

**Color Guard Advisory Board Meeting
May 18-19, 2007
San Francisco, California**



World Championships

Proposal #1

WGI should establish a curtain in front of the units at World Championship Finals. Time intervals in Finals competitions can also be extended by one to two minutes.

Submitted by Daniel Wiles, Avon HS

Rationale: The Finals shows have been upgraded to such a high level. A curtain could allow the performers in finals the opportunity to set up and tear down without the stress of the audience watching. Who likes watching guards run out there and toss and run around frantically? With a closed curtain the professionalism of the finals event could be even better. Performances might improve? The audience could be watching those wonderful video screens between the set up and tear down. The lengthening of time would also give judges slightly more time to make the important decisions at hand.

Financial Impact: A Curtain that could be raised and lowered from the ceiling. We already rent the screens. Tow people to pull the curtain.

Proposal #2

Do away with the block and post block for World Class. Use the scores from the season to divide the class into thirds and random draw the prelims performance order.

Submitted by Randy Nelson, Choctawhatchee HS

Rationale: The block is not needed.

Financial Impact: Less therapy for instructors and judges.

Proposal #3

Eliminate the block score as a tool for scoring.

Submitted by Shirlee Whitcomb, Education Director

Rationale: When the block score was implemented, its purpose was to aid judges in adapting to the 3-tiered system as well as identifying the upper third of the class for the purpose of seeding for Championship. Since that time, only the World Classes still utilize this as a seeding tool. The continued application of the block score has promoted scoring by the calendar instead of scoring based entirely on the criteria reference. In some cases scores automatically grow whether or not the guards' have grown. This compromises the scoring process and dilutes it's accurate and effective application. Rank the World Class guard in the same manner we rank the Open and A class guards, divide the total ranking into thirds and draw for placement within those thirds.

Financial Impact: None.

Proposal #4

For those organizations that have two performing groups participating in the Championships and both groups make it to finals, eliminate the need to buy additional entrance tickets when one of the groups needs to assist the other group with the tarp, props or attends the performance to cheer and extend moral support.

Submitted by April Gilligan, Braddock Independent

Rationale: Organizations with an Open and World guard are being penalized for having two groups of which one is only attending the one performance of the other to help in that one final performance. This year Braddock Independent paid \$260 for the World guard to carry the Open guard tarp and cheer for 4 1/2 minutes!!!!

Financial Impact: Minimal as it only applies to organizations with two performing guards.

Proposal #5

If two color guards tie in any preliminary round, they will be scheduled back to back in the next round.

Submitted by Randy Nelson, Choctawhatchee HS

Rationale: When a coin toss is used to determine placement in the next round, it creates a situation where a competitive advantage or disadvantage occurs.

Financial Impact: None.

Proposal #6

Move Scholastic World Prelims to Thursday Evening at World Championships.

Submitted by Randy Nelson, Choctawhatchee HS

Rationale: The Thursday evening prelims would make for an easier Friday for the Scholastic World Guards. Some guards are getting up at 4/5 A.M. to make it to the early morning show. It would make it possible for A Class Finals to start earlier and end before midnight on Friday.

Financial Impact: None.

Proposal #7

The ranking list should NOT be used to assign units to rounds at World championships; guards should randomly be assigned to rounds.

Submitted by Greg Fleenor, Walton HS

Rationale: The ranking list going into World Championships is not a valid means to seed rounds because each regional's dynamics are different; scores from one regional cannot be compared to other regionals due to these different dynamics. Being able to depend on the accuracy of the judging system should be priority. If the judging community is held to the minimum standards of having to serve three to four years in a local circuit, attend the Academy, and trial judge for one year, guards will receive the proper placements at World Championships according to the scores

assigned at World Championships, not at regionals. World Championships should be the contest of the day, not the season. The highest scores from all rounds, collectively, will proceed to semifinals and, respectively, finals. The regional scores are not an accurate depiction of rankings when coming to World Championships. The 2007 season for Scholastic A had the number-one-ranked guard to the fiftieth-ranked guard within ten points with thirty-two of these guards with a block score. What is the reality of thirty-two guards blocking in one season? Therefore, with the ranking/seeding system, are the fifteen finalists really the top fifteen? Just because a guard comes out early, or late, and gets "popped" a score, does that mean their ranking is accurate at World Championships? The judges should not be influenced by the rankings of the season and should not feel that they must adhere to these rankings. We need to rely on the proper training of the judges to decide the "rankings" at World Championships.

