

**Color Guard Advisory Board
June 6-7, 2025
Las Vegas, Nevada
Proposals for Consideration**



WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS

Proposal #1

I'm suggesting a proposal to have IRA/SRA perform in WGI Finals, but they only would be qualified through Power Regionals scores or at least 2 local regional scores.

Submitted by Lawrence Ball, Providence Catholic HS (SRA)

Rationale: Many directors understand that WGI is trying to find new methods to get funding for the circuit and IRA/SRA is an untapped area that could bring more funding to the program, and also develop growth for other schools wanting to develop a competitive team(s). However, knowing that the timing and logistics for WGI Finals Championships makes it difficult to have more units to have prelims/semis/and finals, IRA/SRA could qualify for a finals appearance through either participating in 2 Local Regionals (Ex: A unit would compete at the Indianapolis Regional and Chicago Regional. Also, if they were at least a finalist in one of the 2 regionals and the better of the 2 scores with seeding points would be accepted) or 1 Power Regional (only if they were finalists). If approved, IRA/SRA class could perform either at the Nutter Center for their finals at the same night as IA/SA class, or in the morning at the Dayton Arena just before IA/SA performs in the evening. At worst, we could ask to have their latest WGI recorded performance being shown at Finals during an intermission between units and/or class change at a finals show.

Financial Impact: Only price increase would be the judges, awards, and space to rent for competitions due to a possible increase of participants. However, the increase of funds from more competing units should offset these costs and possibly bring in a positive revenue in the long run. There were 216 SRA units that competed in a regional in 2025. With a registration fee of \$345 per unit, then WGI made \$74,520 from their registration through prelims. If SRA knows that they have a chance to perform at WGI Championships Finals, then those numbers could increase to 300+. If the unit(s) makes it to WGI Championships, then they can pay for their participation fee by the following weekend if they wish to participate in Dayton. If not, then the next seeded unit could be given the option to perform.

Proposal #2

Improve equity and accuracy by replacing the existing seeding process for WGI World Championship Prelims with a totally random draw

Submitted by Michelle Koski, Irondale HS (SA)

Rationale: The current prelims seeding process is a remnant of the days before Competition Suite - when judges had to commit a ranking and rating to paper with the first group on in the first round. At the time, this seeding process was meant as a way to create competitive balance between multiple rounds and competition sites. But now that judges are allowed to "hold their numbers" for an entire round, the seeding process has become more of a crutch and is doing more harm than good.

Using this year's SA Finalists as a data set, we can see that...

1) When comparing a unit's seeding score for prelims with their actual final placement in finals, there was an average difference of 10.8 spots between the seeding "rank" and their final placement. This is significant, especially when we look at how many units were in the tight "bubble" to advance from semi-finals to finals.

2) None of the SA Finalists received their seeding score in weeks 1-3 of the competitive season. Only one finalist received their seeding score during week five, and 95% of SA finalists received their seeding score in weeks 5-7. So if your only option was to attend an early-season regional, when shows are often incomplete, when judges are still adjusting to competitive dynamics, paradigms, and expectations for the season - those units are at a disadvantage.

3) All of this year's SA finalists performed in the second half of their prelims round. Using a round of ten units as an example, units seeded 10th-6th are randomized and perform first, and then the units seeded 5th-1st are randomized and perform in the second half of their round. So in theory, you could have the 1st seeded unit competing right after the 10th seeded unit in a round. Or you could have the 5th seeded unit competing right after the 6th seeded unit.

Although judges are told to ignore seeding and performance order, there is still a subconscious perception that "better units perform later in the round." Combining this with the seeding scores being off by an average of 10.8 spots, we should expect to see SOME units from the first half of their round advancing to finals.

Additionally, please see Karl's notes on Seeding/Ranking at <https://www.wgi.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/2025-Dayton-Judge-Meeting-Notes.pdf> and it is clear that a top-to-bottom, totally random draw for prelims performance order would create the most equitable competitive environment for all units.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #3

Establish a formal rule outlining how the number of rounds for preliminaries and semifinals is determined. Proposed guideline:

Classes will be divided into rounds based on the number of groups registered for World Championships, with one round added for every 10 entries. For example:

- Up to 24 groups = 2 rounds
- Up to 34 groups = 3 rounds
- Up to 44 groups = 4 rounds
- Up to 54 groups = 5 rounds
- Up to 64 groups = 6 rounds, etc.

