different from a championships prelims performance.

When guards are performing in seeded rounds, it could be not just about the performance of the day but also about seeding. The order of performances places the units in a certain neighborhood where it becomes very tough to move one (or more) neighborhoods up the ranks.

By having all guards perform in a random order the WGI Championships prelims evolve more around the pure contest dynamics of judges picking the right units for (semi)finals.

**Financial impact:** None.

### Proposal #16

**RANDOMIZE FINALS SEEDING WITHIN NEIGHBORHOODS - For final contests seeded from a semi-final, take the top 15 scores across all rounds in the semi-final as the finalists. Seed the finals in reverse order of score in groups of five (15-11, 10-6, 5-1) and randomize within each group of five.**

**ALTERNATIVE: Ignore slotting of round winners and retain the "reverse order" paradigm and seed the finals truly in reverse order of semi-final score.**

*Submitted by George Oliviero and William Chumley, judges, and William teaches at Legacy HS (SO).*

**Rationale:** The purpose of the semi-final is to choose the finalist guards. It is NOT intended as the means to sort out the units into proper score order. Therefore, it doesn't make sense to rely on the semi-final scores as proper, "reverse order" seeding for the finals.

The system for the semi-finals does effectively sort the guards into neighborhoods. A finals order based on neighborhoods makes the most sense.

This system alleviates any perceived advantage for round winners, and eliminates disadvantage to teams who may have scored higher than a round winner but finished second in their round.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### Proposal #17

For Scholastic A and Independent A semifinals, combine rounds 1 & 4 into a "super round" and rounds 2 & 3 into a "super round" while retaining the division classifications for awards. This would lead to two semi finals rounds of 24 (SA) or 16 (IA), with units still performing in groups of 4 randomly drawn (as it is now). For awards, the two divisions would still be split out and ranked according to their divisions assigned beforehand by the current seeding system. (See attached example)

*Submitted by Chris Putnam, Odessa HS*

**Rationale:** This allows for the two rounds to be judged "simultaneously" and will give the judges a more accurate comparison of competitive units. Presumably, the top 8 or 9 units in this "super round" will be the units competing for spots in Finals and should be compared more directly to each other. By keeping division designations (Knaub, Skylark, etc...), there is still the opportunity for recognition of units based on their division within the super round.

**Financial Impact:** \$0

**Current IA Semi Finals Seeding**

Zingali (1)	Brubaker (2)	Brazale (3)	Knaub (4)
36*	35*	34*	33*
29	30	31	32
28	27	26	25
21	22	23	24
20	19	18	17
13	14	15	16
12	11	10	9
5	6	7	8
4	3	2	1

\* indicates units included in case of ties  
(round number in parentheses)

**Proposed IA Semi Finals Seeding**

Zingali (1)	Knaub (4)	Brubaker (2)	Brazale (3)
36*	33*	35*	34*
29	32	30	31
28	25	27	26
21	24	22	23
20	17	19	18
13	16	14	15
12	9	11	10
5	8	6	7
4	1	3	2

\* indicates units included in case of ties  
(round number in parentheses)

**Current SA Semi Finals Seeding**

Quasar (1)	Phantom (2)	Imperial (3)	Skylark (4)
52*	51*	50*	49*
45	46	47	48
44	43	42	41
37	38	39	40
36	35	34	33
29	30	31	32
28	27	26	25
21	22	23	24
20	19	18	17
13	14	15	16
12	11	10	9
5	6	7	8
4	3	2	1

\* indicates units included in case of ties  
(round number in parentheses)

**Proposed SA Semi Finals Seeding**

Quasar (1)	Skylark (4)	Phantom (2)	Imperial (3)
52*	49*	51*	50*
45	48	46	47
44	41	43	42
37	40	38	39
36	33	35	34
29	32	30	31
28	25	27	26
21	24	22	23
20	17	19	18
13	16	14	15
12	9	11	10
5	8	6	7
4	1	3	2

\* indicates units included in case of ties  
(round number in parentheses)

## REGIONALS

### Proposal #18

**Move one-day regionals from a prelims/finals event to a finals only event.**

*Submitted by Greg Mar, Arcadia HS*

**Rationale:**

- One day events are very taxing on the performers, parent support, instructors, judges & staff.
- Easier/shorter days for most groups.
- Potential to have more audience seats filled for the event with single performances.
- Allows more units to enter into the show.
- Could allow the opportunity for critique with the judges.

**Financial Impact:** Potential increase in entry fees by allowing more units into a one-day contest. Potential savings in judges fees and hotel costs.

