

**Percussion Advisory Board Meeting
May 17-18, 2019
Las Vegas, Nevada
PROPOSALS FOR CONSIDERATION**



WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS

Proposal #1

At World Championships PSO and PIO will alternate year to year who performs first at Finals.

Submitted by Chris Rivera, Terry Sanders, Norwalk HS, Escambia HS

Rationale: This year PSO finals began at 9:00AM and PIO finals began at 11:55AM. Adding the rotation would allow both classes to have more of a “World Championship” feel by experiencing the feeling of performing for a larger crowd. Color guard appears to follow this procedure for their SO and IO classifications. SO guards performed first in 2018 and IO guards performed first in 2019.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #2

Any classification at World Championships that has 3 rounds (prelims, semis, finals) will have their performance locations limited to a maximum of 2 venues.

Submitted by Chris Rivera, Terry Sanders, Norwalk HS, Escambia HS

Rationale: This year PSO, PIO and PIA had to perform at 3 different venues for each of their 3 rounds of competition. This is asking a lot from not only a logistic/travel standpoint, but also from an audio and acoustic perspective.

Financial Impact: Unknown

Proposal #3

Create verbiage on the left side of the music and visual sheet that explicitly addresses when performance affects the readability of the composition. The verbiage should read: "Clarity of Composition as it Relates to Performance." This verbiage could possibly exist under the “Clarity of Intent” bullet, which is explained on the back side of the sheet.

Submitted by Dan Schack, George Mason University

Rationale: Though the composition side of the sheet currently has the verbiage "clarity of intent," music and visual judges frequently do not articulate when the quality of performance is impacting their ability to read the composition. The sheets do not appear to address that this could be a possibility at all. "Clarity of Intent" only addresses the clarity of the composition ("The presentation of compositional elements in a clear, accessible, and intelligible manner").

Currently, music and visual judges are evaluating groups through a synthesis of both boxes; in the worst case scenarios, music and visual judges will criticize the composition and reward the performance in their tapes, and then put down numbers that represent the opposite. We should more explicitly address this issue with an addendum to the sheets' verbiage, or, we should address the problem that judges are not able to read the

composition and performance in a dichotomized, insular way (and therefore cannot relate their read to what they put down in each box). This appears to be a fundamental issue with how the boxes are related to one another and how judges are being trained to interpret the left and right box.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #4

Place all criteria on judging sheets, top to bottom, in priority order of point value. Decisions of priority order made by steering committee and the judges. Final results publicly shared as well as printed on the sheets in the interest of transparency and education.

Submitted by Ian Grom, Chino Hills HS, Pulse Percussion, POW Percussion

Rationale: We are at a point in the activity where the wide variety of program offerings may present some challenges to compare “apples to oranges” when evaluating the achievement and design of an ensemble. While the sheets provide a fantastic array of criteria to choose from, it has become unclear as to what major buzz words a design/instructional team should focus on in their efforts to improve from week to week or even year to year.

I'd like to use the music caption only as an example to represent all captions for the sake of argument. Based on my commentary over the years, clarity of intent seems to be the prime consideration for the composition subcaption and rhythmic clarity for performance. Do we agree or disagree with that? If all criteria are equally weighted in value, do our commentaries consistently reflect the evaluation and competitive comparison of those terms?

Placing the criteria in priority order creates transparency for all involved. If there cannot be an agreement on assigning their weighted value, then we must agree all are evenly weighted and treated as such.

Financial Impact: Sheets reprinted, additional adjudication training

Proposal #5

Add the following to the music sheet for marching percussion in the "marching percussion ensembles" box: "When there is a double panel, judge 1 will primarily focus on the battery and judge 2 will primarily focus on the front ensemble. Both judges will also analyze the overall percussion ensemble as a whole".

At shows with double panels, judges who are more comfortable evaluating front ensemble techniques and instruments will be assigned judge 2 so that front ensembles can be evaluated more equally and accurately, and judge 1 will be able to focus more on the battery elements.

Submitted by Daniel Burbank, Fair Lawn Indoor Percussion

Rationale: The nature of this proposal is to increase the judge's ability to accurately evaluate and assess the skill demonstrated by every section in each ensemble. Throughout the season, we are provided with feedback that demonstrates the strength of the WGI judging community. We wish to further maximize accuracy and assign music judges a "battery" or "front ensemble" emphasis when judging on a double panel. We feel that this will benefit the integrity of the evaluation process, particularly in regards to front ensemble evaluation.

If this proposal is seriously considered, it will need to be discussed at the meetings exactly what should define a "battery" instrument and what should define a "front ensemble" instrument.