For classes with multiple preliminary sites occurring simultaneously, the number of rounds will be rounded up to the next even number to ensure competitive equity.

Submitted by Eric Babula, Norwin HS (SW)

Rationale: This rule provides clear, consistent, and transparent guidelines for scheduling across all classes, allowing ensembles to better understand competition structure. Additionally, this roughly maintains round sizes within the 8-12 group range for all classes.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #4

From World Championships Semi-Finals Section:

In instances where preliminary contests are held at multiple sites and judged by different panels, Semi-finals will be a double panel of judges consisting of both panels from each preliminary site.

Remove "consisting of both panels from each preliminary site."

Submitted by Doug Wash, Larry A Ryle HS (SA)

Rationale: This was not followed in 2025 for the SA class and should be removed from the Rulebook if it is not going to be followed.

Financial Impact: none

Proposal #5

Amend the wording of Rule 8.2.4, bullet point 3, to state:

"If preliminary contests are held at multiple sites and judged by different panels, semifinals will utilize a double panel of judges."

Submitted by Eric Babula, Norwin HS (SW)

Rationale: The current rule states: "Semifinals will be a double panel of judges consisting of both panels from each preliminary site." However, this procedure has not been applied consistently over the past four World Championships (2022–2025), particularly in Scholastic A. The revised wording more accurately reflects actual practice and clarifies expectations for both participants and adjudicators.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #6

From World Championships Semi-Finals Section:

After preliminaries are completed, A Class Semi-finalists will be seeded using the same method as the preliminary rounds. Color guards will be ranked based on their preliminary score and placed in rounds with the highest scoring semi-finalist in the last round. Once all color guards are placed in rounds, they will be drawn randomly in two groups to determine the performance order

Update to: After preliminaries are completed, A Class Semi-finalists will be seeded using the same method as the preliminary rounds. Color guards will be ranked based on their preliminary score and placed in rounds with the highest scoring semi-finalist in the last round. Once all color guards are placed in rounds, they will be drawn randomly in two groups to determine the performance order. Should multiple sites, and different panels have been used for preliminaries, the top half, bottom half method within a round, will not be used and performance order will be a random draw in the round.

Submitted by Doug Wash, Larry A Ryle HS (SA)

Rationale: This removes the top half and bottom half seeding aspect for A class semifinals. When 2 sites are used and the scoring is different between the 2 sites, this places an undue burden on the lower scoring site, even when scoring neighborhoods are used. For example, in the SA class only 42%, or 12, of the top 28 came from Truist in 2025. In addition, the “show of the day” should be judged by the semifinals panel. Removing top half/bottom half seeding will allow the panel entrusted with determining finalist, to accurately adjudicate the semifinals performance without a preconceived notion of placement due to seeding.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #7

Adopt a rounds-based format for all semifinal scheduling at World Championships. This would remove the current language in Rule 8.2.4, bullet 6, which states:

"Open and World Classes Semi-finalists will perform in reverse order of Preliminary score with the highest score performing last. Should any Open or World Class Semi-finals have more than twenty-four (24) color guards, they will be seeded in the same manner as their preliminary rounds using their preliminary score and placed in rounds with the highest scoring Semi-finalist in the last round."

Under the new approach, all semifinals would utilize tournament-style rounds based on preliminary score seeding, consistent with preliminary round procedures.

Submitted by Eric Babula, Norwin HS (SW)

Rationale: A rounds-based semifinal format fosters increased competition and offers more ensembles meaningful opportunities to advance to finals. The current reverse-order performance method has historically benefitted only a small number of groups. Adopting rounds enhances competitive balance and fairness across the field.

Financial Impact: None currently. Potential financial implications could arise if growth in the Open and World classes leads to an increased number of semifinalists, which may require additional performance time or space.

Proposal #8

WGI Championships Venue Rain Plan

Submitted by Christy Hobby, Tampa Independent (IW)

Rationale: This will require there to be a rain plan for performers and prop storage at all WGI Championships performance venues. The rain plan would include a “load in” time for props/floor and provide a designated space for performing groups. If the groups props/floor exceed the amount of space given by WGI, they would have to stick to the current method of prop/floor loading. WGI could decide the night before each performance if the rain plan was being utilized or not. Having a rain plan would ease some safety concerns involving weather and allow for a less stressful experience.