### Proposal #19

**At all WGI Power Regionals, have a double panel of judges.**

*Submitted by Becca Sullens, North by Northwest*

**Rationale:** This would ensure that any adjudication discrepancies that are extreme to the rest of the panel would be less severe. It would create a balance with the overall score using the double panel. With the fact that your score at the most recent regional you attend seeds you into the Championships, it only takes one judge to place you much lower than the rest of the panel. This automatically creates a space available for any color guard throughout the country to be seeded above you completely altering your draw for prelims at the World Championships. A double panel would help keep any of these instances more balanced with the rest of their fellow adjudicators.

**Financial Impact:** This could increase the expenses for travel, housing, and pay for the judges.

### Proposal #20

**Use a double judging panel for all 2010 WGI Power Regional "finals" competitions.**

*Submitted by Jeff Wroblewski, Warren Central HS*

**Rationale:** Accountability. Integrity. Consistency. This will hold adjudicators accountable and reinforce caption integrity and consistency of the WGI scoring system. At most of the 2009 WGI Power Regionals, a second panel was present and could have been utilized.

**Financial Impact:** TBD

## Proposal #21

**Allow the top three Regional A Class color guards to compete in a finals round at all WGI regionals that allow this classification.**

*Submitted by Becca Sullens, North by Northwest*

**Rationale:** There was not a huge participation of Regional A color guards at regionals this year after bringing back the class in the 2009 season. After discussing this matter with many of the regional A color guards in our own area, the consensus was the following. Why pay 200.00 for one performance that is no different than performing at our own circuit? In the Northwest Association for Performing Arts, Regional A units have a prelims and finals with cuts. Going to the WGI Regional had more negatives than positives for them to consider attending. There was no opportunity to perform in finals, it was more expensive, and they had to perform first. If there was a second round for even just the top three, it would have been considered. In our circuit alone, the regional A class is bigger than all scholastic classes combined. This could increase the number of units attending and bring a more positive light on WGI promoting education to the most important groups in the country, the youngest groups that need the most guidance that will provide this activity with the future world class performers.

**Financial Impact:** More units attending equals more money in fees collected, more tickets sold, and more concessions. There would be a cost on more sheets, cd's, and dvd's of the competition as well as other minimal fees for adjudicators, office supplies, and other necessities for added units. Their entry fees should be able to cover all of this.

## Proposal #22

**ESTABLISH REGIONAL ROUNDS -Establish rounds whenever the total number of entrants in any one class at any regional is more than 10 units. Ideally, rounds would have from 5 to 8 units per round, with no round having more than 8 competing units. Rounds would not have to have equal numbers of units, but the differences between rounds should be no more than two units. There is no need to add breaks between rounds, so there is no impact to the preliminary timeline.**

**Move units into finals based solely on score and not on round placement.**

*Submitted by George Oliviero and William Chumley, judges, and William teaches at Legacy HS (SO)*

**Rationale:** From a judging perspective, managing the rounds is less cumbersome and easier to ensure accurate neighborhoods with smaller rounds. The perfect size for a round is 8 or fewer units. The choice of a small number is neither arbitrary nor based solely on the consideration of judges. The purpose of the preliminary contest (or rounds) is to collect certain groups or neighborhoods of guards who are worthy to continue to the next level of contests, whether it is semi-finals or championship. The larger the number of competitors, the easier it is for the rating process especially to break down.

Additionally, we profess to be an educationally based organization, albeit through competition. It is our belief that it is not good education when large numbers of students fail. With the addition of more rounds, we can prevent such a scenario and still offer every student the chance to succeed at whatever level possible.

**Financial Impact:** None.

[Proposal #23](#)

**NAME POWER REGIONAL ROUNDS - Recognize honored persons in the activity who have passed by naming rounds at Power Regionals in the same manner as at Championship semi-finals.**

*Submitted by George Oliviero, Judge and Hall of Fame member*

**Rationale:** The naming of rounds introduces audience and fans to the stories of the people whose talent and effort have made WGI what it is today, and it reminds all participants of the value of understanding the history of the activity.

**Financial Impact:** None.

## ADJUDICATION

### Proposal #24

**CHANGE JUDGE AFFILIATION RESTRICTIONS – Allow a judge with a primary affiliation to judge in that affiliated class as long as the unit s/he is affiliated with is not competing at that contest.**

*Submitted by William Chumley, judge and teaches at Legacy HS (SO).*

**Rationale:** Judges with current experience are most able to recognize and reward the growing creativity in the units. If a judge's affiliation precludes his/her judging of an entire class, then those units lose out on the expertise of that judge.