Financial Impact: WGI might consider trying to have at least one judge with very strong knowledge of front ensemble techniques/instruments at every double panel show to be judge 2, however in the event that this is not financially feasible then judges should be assigned as normal and the judge that is more comfortable with front ensemble evaluation should be assigned to be judge 2.

Proposal #6

Change the Effect Music and Effect Visual scoresheet sub-captions from “overall effect” and “music / visual effect” to “repertoire effect” and “performance effect”. Redesign the Effect scoresheets with new bullet point considerations and criteria references to reflect the sub-caption rubric changes.

EFFECT MUSIC (30 points)

Repertoire Effect (15 points)

- The Musical Journey
- Creativity, Originality, and Artistry
- Engagement
- Audio and Visual Coordination
- Range of Effects

Performance Effect (15 points)

- Communication
- Musicianship
- Engagement
- Excellence as Effect
- Delivery and Sustainment of Planned Effects

EFFECT VISUAL (20 points)

Repertoire Effect (10 points)

- The Visual Journey
- Creativity, Originality, and Artistry
- Engagement
- Audio and Visual Coordination
- Range of Effects

Performance Effect (10 points)

- Communication
- Embodiment of Character, Role, Identity, Style
- Engagement
- Excellence as Effect
- Delivery and Sustainment of Planned Effects

Submitted by Richard Hinshaw, Avon High School

Rationale: The current Effect scoresheets frequently create inconsistent feedback and scoring profiles from Effect adjudicators, and they do not have a specific enough point value for performer achievement. The broad rubrics of “overall effect” and “music / visual effect” allow for a highly subjective evaluation which is often confusing for many ensembles. It is not always clear how commentary applies to each sub-caption, and how scoring values are assigned in the comparative process. Further, the effectiveness of performer engagement and skill set achievement is undervalued in the current format. The performers do not have an obviously assigned score value on the effect scoresheets. Redesigning the Effect scoresheets to have the more universally applied repertoire and performance sub-captions will give adjudicators a more clearly defined rubric to work with, and it will give ensembles a better picture of how their ensembles are achieving effect.

Financial Impact: Revision of the Effect scoresheets and appropriate judges training for those sheets.

Proposal #7

Define the value of visual-only performers to the Visual and Effect sheets

Submitted by John Mapes, Pulse Percussion, Chino Hills HS and POW Percussion

Rationale: As visual-only performers have become more and more common in our activity, it’s time to better define how they are evaluated. Every performer brings value and all performers should be credited, however, this is a percussion competition and how much weight their contributions hold versus the musicians’ contributions is the question. Since that hasn’t been fully defined, different judges give different value to those performers and that should not be the case. Also, it would be beneficial to the designers to have a more clear-cut answer to what sort of credit or value there is when making design choices.

I suggest we add a tagline to the sheets for clarification. Something like:

“The added difficulty of musicians executing visual roles in comparison to the singular demand of visual-only performers will be considered in the weight of scoring.”

Financial Impact: Sheet adjustments

Proposal #8

Add the term Range of Content to the Visual sheet

Submitted by John Mapes, Pulse Percussion, Chino Hills HS and POW Percussion

Rationale: After using the new visual sheet for the first time this season the one thing that seemed to be left out was Range of Content. Originally we went back and forth with the idea of adding this term to the new sheet but decided to leave it off feeling that the new Principles and Elements of Design covered this need.

On the music sheet Range of Content is defined as “The purposeful use of musical and technical repertoire and vocabulary in the program.” This seems like an important criteria in a competitive activity. The visual sheet defines Elements of Design as: “The purposeful use of line, shape, form, space, color, and texture within the program,” and The Principles of Design as “The purposeful use of balance, contrast, emphasis, unity, proportion, and variety within the program.” I do not see how Range of Content is covered in either of those definitions, specifically the terms technical repertoire and vocabulary.

Range of Content is important on the Music sheet and should be on the Visual sheet as well defined as “The purposeful use of visual and technical repertoire and vocabulary in the program.”

Financial Impact: Sheet adjustments

Proposal #9

Withdrawn

Proposal #10

Include an optional show description for each judge below the program’s show title. The description will not exceed 280 characters and should be easily accessible to the judge.

Submitted by Bryan Nungaray, Etiwanda High School

Rationale: Every second of the performance is an opportunity for the judge to understand the competitive production, but unfortunately those seconds can add up to minutes with lost opportunities to understand the thematic material. By including a short description we can allow the adjudicator a head start to understand the concept before the program begins.

Financial Impact: None.