Financial Impact: None

Regionals

Proposal #8

Power Regionals will only use judges that are assigned to World Championships.

Submitted by Randy Nelson, Choctawhatchee HS

Rationale: Logical and expected.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #9

For Regionals, seed all A and Open class guards based on their standings from their Circuit Championship the preceding year. Distribute these guards in a balanced manner between/among rounds. Guards who did not enter a circuit Championship will go on first.

Submitted by Shirlee Whitcomb, Education Director

Rationale: The seeding at early Regionals has proven to be inequitable at best with some rounds containing a larger number of stronger guards than others. This skews the opportunity for guards to be advanced equitably from round to round.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #10

Eliminate Critiques at Power Regionals.

Submitted by Dave Meikle, Santa Clara Vanguard

Rationale: Not enough time allotted to have quality dialog, and, not able to communicate to both prelim and final panel during that critique.

Financial Impact: Consider lowering the entry fee for guards attending Power Regionals if the above is passed.

Proposal #11

Standardize the seeding methods for all WGI Regional events and publish the process in the WGI manual.

Submitted by Bert Creswell, Fleming Island HS

Rationale: The seeding at various regional events this year seemed to be very inaccurate, yielding a wide range of results within rounds of competition. While some type of seeding process is used each season, the process is not defined anywhere in the manual and therefore could be left up to someone's interpretation. Having it in print will answer many questions and clarify how the seeding is to be applied.

Financial Impact: Negligible

Proposal #12

Consider the possibility of using instructor commentators at regular regionals. These commentators would make tapes for the instructors from a general show perspective. These tapes would be in addition to the tapes from the adjudicators. The commentator would not offer comments relating to competitive comparisons, etc. Their role would be purely educational. These instructors would be selected by the steering committee and would be used in Scholastic A, Independent A, Scholastic Open and Independent Open classes.

Submitted by Randy Nelson, Choctawhatchee HS

Rationale: Increase the educational offerings from WGI. This concept is not uncommon in other art related events. It would offer input from instructors that have achieved success in the activity without any pressure of actually adjudicating the show. The potential positive impact could be a great thing for the many young designers in our activity. This would have no impact on the current judging system.

Financial Impact: To be determined by the Board of Directors.

Proposal #13

At WGI Regional events, standardize the process for units to progress from a preliminary contest to a final contest when the preliminary contests are held in rounds of competition. (i.e. winner of each round plus next higher scores, top three from each round plus next higher scores, top two from each round and next higher scores.) Print the process in the WGI manual so that it will be clear to the participants in advance.

Submitted by Bert Creswell, Fleming Island HS

Rationale: The current process varies from contest to contest. It would seem that the more consistent and standard the process the more clear and accurate the results. This will also continue the WGI effort to make each event the same regardless of region.

Financial Impact: None

Adjudication

Proposal #14

The Chief Judge position should have a two-year term limit.

Submitted by: Daniel Wiles, Avon HS

Rationale: After Fred Feeney served in this position for over ten years, with no review, it should be established that this board can review this position every two years.

Financial Impact: None?

Proposal #15

Change the scoring system for the A and Open Classes by eliminating one of the GE Judges and using a numerical factor on the various captions to place more emphasis on our educational goals. In the A Class the IA captions would use a 1.5 factor to make the equipment and movement captions value of 30 points each placing even greater emphasis on training. (There would be no change in the judges philosophy or application, this would simply be a numerical factor used in the tab program) In the Open Class the Ens and one GE judge would get the 1.5 factor to place emphasis on the design process to prepare the designer for the next class. (Again, there would be no change in the judges philosophy or application, this would simply be a numerical factor used in the tab program).

There is no scoring or judge change for the World Class.

Submitted by Jim Olson, Miamisburg High School, Director

Rationale: We want the division to have certain emphasis; training and design. Putting more emphasis on these captions through scoring will only help reinforce this desire. Is there a need for a second GE placing the weight on the whole in the A and Open Classes?

