

Winds Advisory Board Meeting  
May 18-19, 2018  
Las Vegas, Nevada  
PROPOSALS FOR CONSIDERATION



## WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS

### Proposal #1

Each class of WGI-Winds Prelims, Semis (if and when instigated), and Finals shall utilize a different set of adjudicators per round. (I.E. A class sees panels 1 and 2 in prelims, sees panels 3 and 4 in finals. This does not mean that A and Open can't see the same panels, just that no class sees the same panels twice.)

*Submitted by Wesley Pendergrass, Lake Hamilton Winds (and others)*

**Rationale:** A contingent of winds ensembles:

- Perform in circuits without true winds adjudication panels
- Do not participate in circuits
- Do not attend a regional
- Do not attend a regional adjudicated by WGI-Winds adjudicators (small regionals utilize percussion judges)

This means that in some circumstances WGI-Winds ensembles only receive one "read" a season by WGI-Winds recognized adjudicators. Judging rotation between rounds can increase the number of educated adjudicated "reads" by 2 fold for some ensembles. This also falls more directly in line with the educate/nurture first mentality of WGI, particularly in A class and Open class. Multiple reads increase the potential of the activity more rapidly and allow educators to make a larger impact on their students more rapidly.

**Financial Impact:** None. The multiplicity of panels already exists. They are just currently tied to specific classes for the entirety of the prelims/finals format.

### Proposal #2

**The Chief Judge should work to expand the judge pool for WGI Championships.**

*Submitted by Chris Wing, Greenfield Central HS*

**Rationale:** In the history of the WGI Winds activity, we have had 4 Championship events. This opens the possibility for 8 total judge seats in each caption. We have had 4 different OE Judges, 4 different MA Judges, and 5 different VA Judges. 3 of our judges of have judged 3 of the 4 years of the division's existence.

This is in no way a slight against any of these judges. They are ALL outstanding judges and we learn from them every year. That said, for the growth of the activity, I think it is important for us to have as many eyes and ears on our groups at the culminating event as possible. The more people who see this event live and offer critique and analysis, the more our designers, instructors, and students can grow.

**Financial Impact:** None. We're bringing judges in already, we'd just be bringing different judges in.

## ADJUDICATION

### Proposal #3

**Eliminate "Box 6" from the scoring rubric**

*Submitted by Andrew Markworth, Rhythm X*

**Rationale:** Box 6 was originated in the WGI Percussion activity and was removed from their scoring system this past year. Originally, the term “sets new standards” was part of the Box 5 description. As a result, judges rarely felt that they could give a group a box 5 number so the top numbers in each class would end up in the low 90s. Box 6 was created to allow more groups into Box 5 while reserving the very top numbers (98-100) for those groups who truly set new standards.

As the activity has evolved, more and more groups score in Box 5 on finals night which causes some issues in the system since Box 5 is the smallest range of numbers (other than Box 6). This will become more of an issue as the Winds activity grows and develops and we start seeing more quality groups.

Here are some points of consideration that lead the Percussion Advisory Board to eliminate Box 6 last year:

1. For world class, “setting new standards” is a very subjective term. In terms of performer achievement, I believe it is near impossible to set a new standard. As for design, deciding a new standard for the activity is a subjective opinion that is shaped by that person’s prior experiences.
2. For A and Open class, “Maximization of Class Expectation” is usually obvious by the numbers themselves and doesn’t need a separate delineation. I would argue that the top groups in A or Open are often exceeding the class expectation in their final performances.
3. If Box 5 is only 90-97, then it becomes nearly impossible to follow the spread guidelines at the end of the season. The numbers get so compact that the ordinals become more of a focus than the scores. The half-tenth system allows for the avoidance of ties, but when you look at the terms “very comparable”, “minor differences”, and “definitive differences”, it becomes very difficult for the judges to follow the system. As a result, the judges either push groups into up to Box 6 or down to Box 4, even when that group may not perfectly fit that criteria. Again, this isn't a major issue in the Winds activity yet, but will become more of an issue as the activity grows.
4. Designers and instructors don’t need a special box to motivate them to do great work. We already have medals, scores, and the audience to give validation to a great product and process.

**Financial Impact:** None

## RULES

### Proposal #4

**Eligibility:** Winds ensembles from the United States competing in the independent classes and composed of members not over 22 years of age as of 12:01 a.m. on April 1st of any given year shall be permitted to compete in contests governed by WGI. Each ensemble appearing at a WGI contest shall be prepared to show proof of age. International independent winds ensembles are not bound by any age limit.