Financial Impact: Unknown. I am not sure how much space is rented at each venue (for example the gymnasium at the Nutter Center).

Proposal #9

Provide coverings for prop storage at UD Arena. Units may use this space up to one hour prior to their performance time.

Submitted by Brian Franco-Winn, Etude (IW)

Rationale: In the event of rain, there is very little space for units to store props while at UD Arena. While tarps help, they do not eliminate the risk of wet floors and props. This poses a safety issue and makes the pre-show process chaotic for performers and staff.

Financial Impact: Costs associated with renting extra tents.

ADJUDICATION

Proposal #10

Limit rounds to 8-10 groups.

Submitted by Melissa Nielsen, Lakeville HS (SA)

Rationale: Limiting the rounds to 8-10 groups adds a deeper level of integrity to the judging process. It is taxing for anyone to watch 12 groups in a row without a break, and particularly taxing for judges who are tasked with assigning scores. By allowing for smaller rounds, judges are more likely to avoid scorecapping, and fatigue in the judging process thereby allowing for a more accurate read on the shows. This provides more fidelity in the scoring process and will benefit units who may have been at a disadvantage because of their performance slot in a large round. It benefits the judges by giving them an opportunity to refresh more often. Any judge will tell you that there is a noticeable difference between a round of 8 and a round of 12 in any large contest.

Financial Impact: This should have minimal financial impact. Round breaks could be shortened slightly, but because WGI rents the facility for the day, it shouldn't have much impact.

Proposal #11

Improve integrity and competitive accuracy of the judging process and improve member safety by adding a fourth round of competition to any division with over 60 units.

Submitted by Rebekah Salas, River City Rhythm Winter Guard (IA)

Rationale: As the A class has consistently provided the greatest number of units into the WGI arena of competition, it should then be considered that the greatest number of WGI resources should be allocated toward this group of units to provide the most accurate, equitable, and safe competitive environment for these units.

Safety being the most poignant of concerns, WGI is expecting these units (often our youngest) to travel the farthest between rounds and compete twice in one day. The extreme physical aspect of our activity combined with the taxation of the competitive arena this week causes undo hardship on our unit's members as well as excessive exposure to unfortunate safety risks such as rushing from one part of the state to

another at the last minute to make the next round of performances. Friday is becoming a long, exhausting, and ultimately unsafe environment for everyone involved.

In order to reduce the temptation of merely sorting and increase the accuracy and integrity of the adjudicators, this fourth read will truly allow the rating and ranking to work in the A class idiom as designed. 2025 was a true example of the impact of sorting where a myriad of units landed within tenths and therefore the magnitude of “bubble” teams truly didn’t end in an equitably rated and ranked situation when you look at the semi-finals results.

Financial Impact: TBD - Potentially significant. Given the current time, space, and logistical constraints surrounding Championships, a fourth day of competition may need to be added?

Proposal #12

I propose that the WGI Color Guard Advisory Board recommend that use of the 60/140 (RA) and 70/130 (A) factoring in computing scores of the Individual Analysis captions be eliminated.

Submitted by Vicki Mogil, Steperette Cadets Color Guard (IRA)

Rationale: RATIONALE: As an essential premise, I assume that all concerned parties agree on priorities for introducing early learners to the sport of color guard. These include creating a passion in them for the sport and assuring that they are able to pursue their passion with fundamentals in place that will allow them to succeed at subsequent levels.

It is in teaching methodology and program emphasis that I feel the IA factor does not serve early color guard learners. I believe that the factor discourages guard instructors from allowing early learners to exercise the curiosity about color guard that brought them to our sport instead of another for the two reasons delineated below. Additionally, I believe that the opportunity to score the “what” and “how” in each caption sends a clear message to instructors that discourages them from overwriting without exercising an additional factor in the IA captions.

1.) The use of the factor does not promote maximum student learning because it discourages instructors from teaching equipment and movement skills that initially are just out of reach for their learners. Eventual mastery of such skills is more satisfying to learners than learning material that is within their grasp initially, and it promotes their maximal growth. Equipment skills are the “charm” that brings learners to guard and keeps them there. Anything that discourages their development is not in the students’ or the activity’s best interest.

2.) The factor competitively rewards only early perfection in whichever guard members are participating in performance. This has been observed to limit the number of students who perform more difficult segments of shows, thus eliminating opportunities for growth of those earlier in the learning process because of the scoring ramifications.