Financial Impact: Possible saving of one judge.

Proposal #16

WGI should re-evaluate the education of the activity from an instructor/judge standpoint.

Submitted by Daniel Wiles, Avon HS

Rationale: The activity needs to look towards the future in terms of education and the current administration in this department is not necessarily tackling this issue. We are at a time when we need to follow what the executive director and his administration has done in terms of taking the activity to the next level. The education department needs to do the same.

Financial Impact: Could be significant. Could stay the same.

Proposal #17

Eliminate the position of Chief Judge from the WGI staff

Submitted by Randy Nelson, Choctawhatchee HS

Rationale: If we are using caption specific managers that are only concerned with their respective captions, then the sum of those numbers should accurately determine the outcome of our contests. The color guard coordinator would be responsible for overseeing the managerial aspects of the adjudication process and the education director would be responsible for educating the judges. There seems to be duplication of jobs in our current system. This proposal is intended to bring forth discussion on our current system of management.

Financial Impact: Possibly some financial savings.

Proposal #18

Re-establish double panels for Power regionals and World Championships.

Submitted by Daniel Wiles, Avon HS

Rationale: The Advisory board deserves to opportunity to at least vote on this topic.

Financial Impact: Significant?

Proposal #19

For A Class guards only at preliminary contests at all Regionals and at Championship, provide groups with the ordinal recap only.

Submitted by Shirlee Whitcomb, Education Director

Rationale: In a Preliminary event, the primary function is to advance the proper units to move into finals. Given the large number of groups in the preliminary contest, scores often expand and contract in order to fit all guards into one scoring range. Even the use of rounds has not alleviated the frustration instructors feel when scores drop from prelims to semi-finals or finals. Judges would continue to score the same and to apply the numbers as they always do, but the units would receive only the ordinal recaps following their preliminary competition. This would permit judges to apply a more accurate score in the semi-finals and finals contest and would avoid the pressure to give arbitrarily higher scores in the next contest. This would alleviate those huge changes in scores that frustrate students and instructors alike.

Financial Impact: None.

Proposal #20

Evaluate and credit the Sound Design, Concept, Set Design, Costumes and Colors in the Ensemble Analysis Caption.

Submitted by Jon Vanderkolff, Santa Clara Vanguard

Rationale: As these elements are integral in the compositional process, it makes sense that they should be evaluated with greater depth and perception in the caption that evaluates the Design and Orchestration of our productions. The current philosophy allows the effect judge to consider these compositional elements as it relates to repertoire, however, General Effect is not an analytical

caption. Therefore, it is logical that the Ensemble judge be able to communicate the visual composition as it relates to the musical structure, concept, set design, costumes and colors as part of the composing process.

Financial Impact: none.

Proposal #21

The maximum number of tenths between sub-captions needs to be re-evaluated. Allowing more than a maximum spread of 8 tenths between sub-captions begins to dilute the meaning of derived achievement, and also works against the philosophy of training establish skills.

Submitted by Dave Meikle, Santa Clara Vanguard

Rationale: The IA captions are analytical based. IA is not a caption where the designers get credit for the written book, those points are upstairs. The IA captions address training and skills which is the basis in which choreography is evaluated. If the performers have not been given the proper training to perform the skills required by the choreography, that situation needs to be weighed against those that are trained. It's possible, that the change to the word 'Choreography' from 'Vocabulary' has introduced a design element into the IA captions that justifies a much greater spread between the top and bottom number. If that was not the intent when the decision was made, a max of 8 tenths spread between sub-captions will allow sub-caption integrity as it relates to the philosophy of derived achievement.

Financial Impact: None.

Proposal #22

Allow a units director (or someone from the unit) access to the WGI Web site to write a couple of paragraphs about their program which can only be accessed by that unit and the judges. There should be a maximum number of words allowed and a requirement for all judges to read these paragraphs.

Submitted by Dave Meikle, Santa Clara Vanguard

Rationale: This will give the judges some insight into a units program and better prepare the judges for their evaluation of that unit during the season. It could also help to address the communication gap with the lack of critiques during the winter.