The assignment of a judge should be made with a view to best fit and quality, regardless of affiliation. Acting out of fear of impropriety accuses a group of people of imaginary and uncommitted crimes. Rather than assuming problems will occur, trust that individual concerns, IF they arise, can be effectively addressed and resolved.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### Proposal #25

**Allow judges to keep sheets for either**

- 1. the first 3-5 guards within any certain classification,**
- 2. the entirety of each classification,**
- 3. or the entire show**

*Submitted by Teresa Moura, Oak Grove HS*

**Rationale:** For the first, second and third guards to perform within any class, how are they to be effectively "compared", evaluated, then fairly scored if there has been nothing to compare them to. Allow the judging community to have the opportunity to form an opinion of those first few guards then the ability to form a reference point in which to give an appropriate number.

Though there is no block scoring, scores throughout the country are considered as a guard is on their way to WGI. Scores should not necessarily be higher in one part of the country over the other on any given weekend.

This could allow judges to give a number that the first guard may honestly deserve without the fear of elevation or compression of numbers.

This would also eliminate the participant's, instructor's, and director's fear of going on 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, or 3<sup>rd</sup> in a large number of units.

Yes, this would make the tabulation process different and possibly more time consuming, yet we may find that there are a lot of folks that would be just fine with that as one of the only negatives.

**Financial Impact:** NONE

### [Proposal #26](#)

**EIGHT-UNIT ROUNDS:** Include no more than eight (8) units in rounds at regional and world championship competitions. Note: there is no need to add breaks between rounds, so there is no impact to the timeline.

**Move units into the next round of competition (semi-final, or final) based solely on score and not on placement within any round.**

*Submitted by George Oliviero and William Chumley, judges, and William teaches at Legacy HS (SO).*

**Rationale:** Judging smaller rounds makes numbers management less cumbersome and makes it easier to ensure accurate neighborhoods. Also, accurate rating is more easily achieved within a smaller, overall population within one round.

Additionally, this creates more round winners and allows for more units to place higher within their rounds.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### [Proposal #27](#)

**All movement judges must have a degree in dance or a substantial performance resume with credible performance credentials.**

*Submitted by Randy Nelson, Northeast Independent*

**Rationale:** For discussion purposes.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### [Proposal #28](#)

**For the analysis captions, trial a judging system using 20 points for Vocabulary/Composition with a single judge and 20 points for Excellence with a single judge. The IA and Ensemble Captions would still be worth 20 points each with the average of the two independent sub-captions.**

*Submitted by Randy Nelson, Northeast Independent*

**Rationale:** Provide a clearer, more defined application of the "What" and the "How."

**Financial Impact:** Minimal. Use judges already at a Regional or World Championships.

## CLASSIFICATION

### Proposal #29

The classification of all units shall be determined initially by the unit director. Further classification can be made during the contest season based on the performance of the students relative to the criteria and competitive neighborhoods as established by a consensus of the judging community and/or a review committee. This will effectively end the need for post season promotions.

*Submitted by Mara Rys, Fleming Island HS*

**Rationale:** Every year is different and it is nearly impossible to project the achievement of a unit in another class. With a failsafe of reclassification, we have removed the need to promote units based on past performances. It hardly seems fair that every unit director gets to assess and determine the goals and abilities of their unit with the exception of units promoted based on the previous year's results.

**Financial Impact:**

### Proposal #30

**Remove the requirement of promoting the top 15 Scholastic A units and the top 10 Independent A units each season.**

*Submitted by Chris Putnam, Odessa HS*

**Rationale:** Last year, this rule promoted the top 12% of SA groups and if we apply it again this year, we'll be promoting the top 15% of those units. As the class gets smaller, the percentage promoted will continue to increase and more units that are not Open class caliber units will be moved into a class where they will not see success. The same holds true for Independent A as well.

This past season, 16 SA units were promoted and only 2 made Open Finals. Only 3 additional units made Open semi finals. Less than 1/3 of the promoted units were able to advance to semi finals in a class where over 60% of the units advanced to semi finals. In fact, only 4 of the promoted units (10 were at Nationals) were even able to break 80 in prelims! Clearly these units were not prepared to move to Open class this season and in hindsight it was a mistake to push them to that class.

If the goal is to make Open class larger, then this approach also was not successful as we saw the smallest Open class in years this past season. Success in Open class requires more resources than many of these units may have to offer to their programs. We should return to the system where the review committee looks at each unit individually to determine their readiness for Open class.

