

**Color Guard Advisory Board Meeting  
June 17-18, 2022  
Las Vegas, Nevada  
PROPOSALS FOR CONSIDERATION**



**WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS**

**Proposal #1**

**Switch or Alternate Open and A class finals between Friday night and Saturday morning.**

*Submitted by Daniel Wiles, Avon HS*

**Rationale:** In a continued attempt to incentivize groups moving up through the system, we should give the Open class groups the opportunity to perform in the Friday night electric environment. The Open class has fewer groups to accommodate over Thursday prelims and Friday semifinals and would have ample time to get between sites. Open groups should be more mature to handle 2 performances in one day. The judges and the A class groups could have more time to navigate a difficult weekend.

**Financial Impact:** None

**Proposal #2**

**Proposal- Eliminate the randomization of SCH A guards for Semi finals round competition.**

- 1. A class Semifinalists should be placed in rounds by the preliminary score and performances should also be determined by that score and not a random draw or shuffle.**
- 2. The top 4 highest scoring units in each round should automatically advance to finals competition and the next four highest scores if there are 4 rounds.**
- 3 If there are 5 or 6 rounds, the top 3 in each round would advance.**

*Submitted by Detrick Tilley, Lanier High School*

**Rationale:** Currently, the A class seeding process for groups competing in Semi-finals is inconsistent with open and world class .

Currently, 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.

Continuing: "The difference here is that Open and World class Color guards perform in the reverse order of preliminary score with the highest score performing last.

As it stands, this puts A Class units who perform early in the round at a disadvantage. since we have seen some adjudication favor RANKING in each round OVER the RATING of the unit.

**Financial Impact:** None

### Proposal #3

**Top 10 Scholastic A guards promoted to Scholastic Open class.**

**Top 7 Independent A promoted to Independent Open class.**

**Top 5 Scholastic Open promoted to Scholastic World**

**Top 5 Independent Open promoted to Independent World class**

*Submitted by Daniel Wiles, Avon HS*

**Rationale:** We should do everything we can to incentivize moving through the classes. The disproportionate numbers continue to be a problem.

**Financial Impact:** none

## REGIONALS

### Proposal #4

**Mandatory Critique at all WGI regionals**

*Submitted by Dolores Zappala, Blessed Sacrament World*

**Rationale:** Communication between instructors and judges is essential for the development of the activity. Critiques are a critical learning moment for both the judge and the instructors

**Financial Impact:** None

## ADJUDICATION

### Proposal #5

**Reduced Judging Panel: Three judges score all**

**General Effect - 40 pts Repertoire 20 pts, Performance 20 pts - current GE criteria**

**Design Analysis 20 pts Repertoire 10 pts, Performance 10 pts - current DA criteria**

**Individual Analysis 40 pts Equipment Repertoire 10 pts, Equipment Performance 10 points; Movement Repertoire 10 pts, Movement performance 10 points Combines Equipment and Movement IA captions**

*Submitted by Dolores Zappala, Blessed Sacrament World*

**Rationale:** The activity has evolved to where all aspects of the performance should be considered and judged together. This would allow each judge to rank and rate each aspect of the performance. Reducing judge panel size gives greater opportunity of putting the best judges in place. judges would be more accountable for their scoring and motivates judges to keep learning.

**Financial Impact:** Reduces judging fees.

## CLASSIFICATION

### Proposal #6

**The Top 2 Scholastic and Independent A Class Guards and the Open Class Champions at each WGI Regional will be automatically reviewed. All color guards remain subject to review at any regional. Additional teams may be added to the weekly review list based on the recommendation of the Director of Color Guard, Education Coordinator, or Lead Judge at any WGI Regional.**

*Submitted by WGI Color Guard Steering Committee*

**Rationale:** Adding the Open Class Champions will provide continuity in our approach between the Open Classes and the A Classes. This will standardize the process, thereby leveling the playing field. The third placing A Class unit has never been reclassified. Keeping the option to call any group for review protects the ability to review those potentially misclassified groups beyond the top two, especially at Regionals with larger A populations.