Financial Impact: none

Proposal #23

Change the current method of seeding for finals in those larger classes with multiple round/site or prelims/semis/finals format to a random draw for the finals competitions.

Submitted by Brian Giddens, Pope HS

Rationale: Although a standard justification for seeding is to arrive at competitive "neighborhoods", it seems as though this justification holds true only when there are large shows with multiple groups to evaluate. When a finals show with fewer units is reached, however, coupled with the fact that it is a championships situation, placements and positions from previous shows should be irrelevant so that a perceived slotting of groups ceases to exist and a real sense of

competition can be felt among all finalists. Furthermore, due to the large amount of participants, or in a prelims/semis/finals situation, different sites and rounds are often required, leaving room for spreads in numbers across these various sites and rounds. A random draw would reduce the occurrence of such a situation thereby putting all finalists on equal playing fields for finals regardless of site or round. At this point, a championship finals competition, we presumably would have reached a collective competitive neighborhood of units thus eliminating the need for similar seeding from previous shows. It should be treated as "anyone's show to win". Presently, neither in perception nor practice does that exist.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #24

To refocus the intentions and parameters of the movement judging sheet, with the ultimate goal of re-naming this caption "Expression and Communication".

Submitted by George Staib II, Walton HS

Rationale: Historically, our activity has served a wide range of people with a wide range of skills and an even wider background. The beauty of what we do rests upon the exposure we provide to young people not only in the field of equipment handling, but the dance and performance arenas as well. It is the relevance of what we do and its significance that prompts me to urge WGI to re-word the movement sheet and reanalyze what it is we hope to accomplish with this caption.

Naturally, movement education is a vital component of this art form. Without a solid understanding of the body, it is very difficult for any performer to actualize all of the physical and equipment demands that are placed upon him/her. As we reach further and examine choreographic intentions more deeply, it serves us very well to make certain our performers are well equipped to not only communicate the intention of the program, but to express these ideas in an authentic way. In my opinion, we all have the same goals for this caption, yet unfortunately the methods of realizing them are incongruous.

By placing so much critical emphasis on achievement (60-40) we are limiting what we expose to our students, we remove the personal exploration necessary to achieve, and are, in the end, placing unrealistic demands on the novice or beginning dancer. To suggest that a student could have a firm grasp on the ideas that govern flexion, rotation, breath, weight, flow, totally body integration, and so on and so on, with only a few hours of training a week, we not only demand way too much, we are insulting those performers who actually do have a solid understanding of dance and movement. As a dancer and dance educator, I know all too well that three hours a week does not make a dancer. It is rather a life-long journey that requires constant attention, dedication, and focus. My goals as a movement educator, are to make certain that the young dancer can relate to movement concepts rather than all of the technical elements inherent in advanced dancers. Of course I stress toe-pointing, long legs, lift and breath, but I would never force my students to look exactly like the other students in class. Our bodies are dramatically different and our approaches to movement are also varied, and this is abundantly clear in the A Class.

Wouldn't it stand to reason that we would want our performers to feel comfortable as movers and want them to understand movement from the inside out rather than the other way around? I advocate crediting vocabulary that is successful in its intent rather than the overall look of the movement. Anyone can point their toes, but isn't it more important to reveal and reward the impetus rather than the outcome?

Each year at nationals I see heel stretch, after heel stretch, after heel stretch, botched fouette turns, hideous kicks to second position, technically incorrect pirouettes, etc. and I also see a ton of

credit being given for them because the movement judge may only be responding to the excitement of these movements, or because he/she may not be aware of all the technical rules that govern such advanced "tricks". Is this what we want to advocate? Poor vocabulary choices that don't line up with the overall look and intention of the show and poorly executed heel stretches? Is that what we are about? Shouldn't we recognize the communication and expression more in the movement caption and take this burden off the GE judge? To me it makes perfect sense. Until WGI can acquire an expert panel of trained dance educators as movement judges, I feel it is time revamp this caption. Too much is overlooked and too much is highly critical and unreasonable for beginning dancers. Am I making excuses for my students? No. I feel very secure knowing that I am giving them the tools that they need as young dancers to not only communicate clearly, but to enjoy sustained careers as dancers. Movement concepts, expression, and communication are the areas where this sheet should live, at least for the A Class. Demanding a perfect back attitude should be saved for the world class and should also be judged by someone who has experience teaching it and someone who has a deep understanding of the principles involved in it; just in case Susie doesn't get her leg up as high as Sally's.