Some have said that students’ needs are met if they are trained in basics of dance and on various pieces of equipment in rehearsal. However, if they do not have the experience of performing in front of others because they have not yet demonstrated full mastery, which is what factor rewards, they will not gain maximally.

Moving beyond the IA captions, I feel the emphasis on achievement engendered by the IA factor bleeds over into the DA and GE captions. When one examines the overall philosophy espoused in the upstairs captions, then looks at the description of expectations for RA particularly and finally examines scoresheets in all of

the captions, there are mismatches. Some judges lean heavily on the stated class descriptions and feel they cannot credit largely-successful efforts that go beyond the them even though the criteria on the sheets include components that are a part of the caption philosophy. Others think first about the caption philosophy and score with that in mind. Differing perspectives yield different commentary. Do those different perspectives yield different results?

My desired outcomes:

- 1.) Elimination of the IA factor in the RA and A classes.
- 2.) Education of RA and A teaching staff in the components of more advanced skills and assisting them in recognizing and teaching the steps that develop early participants' mastery. Early guard learners want to learn the flashier tricks they see others do in both equipment and movement. Instructors need to be aware of and to teach the components that will help them do that even as learners experiment with IA caption skills.

A criticism of staff just coming out of the competitive ranks who often are those who teach at the RA and A levels is that they try to teach everything they personally know no matter what the developmental stage of their learners is. I have heard the factor promoted as a way to try to "score" that tendency out of them. Rather than depend on the factor, I believe it would not only be more effective, but that it also is the obligation of the activity to help young instructors to reflect on the components that entered into the material they personally have mastered so they convey them properly to their students.

I will be in attendance in Las Vegas for the Friday meetings and for much of the day on Saturday, but please be aware that I am willing to serve any group that examines teaching color guard early learners. I can be reached best by e-mail at vpmogil@gmail.com. Thank you for considering my thoughts and this proposal.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #13

Utilize a 130/70 scoring system for equipment and movement analysis in the independent world class.

Submitted by Tim Mikan, Fantasia (IW)

Rationale: There is a relatively safe assumption of training that exists in the independent world class. With the rule book outlining, "...we assume that choices are drawn from all possibilities, as this class strives to set new standards," it appears fitting that we place a higher importance on design and innovation.

Referring to the premise of training in the A classes - It also seems appropriate that we consider the inverse and emphasize the expanded choreographic and design choices for the independent world class. As we utilize performers with extraordinary skills, I'm not sure there's been a time when recognition of derived achievement has been more important. This certainly can't be done without some level of excellence, and that should continue to be rewarded, but we should promote these teams to lead the way for creation and possibility and encourage them to examine the unexplored.

This is assuredly applicable upstairs and I'm open to placing a similar focus on general effect and design analysis as well.

Financial Impact: Unknown

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Proposal #14

Increase diversity of thought, experience, viewpoint, and opinion by opening membership to BoD and Steering Committees to anyone who is interested

Submitted by Melissa Nielsen, Lakeville HS (SA)

Rationale: “The best ideas often come from the most unexpected places”

Current policy restricts participation on the BoD and Steering Committees to individuals affiliated with a unit who participate in WGI events. But there are many talented, creative people who may be education coordinators in local circuits, judges, former instructors or designers, etc. Removing this current limiting membership eligibility requirement allows for more people to be involved. WGI should not restrict opportunities for participation, at any level, whenever possible.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #15

Commencing from the 2025 elections, all elected positions within the Color Guard Steering Committee will be subject to term limits. This change is designed to invigorate our leadership structure, fostering a continuous influx of fresh ideas and perspectives. Under the new policy, individuals can serve up to three consecutive terms for these positions. After three consecutive terms, individuals may be elected again after taking a one-term absence.

Submitted by Randy Nelson, Pegasus A (IA)

Rationale: The vitality of any organization hinges on the infusion of new leadership over time. This not only sustains growth but also introduces fresh perspectives. While we deeply value the service of those who have previously or are currently serving, it's a stark reality that in the past ten years, only twelve individuals have served on this committee out of a possible 50 elected terms. If we extend our view to the past 20 years, the number of committee instructors totals only 30 individuals. This reinforces the importance of expanding leadership roles to include more diverse perspective and emerging leaders.