Proposal #11

Add an optional 60-seconds to the interval time to compensate for set up emergencies; to only be used once per season.

Submitted by Tony Lymon, Petal HS

Rationale: With WGI Percussion leading the marching arts with innovative and elaborate productions, the interval times are unforgiving for any freak failures in setup. Often times it is a simple fix that would only require a little bit extra time to solve. There have been many times where the ensemble is penalized for interval time because of some anomaly in setup that caused them to go over the interval time.

This proposal asks that each ensemble be given a 60 second forgiveness to only be used once per season at any given regional or world championships. The potential for too many ensembles to use this additional minute and causing the show to run way over in time would be policed by it being in the ensemble director's best interest to save the 1 minute forgiveness for an extenuating circumstance.

Financial Impact: No impact. Minor adjustment of contest performance times.

Proposal #12

Remove current age cap for independent World Class. Allow for World Class ensembles to compete with performers of any age.

Submitted by Kaden Levy, FIU Indoor

Rationale: More performers are beginning to "age themselves out," leaving years remaining while still being eligible. Most would not continue to compete past the current age out, or prior, but would allow for those who were unable to march during their years of eligibility to the opportunity to do so.

Financial Impact: No additional cost to any but the individual who would gain eligibility and wishes to audition for and compete with a World Class ensemble.

Proposal #13

Change Eligibility Rule 1.1 Allow a possible exception to current Rule for individuals participating in a United States independent class group, over the current age limit of 22, for their first season, to be permitted a year of eligibility determined on a case-by-case basis by the advisory board.

Submitted by Kaden Levy, FIU Indoor

Rationale: Due to financial hardships during the time of my eligibility, I was unable to continue as a performer. My mother was diagnosed with Multiple Sclerosis when I was in high school, and I made the decision to put my dreams on hold in order to make sure she was properly cared for. She needed 24/7 care, and despite my father's income, I also needed to work to keep up with increasing medical expenses.

After graduating, I returned to teach the percussion section at my alma mater. I've since expanded to working with numerous programs, both scholastic and independent, across South and Central Florida. Despite this, I still am left with the deepest regret of never having marched, due to the extenuating circumstances during eligibility. I would truly give anything to be awarded the opportunity to march for one single season; to fulfill a dream that unfortunately does have a limited window of opportunity, one that I'm sure I share with others who have also been unable to perform.

Missing the opportunity to perform is truly the biggest regret of the entirety of my life; I would sincerely appreciate your consideration in allowing a possible exception to the current rule that would allow myself, and others in similar circumstances, to possibly be awarded one year of eligibility to compete in WGI.

Financial Impact: None; expense would only be to the performer requesting consideration of eligibility

Proposal #14

Rule 2.7 should be reworded to say:

"A dedicated 20 amp circuit shall be available at the front and back of the center line of the competition area. Ensembles must provide their own extension cords. Power specifications will be available on the competition area footprint for each event."

Submitted by Kevin Kenney, Atlanta Quest

Rationale: On finals night at UD, we were not receiving consistent power which caused our sound system to turn off and on multiple times during our performance. Before the show, I plugged the system into the tunnel power outlet and my voltage meter read 90v coming from the house power. The same happened when we got out on the floor and plugged into the front sideline outlet. The house power at UD has never been great and I understand that Phase 3 of the construction 'might' address this issue but I feel like the rule needs to be re-worded to ensure that the ensembles are not effected by inconsistent power during any regional or finals performance.

Financial Impact: If we are not doing this already, I think it would be smart for WGI to consult electricians for sites that host giant events like WGI Finals and the power regionals. With the amount of money we all give to the city of Dayton and to the University of Dayton, there should be no reason why we should not be able to get a dedicated 20 amp circuit for the front and back of the performance area. If they say they do not have the funds, then we need to find a way to make it happen so this does not happen to any groups in the future.

Proposal #15

Add "All samples must be performed live, in real time." to rule 4.2.1.

Submitted by Percussion Steering Committee,

Rationale: Restoring this phrase to the rule closes a loophole in the current structure of the rule that was exploited this season. The intent of the rule is for all music to be performed live, and in real time by the performers on the floor. If we want adjudicators to credit everything they hear, all musical elements must be performed in real time.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #16

Amend rule 4.2.1 to exclude all vocal samples from the rhythmic intent rule. The rule would still stand for all other electronic sounds, but any lyrics or spoken word samples would be exempt.