Financial Impact: The financial impact would reside in retraining our current movement judges to the revised criteria. Ultimately it would suit the organization tremendously to hire trained dance educators to serve in the capacity of movement judging. The financial impact is therefore unknown.

Rules

Proposal #25

ELIMINATE AGE RESTRICTION IN IND. OPEN CLASS - The current age consideration in the WGI Independent Open Class for Colorguard does not allow units with members that are over the age of 23 at finals. This proposal is for the eliminations of the age restriction in order for units with members of any age to be able to compete in the WGI Independent Open Class.

Submitted by Color Guard Netherlands

Rationale: The lack of dance and winter/colorguard programs in European high schools generally results in a late start and a lesser extent of exposure to dance and colorguard for European teens relative to the US. This big disadvantage means that European guards, by far do not get the level of skill/experience at their auditions of those in the US. It would not be fair to expect these units to still be able to become competitive with the Independent World units at the WGI World Championships.

This WGI rule change would create a stronger consideration for the needs of European units and in general non-American guards with similar schooling systems as in Europe. The change would therefore create a stronger alignment for utilization of the WGI Criteria Reference at an actual International level.

EDUCATIONAL - In the last 15 years several European Independent Open Class units came to the US. In recent years these groups had no change other than to compete in the Independent World Class where they generally did not belong when regarding the criteria reference for this classification. This resulted in an unfair change for (competitive) success for these teams or the organization.

CREATIVE IMPACT - In the currently situations designer of European Open Class units with plans to come to WGI Championships are forced to design a show with a two-faced curriculum. While really being an Open Class guard following the WGI criteria reference they are almost forced to

'overwrite' their programs in order to attempt a connection to any competitive neighbourhood in the Independent World Class at the WGI World Championships. At the same time these programs are allowed in Open Class in Europe. The creative impact of this change would therefore be that this allows for a 'better fit' of the European Open Class unit designs with the WGI Classifications / criteria reference.

Proposal #26

Amend the definition of a Scholastic Unit: Any unit which consists of students from more than one school district may compete in a Scholastic Class, limited to no more than 3 schools within a 30 mile radius of the host school.

This may be further defined as: ...if the student is part of a District Authorized Shared Services program, documented and recognized by State Regulation.

Submitted by Barry Obergefell, Trumansburg HS

Rationale: School Districts (and Color Guards) are increasingly attempting to preserve services in the face of competition for extra curricular dollars. In some areas of the country, New York in particular, declining enrollments add to this problem. New York State specifically encourages neighboring schools to merge activities and/or allow students from neighboring schools to participate in extra curricular activities underwritten by the sponsoring school. When this occurs with sports and other activities, it does not change the division or class that they are currently classified.

In the Mid York Color Guard Circuit, it is estimated that 20% of school sponsored units use shared services. Many of the school's involved are rural and have K-12 enrollments of less than 1,200. Because WGI currently defines such a unit as "Independent", school administrators have raised questions as to why High School students are competing against adults.

The amended definition of a Scholastic Unit would in no way allow *ad hoc* recruiting or "all star" teams. Participation in any shared sport or activity requires administrative approval and creates a provable "paper trail". This would serve to allow students the opportunity to compete solely within a group of their peers unless they make an individual decision to join a unit competing in an Independent Class.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #27

Allow Scholastic Units to pull membership from any school within same school district and its feeders in which a winter program does not exist. This proposal would put WGI on the same page as BOA when it comes to fair and appropriate participation for students who would not necessarily have the opportunity in a scholastic setting.

Submitted by Gary Swanson, Irondale High School

Rationale: With continued budget cuts and student involvement in extra curricular activities on the down swing it is harder and harder to field a group and justify this program. We have been forced to combine resources with many other programs within our schools as well as our districts.

We continue to look at this issue as a competitive one and the fear of a "Power Guard" has been discussed. While I do not think this would ever happen, the adjudication system would bump this group into its rightful class and for Scholastic World, I think the challenge is a positive one. (Similar to the no age rule in IW and how it has changed that class.)