*Submitted by Stephen Mason, Rhythm X*

**Rationale:** To keep the winds division in line with the other (most) divisions. I believe keeping the age limited to performers who are under 22 keeps with WGI's stated purpose, "WGI Sport of the Arts provides a venue for young people to achieve the extraordinary through performance and competition".

Financial Impact: None.

#### Proposal #5

##### **Rules Clarification**

**1.3 Winds groups must have a minimum of ten (10) members on the floor of competition at any time including an optional member conductor. [deleted "student," added "member"]**

**1.4 Winds groups may use an optional member conductor ... [deleted "student," added "member"]**

**8.4 During a performance, adult or non-performing student personnel (other than the designated conductor) may not coach, cue... [added "(other than the designated conductor)"]**

*Submitted by Wayne Markworth, Winds Administration*

**Rationale:** Consistency of wording is needed for references to the use of a conductor.

Financial Impact: None

#### Proposal #6

**Rule 4.1 For the protection of the facilities, especially wooden competition floors and easements, all equipment must be properly prepared to assure that damage to the facilities will not occur. All equipment will be subject to inspection. Any damage to the facility that may occur (dragging the timpani, wheels on carts locking, improperly prepared equipment, etc.) will be the responsibility of the ensemble.**

**Penalty: One-tenth of a point (0.1) penalty per point of contact for each piece of equipment.**

*Submitted by Wayne Markworth, Winds Administration*

**Rationale:** This change was adopted by the Percussion Division for 2018. It is important for the Timing and Penalties judges that rules and penalties are the same whenever appropriate.

Rule 4.1 is inconsistent with current practice and terminology and is in need of an update. This would remove the outdated references to "taping" and the unnecessary penalty range of 0.1 to DQ.

Financial Impact: None

#### Proposal #7

##### **Rule 4.2.2 Addition**

**"...A performer in the competition are must control all lighting and robotic devices." [added "and robotic devices"]**

*Submitted by Wayne Markworth, Winds Administraton*

**Rationale:** This change was adopted by the Percussion Division for 2018. It is important for the Timing and Penalties judges that rules and penalties are the same whenever appropriate.

Clarification is needed as the use of robotics is a possibility.

**Financial Impact:** None

### [Proposal #8](#)

#### **Rule 4.3**

#### **Rules 4.3.1 - 4.3.9**

#### **Amend the penalty for use of prohibited items**

**PENALTY: Ten-point (10.0) penalty or Disqualification for use of any prohibited equipment**

*Submitted by Wayne Markworth, Winds Administration*

**Rationale:** This change was adopted by the Percussion Division for 2018. It is important for the Timing and Penalties judges that rules and penalties are the same whenever appropriate.

Currently, violation of any of the prohibited item stipulations (rules 4.3.1 - 4.3.9) carry a discretionary penalty of 10 points up to disqualification. The range of penalties is unnecessary. Changing the penalty to two, flat options (10 points for 99% of all violations, and a Disqualification as a failsafe for extremely dangerous or flagrant violations) would help streamline the process and make it more consistent.

**Financial Impact:** None

### [Proposal #9](#)

#### **Rules addition:**

**Under 4.3 The following are NOT ALLOWED in the Competition Area:**

**4.3.7 Use of glass objects that may break and/or leave shards of glass in the competition area.**

**Renumber:**

**4.3.8 Drones or any remote-controlled airborne devices. [was 4.3.7]**

**4.3.9 Hover boards. [was 4.3.8]**

*Submitted by Wayne Markworth, Winds Administration*

**Rationale:** This rule was inadvertently left out of the Winds Rules and added through a memo emailed dated 2/21/2018 to all groups, circuits and T & P judges. The rule is due to safety considerations.

The renumbering is for consistency with the Percussion Rules for Timing and Penalties judges.

**Financial Impact:** None

### [Proposal #10](#)

#### **Rule clarification**

**Rule 6.8 Once the performance begins, all performers must remain in the designated competition area for the entire performance. [added the word "all"]**

*Submitted by Wayne Markworth, Winds Administration*

**Rationale:** This change was adopted by the Percussion Division for 2018. It is important for the Timing and Penalties judges that rules and penalties are the same whenever appropriate.

The current wording of rule 6.8 could be interpreted two different ways. The addition of the word “all” clears up any possible confusion.

**Financial Impact:** None