Submitted by Andrew Markworth, Rhythm X

Rationale: Most of the previous discussions about rule 4.2.1 have either been about keeping the rule as is, or eliminating it all together. This proposal offers a middle ground. The demand on the performers will still exist and may even expand amongst more members of the ensemble. I imagine that most ensembles would still cut up their samples a good deal and those who don't will have to achieve perfect tempo over the extent of that sample. This would open the possibility of ensembles playing timed vocals from the back of the floor, but playing loud drums in time with vocal samples in perfect balance and tempo would be a formidable challenge. Ensembles who choose to take those risks and do not have a good cohesive ensemble sound (in both balance and timing) would suffer competitively. In this scenario, I would hope that the judge hold a very high standard in evaluating how vocal samples fit into the ensemble sound. Keeping the non-vocal sounds under the rhythmic intent rule will prevent groups from using drum machine tracks, audible metronomes, playing recording of songs, etc. This rule inherently would also open up the use of vocal delay on both pre-recorded samples and live vocals.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #17

No longer require the play back of vocal samples to be "split up" and triggered by word or other specific rhythmic parameters. This does not apply to rhythmic instrumental samples or use of any type of arpeggiator. This is strictly related to samples triggering "sung vocal content".

Submitted by Rob Ferguson, Matrix

Rationale: In the evaluation process that we experience from our judging community, the use of "vocal samples" is something that is generally acknowledged and evaluated as an effect tool and part of the design components versus a performance demand/ achievement by a performer. We virtually never get feedback on those samples from the perspective of a performance achievement by the student playing them beyond balance and compositional use. In addition, the rule as it exists now is virtually un-policeable in any reasonable manner by the T&P judge during a performance. This would allow ensembles to "cut and trigger" vocal samples as they see fit.

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #18

Allow for the use of gel, SLA, VRLA, and AGM batteries in the competition area.

Submitted by Percussion Steering Committee,

Rationale: The current wording of rule 4.2.4 is limited in what kind of sealed lead acid batteries are permitted. This proposal seeks to update the terminology to current industry standards. If passed, the last sentence of rule 4.2.4 would now read "Sealed, spill-proof maintenance-free lead acid batteries such as gel, SLA, VRLA, and AGM batteries are also permitted."

Financial Impact: None

Proposal #19

Amend the wording of rule 4.3.7 to reflect a more accurate definition of the stance taken by WGI regarding the use of glass.

Submitted by Thomas Sparling, Matrix Open

Rationale: The current rule doesn't take into account the various uses of glass that currently exist within the activity (laptop screens, TV screens, light bulbs, etc.) and needs to be updated. Due to liability and safety considerations, the exact wording should be determined via discussion between a WGI representative and the PAB meeting attendees.

Financial Impact: None.

Proposal #20

Adopt a rule mandating hearing protection for all performers during warm-up and performance at all WGI events.

Submitted by Erik Kosman, North Forsyth High School

Rationale: WGI percussion units regularly exceed the sound level exposure standards set by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH). NIOSH recommends limiting exposure of the following sound levels to a maximum daily dose to avoid developing permanent hearing loss:

Time to reach 100# noise dose	Exposure level per NIOSH REL
8 hours	85 dB(A)
4 hours	88 dB(A)
2 hours	91 dB(A)
60 minutes	94 dB(A)
30 minutes	97 dB(A)
15 minutes	100 dB(A)

A 2015 study by Lindsey Schueller of several WGI Percussion units showed that groups average a sound level between 90.73 dB(A) and 98.08 dB(A), which would put the safe limit of time exposed to between a half hour and 2 hours. This time range is very similar to the amount of time a unit spends warming up and performing at a show.

As WGI evolves, it is important that our safety standards evolve with it. As the governing body, WGI has a responsibility to its participants that its requirements ensure member safety at its events. Hockey goalies used to not be required to wear masks or helmets, face-masks were optional in football, netting was not required behind the backstop at home plate in baseball. It unfortunately took several severe injuries to athletes and fans for these safety requirements to be implemented in other activities.

WGI has been on the forefront of the pageantry arts when it comes to performer safety, and this requirement seems like a proactive step to ensuring that our performers are not only safe during the actual performance, but that their long term health/hearing is not compromised.

Financial Impact: Depending on the level of quality/clarity desired by the performer, ear plugs are as little as a penny a pair for the foam earplugs, to several hundred dollars for custom molded ear plugs with changeable filters. There are several products that are a happy medium between foam and custom that can be purchased for \$10-\$20/student that block out all frequencies evenly, and are durable enough to last multiple seasons if cleaned and cared for properly.

If instituted, WGI could potentially pursue a sponsorship with an ear plug manufacturer to lower costs even further. Another way to potentially lower costs would be for WGI to make a large purchase order to get a bulk discount, and pass on the savings to units if desired.