Lastly, Scholastic and Independent are two different beasts. I feel high school groups should be competing with high school groups and not groups that contain college age members.

The culture of scholastic units is very different than independent ones. Being IA this year and surrounded by college age units, the atmosphere was definitely not what we have experienced in the scholastic competitions. As an educator, I feel it is not a totally appropriate place for high school age students to be. This is my biggest concern

We feel color guard and WGI is unique and beneficial to our student and want it to continue in our schools.

BOA has recognized the benefit in keeping the activity healthy in all parts of the country and it has not seen any misuse of this rule for competitive reasons. Can WGI align itself with BOA on this very educational proposal?

Financial Impact: None unless you consider any lost group to WGI's member list because they cannot exist under the current classifications.

[Proposal #28](#)

Amend Rule 2.1 to read: For the purpose of interpretation, the "competition area" shall measure a minimum of sixty by ninety (60' x 90') feet and does not include entry ramps, hallways nor any bleachers or seating area. Units are permitted to utilize the entire designated competition area for their performance. Units may not use "floors" (tarps) larger than sixty by ninety (60' x 90') feet. All props must be in the designated competition area. There can be no equipment choreography outside the competition area. All performers must begin within the designated competition area.

Submitted by Ron Nankervis, Executive Director

Rationale: The WGI Board of Directors passed this directive last year but current rule as published in the rulebook was unclear.

Financial Impact: None.

[Proposal #29](#)

Amend Rule 2.2 to read: All WGI contests sites must have a minimum of sixty-five by one hundred feet (65' x 100') to accommodate a "safety zone" of five feet (5') on the sides and back using the minimum competition area of sixty by ninety feet (60' x 90'). No performers may enter the safety zone at any time during their performance. Depending on the performance venue, WGI can authorize additional competition area and will include that information in the diagram (footprint) to be made available to all competing units to identify the competition area.

Submitted by Ron Nankervis, Executive Director

Rationale: The WGI Board of Directors passed this directive last year but current rule as published in the rulebook was unclear.

Financial Impact: None.

Proposal #30

Amend Rule 2.5 to read: All regional contests must utilize a high quality sound system with a variable speed CD player and the capability to use external devices such as MP3 players and/or iPods.

Submitted by Ron Nankervis, Executive Director

Rationale: Color guards are no longer using cassette tapes to provide their music and it makes little sense to incur yet another cost to a show sponsor to provide what is not being used and refocuses

Financial Impact: Little as this is the most common practice today.

Proposal #31

Reduce the interval time for each unit by one minute for Open and World guards. Open guards would have eight minutes and World guards nine.

Submitted by Dale Powers, WGI Color Guard Coordinator:

Rationale: We have a limited number of slots in a regional show now because of the current interval times. Reducing the interval time, not the performance time, will allow WGI to add another 6 or 7 units to a one day show and 10-12 units to a two day show.

Financial Impact: Sponsors will benefit from the additional units at shows. Attendance, food, rebates, etc. WGI would benefit from this by generating more entries.

Proposal #32

Amend Rule 4.4 to: Amplification can be used in the competition area by performing members playing musical instruments, singing or voice, and/or other visual amplification devices. The electrical source for electronic amplification must be a 115/120 V typical wall outlet (if available) as noted on the footprint of the facility as supplied by the sponsor. Car/truck type wet batteries cannot be used. The only batteries that will be allowed are "off the shelf" type flashlight batteries. Gasoline, electric or manual powered generators will not be allowed. Lighting cannot be turned off in the competition area by a unit.

Submitted by Greg Mar, Leigh HS

Rationale: Currently we can "amplify" voices, sounds, instruments, and any other "audible" sensory awareness with electricity or "off the shelf" batteries. Approval of this proposal will enable us to amplify the "visual" sensory awareness as well.

The intent of this proposal is to be able to amplify visual footage restricted to the competition floor only. This could include movie projectors, slide projectors, or computers hooked up to projectors.

We will be able to use electricity from standard wall outlets, as currently stated in Rule 4.4

Financial Impact: No financial impact to WGI. Possible financial implications to the units implementing audio/visual amplification equipment.