**Financial Impact:** None.

### Proposal #7

**A & Open Classes.**

**Creating standard promotional "block" scores that are adjusted throughout the season by week for advancement to the next class.**

*Submitted by Cecil Crabtree, Pebble Hills High School & Glory Independent*

**Rationale:** Throughout the WGI season, A & Open color guards that place in the top 3 at a regional, are required to submit videos to WGI for the possibility of promotion to the next class. Although this process can be overwhelming at times for most directors, students, and staff, there is not a concrete system on how some groups are promoted while others are not.

Implementing a promotional "block" score will help give directors more peace of mind in the review process because the "block" score would place these groups in the top 3% of their class and help in the determination of placement to the next class.

For example, in week 3 the "block" score is set at 83.5. We have two groups that scored 83.5 or better during week 3. All groups still go through the review process of placement into the next class, however, the groups that scored 83.5 or better would automatically be placed to the next higher class.

At the end of the day, it is important to remain transparent, accountable, and consistent on the promotion review process.

**Financial Impact:** None

## **Proposal #8**

**Any group reclassified from A Class to Open Class may forfeit their initial appeal and compete at their next Regional in the Open Class, with this understanding:**

**If their highest score at their next Regional is within 5 points of, or lower than, the Weekly Qualifying Score for Open Class (found on pg.19 of the Adjudication Manual), that unit may request, and will be granted (upon request) an Appeal Review.**

**The group will have through Wednesday of the following week, from the Regional in question, to submit a request for appeal along with a video for review. This request must be presented to the Director of Color Guard in that timeframe.**

**Seeding into Championships for those units reclassified back to A, after their appeal:**

**-If the group has another Regional, they will be seeded using their scores from competing in the A Class, as though they had not competed in the Open Class. Open Class scores will not factor into their A-Class seeding.**

**-If the group does not have another Regional, the group will pick one of two options to be seeded into Championships.**

- 1. Pre-Championships video review, in the same way that the 400 mile groups are seeded.**
- 2. Have their pre-reclassification scores be factored into the seeding progression as though they had never competed in the Open Class. Open Class scores will not factor into their A-Class seeding.**

**This proposed option is only available using scores from the group's first Regional in Open Class.**

**This proposed option will not be made available to Units opting for their initial appeal upon reclassification to Open, before competing in the new class.**

*Submitted by Karl Lowe, Color Guard Education Coordinator*

**Rationale:** This incentivizes participation in the new class, and offers a safety net in case of misclassification to Open. This proposal serves to benefit those groups that participate early, that may fear competitive viability in the next class. Seeding options allow the unit to strategize a "best possible outcome" if granted the reclassification back to the A Class. This also maintains the 1-appeal practice already established. The Wednesday deadline accommodates potential scheduling issues and logistical challenges that arise from reclassifications in general.

If this proposal is seconded, I am willing to discuss, and possibly shift, the numeric threshold and the seeding options.

**Financial Impact:** None

### Proposal #9

Any group competing in the Open and World Classes may request, and be granted (upon request), a one-time review to reclassify to the next lower class, under the condition that their highest competing score, at their first Regional is within 5 points of, or lower than, the Weekly Qualifying Score for Open and World Classes (found on pg.19 of the Adjudication Manual). The group will have until Wednesday of the following week, after the group's first Regional, to submit a request for appeal along with a video for review. This request must be presented to the Director of Color Guard in that timeframe.

**Seeding Procedures for those units reclassified to a lower class, after their Review:**

- If the group has another Regional, they will be seeded using only their scores from competing in their new class. No out-of-class scores will be factored for seeding.
- If the group does not have another Regional, the group will be seeded for Championships by video review, in the same way that the 400 mile groups are seeded.

**This proposed option is only available upon the group's first Regional in the Open or World Class.**

*Submitted by Karl Lowe, Color Guard Education Coordinator*

**Rationale:** This incentivizes participation in the Open and World Classes. This also encourages early participation with the understanding that a recovery is possible if competitive viability proves limited. The Wednesday deadline accommodates potential scheduling issues and logistical challenges that arise from reclassifications in general.

If this proposal is seconded, I am willing to discuss, and possibly shift, the numeric threshold and the seeding options.