Having served on this committee, I have found consistency to be a valuable aspect of how the committee functions. However, with an organization as large and inclusive as ours, it's crucial that we encourage the next generation of instructors to serve on this committee. Their fresh perspectives and innovative ideas will be invaluable in shaping the future of WGI.

Financial Impact: No additional impact

Proposal #16

Provide wristbands for all members of a participating unit regardless of whether or not they perform at that particular show. Amount of wristbands provided should match the unit's season roster rather than number of members performing that day.

Submitted by Brian Franco-Winn, Etude (IW)

Rationale: Currently, the amount of wristbands must match the number of performers on the floor at each show. This doesn't account for alternate/swing members in a unit or any performers who may be injured at any particular show. If a unit has any alternates or injured members, they often have to use staff/volunteer wristbands to cover their entrance into a show, forcing the unit or individual to purchase a spectator ticket to enter the show to support the unit.

Financial Impact: Exact financial impact is unknown, however only minimal impact is estimated.

RULES

Proposal #17

1.0 ELIGIBILITY 1.1 Color guards in the Independent A Classes from the United States composed of participants not over 22 years of age as of 12:01 a.m. on April 1, 2026, shall be permitted to compete in contests governed by WGI. Independent Open Class color guards from the United States may utilize participants not over 25 years of age as of 12:01 a.m. on April 1, 2026. Independent World Class Color guards may compete with participants of any age. Each color guard appearing in a WGI contest shall be prepared to show proof of age. International independent color guards are not bound by any age limit except for U.S. citizens performing with that group. U.S. citizens performing with an international group may not exceed the age allowed for that classification.

Submitted by Stacy Roose, Elevate (IN) (IW)

Rationale: The one year age difference from A to Open may not be enough time for members in Open class to receive the training and experience to prepare them for World Class. This gives them more time to build their training without moving up a class before they are ready to do so.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #18

Change the Independent open class age limit to 24 or 25 in states that do not have any active world class programs.

Submitted by Shannon Spaulding, Baldwinsville HS (SA)

Rationale: (1) In states where there are no Independent World guards, performers are faced with having to end their performing career at age 23 or relocate their lives entirely to perform.
(2) International groups competing in Independent Open are not bound by age due to limited opportunities. The same could be said for states with no Independent World groups. This age change would be more consistent with the reasoning for eliminating the age limit for international groups.
(3) This can only serve to strengthen Independent Open class programs with more seasoned performers, preparing them for the transition to Independent World.

Financial Impact: No negative financial impact. It has the opportunity for positive financial impact when increasing numbers on open class rosters. This means more performers and spectators supporting WGI sanctioned shows and world championships.

Proposal #19

Expansion of WGI Competitive Opportunities to Include Senior (All-Age) Color Guards

Summary:

This proposal recommends the formal inclusion of Senior (All-Age) Color Guard teams in select WGI Regional Events as a new Senior Class under the Independent Division. These groups would compete using Independent A Class sheets to ensure age- and ability-appropriate adjudication.

Additionally, the proposal introduces a lottery-based exhibition system to allow up to 5 Senior units each season to perform at WGI World Championships—as time and space allow. These performances would be non-competitive and follow all standard WGI safety and appearance policies.

Submitted by Robyn Kotte, The ProcesS Senior Independent (IW)

Rationale: Inclusivity & Growth:

This proposal expands WGI's reach by creating a place for adult performers who do not fall into the existing scholastic or traditional independent categories. It supports WGI's mission by promoting access to performance and education for all age groups.

Sustainability & Access:

While Independent World is technically open age, it requires a level of physical, financial, and time commitment that many adult performers cannot sustain. Senior guards typically consist of adults with full-time jobs, families, and physical limitations. This class provides a developmentally appropriate alternative, preserving access and passion for the activity.

Equity in Competition:

Senior units would be adjudicated on Independent A Class sheets, which reflect performance standards that are developmentally appropriate for groups with varying ability levels, rehearsal time, and physical demands. This ensures fair evaluation while supporting creative, expressive, and sustainable programming tailored to the unique strengths of all-age ensembles.

Pilot Structure:

The proposal recommends launching the Senior Class in 2026 at select local WGI Regionals where there is demonstrated interest and participation. Exhibition slots at WGI World Championships would be awarded through a lottery system, open to Senior units that have competed in at least one WGI Regional during the same season.