**Financial Impact:** \$0

## POLICIES & PROCEDURES

### Proposal #31

#### **Eliminate Expense Reimbursements**

*Submitted by Daniel Wiles, Avon HS*

**Rationale:** It is time that we serve the needs of the entire community of WGI. We need this money to improve many other aspects of the organization. The least we could do is change the percentage.

**Financial Impact:** Helpful. The money spent on these ERC's could be put towards judge training, educational development, and instructor training. I do believe the groups receiving these ERC's (3 consecutive year board members) should be entitled to have flights and hotels to meetings, and all entry fees to WGI regional's and championships covered.

### Proposal: #32

**All World Class Units attending the WGI World Championships must appear on Fan Network a minimum of two weeks prior to the World Championships of the same year. World Class units who are unable to attend a WGI Regional would be required to submit a video no later than March 15 to the WGI Office to be posted on the Fan Network at least two weeks prior to World Championships.**

*Submitted by Michael Lentz, Onyx*

**Rationale:** This would create an equal opportunity for all World Class units competing in Championships to be viewed online prior to the event.

**Financial Impact:** None

### Proposal #33

**Waive timing penalties for WORLD CLASS units under required equipment time and under required performance time for the first two weeks of regional events each year.**

*Submitted by Michael Lentz, Onyx*

**Rationale:** Different parts of the country start color guard at various times. Band commitments may also run longer for units participating in holiday parades, trips etc. Eliminating penalties early season for under time (required performance time and required equipment time) may encourage more units to attend early regionals and allow programs to develop over the season rather than be forced to be prepared/done early in the season.

If judges are judging quality not quantity, this should not change contest dynamics but rather allow developing designs time to evolve without being rushed to completion or diminished in score due to being under time in early February.

**Financial Impact:** No negative impact. Could increase entries at early regionals.

### [Proposal #34](#)

**Reevaluate/restructure all boards and committees. Evaluate policy and practices for optimum results.**

Submitted by Mickey Kelly, Cheshire High School

**Rationale:** Budget constraints/red tape/philosophical differences and decisions made needs to be clarified and documented. Judges who serve our activity severely cut back to meet budget demands not necessarily in the members (guards) best interest nor the judges. OPEN DISCUSSION.

**Financial Impact:** A clear cohesive structure that allows the units to be more in control of their activity.

### [Proposal #35](#)

**Proposals brought before the CAB may not be tabled to the Steering Committee or the Executive Board.**

*Submitted by Randy Nelson, Northeast Independent*

**Rationale:** The CAB needs to be become more involved with the philosophical direction of the activity.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### [Proposal #36](#)

**Members of the Board of Directors may not serve on the Color Guard Steering Committee.**

*Submitted by Randy Nelson, Northeast Independent*

**Rationale:** Create more variety in the number of people serving the WGI organization. This is in no way a negative reflection on individuals that served in both capacities, merely a way to encourage more participation.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### [Proposal #37](#)

**Unit Member of the Steering Committee shall be elected by the CAB, after the election of the Board of Directors. This election will be held at the annual meeting of the CAB. Each member will serve one year terms. Members are limited to 4 consecutive terms. There is no limits on non-consecutive terms.**

*Submitted by Randy Nelson, Northeast Independent*

**Rationale:** Create more variety in personnel. Makes the CAB responsible for the election of unit representation to the Steering Committee.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### Proposal #39

The CAB Steering Committee (6) Instructor members shall be elected by the Color Guard Advisory Board. 3 members shall be for a term of 2 years and 3 members shall be a term of 1 year to begin the process.

*Submitted by Ed Devlin, Blessed Sacrament*

**Rationale:** The Color Guard Coordinator should not have to be responsible for appointments.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### Proposal: #38

**Re-Define the role of Chief Judge(s) and Judge selection/assignment as follows:**

- WGI hires judges on a yearly basis with direction of the Steering Committee based on past year(s).
- Judges are assigned to contests by the Steering Committee.
- World Championship assignments are created first.
- Working back from Championship panels for exposure creates regional assignments.
- One judge from each panel is selected to act as chief judge for each regional.
- Chief Judge for each regional is a working judge at that event.
- Chief judge role is clearly defined by the Steering Committee and limited to logistics.
- Chief Judge at each regional is paid a small additional fee.
- Chief Judge's role is limited to the specific regional only.
- Chief Judge has no assignment input.
- Judge selection and training is conducted by the steering committee Instructors pre-season.
- All judges would be reviewed post season by the Steering Committee for the following season.
- Process Repeats.