Conclusion

Let's recognize that excellence in performance is not limited by age. By welcoming Senior Class performers into the WGI structure, we not only honor the legacy of those who shaped this activity but also create new opportunities for growth, connection, and sustainability. This is our chance to expand the definition of who belongs on the floor—and why it matters.

Financial Impact: Increased Participation Revenue:

Senior units offer new entries at select WGI Regionals—bringing in additional registration fees when space permits—without displacing existing scholastic or independent teams. Inclusion would be determined by event capacity and interest at the regional level.

Minimal Infrastructure Costs:

The Senior Class uses current A Class sheets and judging panels, requiring no changes to existing scoring systems or staffing.

Preservation of Independent World Capacity:

Senior Class will be judged separately and does not affect the scheduling or participation of Independent World units.

Expanded Championship Appeal:

Lottery-based non-competitive exhibition performances increase audience engagement and allow WGI to showcase intergenerational participation—without adding pressure to the scoring system or Finals schedule.

Proposal #20

Allow schools that qualify for Combined Schools to have an additional team in RA.

Submitted by Melissa Nielsen, Lakeville HS (SA)

Rationale: Currently, scholastic units that qualify for a combined schools exception are not able to have any additional teams. They are limited to one team, and must include all students in the program on that team. The rationale for this policy is to prevent schools from gaining a competitive advantage, however the reality is that schools that need to combine in order to provide opportunities for students are already at a significant disadvantage. The other obstacles that combined schools encounter far outweigh the slight competitive advantage that could come from allowing one additional team in RA.

Schools that are approved for a combined accommodation are doing so in order to provide opportunities for students who do not have access to a winter guard experience. These programs are often in small circuits that lack support and access to resources that would allow them to be competitive at a high level.

When limiting these programs to one team, it becomes a safety and equity issue. Units are forced to either turn students away who are not ready to compete in A class, and thereby, remove access to the activity, or they accept students onto a team that is not developmentally appropriate for the student, and the student becomes a safety liability on the field.

A solution to this is to allow combined programs to have a team that competes in the RA class, in addition to one team in a WGI Finals-level division (A, Open, World). This allows the program to still provide opportunities for students to perform at an appropriate level for their skill, as well as helping students develop skills that will allow them to grow and develop in order to perform at higher levels.

WGI's mission statement includes a declaration of a commitment to inclusion. By putting fledgling scholastic units in a situation where they are forced to either compete independently against groups that are college-aged, or limiting who is able to join their scholastic team, WGI is creating a culture of exclusion at the unit level. The people impacted by this the most are the students who are turned away from a program and not given the opportunity to develop and participate in the activity. It puts directors and coaches in an impossible position, where they have to choose between doing what is best for students and doing what is best for the team- a conundrum that is painful for educators to try to resolve.

Financial Impact: Minimal financial impact to WGI. This may actually bring more revenue to WGI because it would allow for the creation of additional groups that would quite possibly attend regionals. It would bring

more spectators to regionals, and would spread the opportunity to more students, thereby increasing tickets sold and an increase in revenue to WGI.

Proposal #21

Remove penalty for any body-only exercises at contests via rule 8.2, that are outside of the official body warm up, where contest sites have allotted hallway space to participants.

Submitted by Eric Jones, Homage Independent (IA)

Rationale: With such emphasis on the safety of the performers, it is not feasible to properly warm up a performers body within the 7-10 minutes allotted for body warm up. Most groups find time prior to their official warm up to do stretches, cardio-based exercises, etc., so their bodies are warm and prepared for a body warm up that mainly covers choreography within their program. Even if official body warm up were not used for choreography within the program, the limited time is not enough to provide performers the opportunity to warm and stretch their muscles to a safe place.

Most show sites that offer groups a hallway space to store belongings and get ready are already allocating space for each group and therefore each group would have a set aside area for their performers to do these exercises making it a fair opportunity across the board. For the show sites that do not offer any indoor space, all the performing groups at that particular site would still have an equal playing field (i.e. contest dynamics).

In addition, nearly all of the directors, instructors, staff and performers would be in favor of allowing these types of warm ups without penalty when the show site supports the opportunity.

Financial Impact: None.

Proposal #22

Amend the tie-breaking language found in both Rule 8.2.3 (preliminaries scheduling) and Rule 8.2.4 (semi-finals scheduling) to state:

"Color guards with identical scores will break ties by random draw and be placed in separate rounds."