*Submitted by Michael Lentz, Onyx*

**Rationale:** Often the best judges are not being utilized or up and coming judges are not offered new opportunities. While this proposal may not be the exact answer it opens the door for discussion regarding the impact of the chief judge in a judging situation. Currently, judges decisions are being questioned pre-event and being caused to mentally question themselves. Judges are hired to perform a task and more trust should be given to these professionals to do their job. If we do not trust a specific judge to judge, this would be something to consider during the hiring process.

WGI is one of the only activities with such a layered judging bureaucracy. It seems more time and funding could be invested in training/learning/sharing opportunities for judges and less money on having a single individual judge all five captions from his/her seat in the arena.

While WGI has experimented with various solutions to the Judging/scoring concerns we all share, it may be time to consider the simplest answer to the question.

**Financial Impact:** Considerable. Chief Judge salaries and travel would be eliminated.

**Proposal: #40**

**The Color Guard Advisory Board at the annual Color Guard Advisory Board Meeting shall formally review Chief Judge(s) yearly.**

*Submitted by Michael Lentz, Onyx*

**Rationale:** The Advisory Board should have the yearly opportunity to review those in the Chief Judge Position(s) yearly in executive session and make immediate recommendations to the Color Guard Coordinator and Steering Committee.

**Financial Impact:** None

**Proposal #41**

**All Chief Judges for WGI shall be approved by the CAB. Each Chief Judge will be approved individually.**

*Submitted by Randy Nelson, Northeast Independent*

**Rationale:** Makes the CAB more responsible for the direction of the adjudication process.

**Financial Impact:** None.

**Proposal #42**

**I propose that Contest Administrators be required to monitor interpretation and assessment of any penalties over .5 up to and including disqualification. (Friendly amendments with regard to the point allocation are welcome)**

*Submitted by Mara Rys, Fleming Island High School*

**Rationale:** From event to event there is different interpretation and application of the intent and letter of the rules as evidenced by looking at the recaps from WGI events. Rules were meant to level the playing field, the interpretation should be consistent. Since the Contest Administrators are outside the influence of the judging arena, cross geographic boundaries, are more free in the contest environment to get immediate interpretation from the Color Guard Administrator, and have a great depth of experience with the rules, they are a natural choice for the job.

**Financial Impact:**

## RULES

### Proposal:

**It is my strong opinion that college teams not be allowed to compete in Class A. Their members are all much older and more mature than the Class A teams in general. I feel that college teams should be restricted to Open or World Class.**

**Should Class A be divided into small team (15 members) and large team (16 members and up to max)? It seems that as I watch dance competitions and cheering that they see the reality. Pulling the competition into divisions would certainly produce some excitement at the performer's level, giving a more equal ladder to the success of their programs.**

**I know that a proposal to limit A to 2-3 eighteen year old members. That would be an unfair balancing act. In my State we are the only competing winter program. So, for us, losing our kids at eighteen may make it impossible in situations like this to even put out a team.**

*Submitted by Gloria Johnston, Maine Attraction*

**Rationale:** A Class is too big to start with and the addition of College teams is really unfair to this Class. In other performance art venues & competitions it is highly likely to see a small group and a large group, therefore leveling the playing field for all.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### Proposal:

**I propose that the term "dangerous materials" as written in Section 4.8.1 on page 77 of the 2009 Adjudication Manual and Rules be further defined to avoid confusion and misinterpretation resulting in possible injury to performers or spectators.**

*Submitted by Mara Rys, Fleming Island HS*

**Rationale:** The current definition is open to interpretation by Instructors, Directors, and Timing and Penalty judges. This open interpretation coupled with no fail safe to mitigate or define the intent of the rule could leave some units open to disqualification and others exempt. I offer three possibilities that could easily be included as a footnote:

*Dangerous materials include materials that are radioactive, flammable, explosive or corrosive, oxidizers or asphyxiants, biohazardous, toxic, pathogen or allergen substances and organisms, but also physical conditions as compressed gases and liquids or hot material, including all goods containing such materials or chemicals, or may have other characteristics that render it hazardous in specific circumstances.*

*A useable item or material that because of its physical and/or chemical nature contains any of the characteristics that are 'hazardous', such as: ignitable, corrosive, reactive, toxic.*

*Chemical substances (solid, gas, or liquid) that are toxic to humans; unprotected exposure to these chemicals may result in severe illness or death; they may be poisonous, flammable, explosive, carcinogenic, or environmentally pollutant.*

**Financial Impact:** None.