Submitted by Eric Babula, Norwin HS (SW)

Rationale: This change promotes competitive consistency by ensuring that all preliminary and semifinal rounds feature an equal number of performing groups. Balancing rounds mitigates potential advantages or disadvantages caused by varying round sizes, which can influence contest dynamics and scoring outcomes.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #23

POLICY PROPOSAL for 8.2.3

- **Classes will be seeded in "tournament-style" rounds using their most recent Regional score increased by 1.5 points each week of the regional calendar. The score used for championship seeding will be the higher of their preliminary, semi-final, or finals score of their last regional appearance.**
- **The resulting "standings list" will be used to assign groups to their round. If there are any tie scores, placement on the standings list will be determined by a random number generator. The groups that were tied will be placed in consecutive ordinal placings. There will be no ties in the standings list**

utilized for placing units in their preliminary rounds. At this time any "400 mile rule" units will be placed into the standings list. For example if there are 95 units competing in a division, the units will be ranked 1 - 95 with no ties.

- * The standings list will be divided into groups (top half, and bottom half). If there is an even number of units in the division, the number of units in each half will be equal. If there is an odd number of units in the division, the top half of the standings will absorb the extra unit. For example, if there are 35 units in the division there will be 17 in the bottom half and 18 in the top half.

- * Once the total number of rounds has been determined, the unit ranked highest will go in the last round. The group with the next highest rank will go in the next to last round. Once the first round is reached using this process, the next highest ranked unit will be assigned to the last round. This process will continue until all units are assigned to a round. For example if there are 8 rounds, the highest ranked unit from the standings list will be placed in round 8. The second highest ranked unit will be placed in round 7. The third highest ranked unit will be placed in round 6, and so on until all units are placed in a round. This may result in some rounds having up to 1 more unit than some rounds.

- * Once all rounds have been assigned, the units in the bottom half of the standings will perform before all units in the top half of the standings. Once the units are placed in the the top or bottom half, they will be randomized within that half for the preliminary performance order.

- * All color guards with potential scheduling conflicts must notify the WGI office using the Championships Scheduling Conflict Form by March 1.

I have also drawn out examples that I would be more than happy to email to WGI to take a look at.

Submitted by Jesse Apperson, i-Squared (IO)

Rationale: Currently, policy 8.2.3 has some flaws that potentially can result in some seriously unbalanced and uneven rounds. In 2025, in the Independent Open division there were some wildly unbalanced and uneven rounds. There were 4 rounds. Round 1 had 8 units, round 2 had 12 units, round 3 had 9 units, and round 4 had 6 units. Those were very uneven rounds. Furthermore, Round 1 only had 2 units in the "top half" of the rankings and 6 units in the "bottom half". Round 2 had 7 units in the "top half" of the rankings and 5 in the "bottom half". Round 3 had 5 units in the "top half" and 4 in the "bottom half". While Round 4 had 4 units in the "top half" and only 2 units in the "bottom half" of the standings list. Those were very unbalanced rounds. We all know that rounds with greater numbers of units posses less numbers to distribute between the units. This potentially can force the judges to deflate or inflate scores unnecessarily in the preliminary rounds. Likewise rounds with less units could potentially allow judges to artificially spread scores out. Both instances are cause for a change in the methodology of placing units in their rounds for World Championship prelims. This proposed policy change would allow for an even and balanced placement of units in their preliminary rounds. This would promote a more fair competition. Units who were tied will be placed in adjacent rounds of similarly ranked units on the standings list. This policy proposal will cost no money, alleviate stress and time for staff making the preliminary schedules, and provide a more even, balanced, and fair preliminary line up for all units competing at WGI World Championships.

Financial Impact: No Impact. It can possibly save staff time when setting up schedules for World Championship Prelims.

Proposal #24

Amend the wording of Rule 8.2.4, bullet point 3, to state:

"If preliminary contests are held at multiple sites and judged by different panels, semifinals will utilize a double panel of judges."

Submitted by Eric Babula, Norwin HS (SW)

Rationale: The current rule states: “Semifinals will be a double panel of judges consisting of both panels from each preliminary site.” However, this procedure has not been applied consistently over the past four World Championships (2022–2025), particularly in Scholastic A. The revised wording more accurately reflects actual practice and clarifies expectations for both participants and adjudicators.

Financial Impact: None