**Financial Impact:** None

## POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

### Proposal #10

**Judges on the active WGI roster may only adjudicate WGI events.**

*Submitted by Jonathan Lischak, Hamilton HS*

**Rationale:** This will provide maximum flexibility and availability for WGI events, ensuring that the full roster remains available in the event of cancellations. Given the public health crisis and economic crisis, late changes may occur with greater frequency than years past. This will help ensure events have the best quality adjudication.

**Financial Impact:** None

# RULES

## Proposal #11

### **Eliminate the Age Restriction for All Independent Classes**

*Submitted by Andy Lecture, Toccata Independent*

**Rationale:** The current age restriction model only serves to benefit World Class guards. However, by allowing performers to spend more time training and performing in A and Open class, we will eventually see a higher number of performers who are ready to perform in World Class - this would benefit everyone. The current model also sets a precedent to those outside of the colorguard activity that the activity is only for kids. Allowing more adults to participate at lower levels will change the way the activity presents itself to the general public as one that is truly inclusive.

A and Open Class guards' growth are stifled significantly by this restriction - it is much more difficult for a program to grow if they are forced to lose their oldest members each year. The World Class guards have nothing to worry about - they all have excellent draws to their programs, and people will still want to be a part of them! The choice of where to march should be entire left up the the performers - if they fall in love with a program, they have a right to choose to stay there. Eventually, this will make every class more balanced and competitive, since we will have more performers at all skill levels. The promotion system is meant to keep the playing field level.

The current model assumes that performers are able to master A Class in a few years and Open class in one. Many performers need more time to build their skills, and this is simply not enough time. World Class is a dream many performers have, but by not allowing them the time to develop their skills, many performers end up missing out on that dream for the rest of their lives. We should be encouraging performers to pursue lifelong engagement with the activity - that is the best way to help it grow! More performers means more teams means more competitions means more revenue for WGI and the local areas in which competitions are held.

**Financial Impact:** We will see more income across the board, since the activity will overall have more performers involved.

## Proposal #12

**In the spirit of diversity and inclusion, allow for high school programs to accept students across district borders while maintaining scholastic status, provided the school or district of that student does not have a competitive program that is open to that student.**

*Submitted by Melisa Nielsen, Lakeville Color Guard*

**Rationale:** This is a more equitable approach to diversity, inclusion, and growth in the sport than current WGI rules, which deny equitable access to students who would like to perform but do not have access to a program fitting their circumstances. Students who come from low-income families and/or attend schools that do not have programs are limited, or even excluded, in their ability to perform. Independent guards become cost-prohibitive for lower socioeconomic students. In many circumstances, the travel to and from rehearsals for an independent group for these students makes participation impossible.

If WGI would adjust the scholastic category to allow for students enrolled in a middle or high school to participate across district lines if their district does not currently offer a winter guard experience to them, it would allow for more students to have access to the benefits of winter guard.

While the current rules do allow for groups in this situation to compete as independent groups, this disincentivizes programs from including students from outside the school district, given that their program would then be placed at a gross disadvantage to many of the college-aged independent organizations. They are faced with the decision to take away opportunities for students to perform who otherwise would like to by closing off membership to anyone from outside of the school district, or risk losing the financial, facility and scheduling support of their district.

The current wording of the rule hampers the growth of young programs in areas where winter guard is not as widespread. It leads to the exclusion of students from lower socioeconomic families that can not afford the fees of an independent group, or students who are geographically isolated from those groups. It discourages programs from including students who could benefit from inclusion in a winter program. The rule should be reworded in a way that honors the intention of the rule but allows for students who are unable to perform otherwise, to do so without penalizing the group that opens their doors to them.

**Financial Impact:** There is not a direct financial impact on WGI. For circuits, this may generate more membership as units will be able to open up their doors to more members, thereby increasing revenue for the circuits. For scholastic units, this will allow them to grow their membership numbers and increase their income.

## Proposal #13

**Increase A and Open class performer limit to 40**

*Submitted by Andria Foerch, Paramount Winterguard*

**Rationale:** A and Open class have a performer limit of 32 while World class has a limit of 40. This change would make it equitable across all classes and benefit any units who are able to field up to 40 performers.

**Financial Impact:** Minimal (increase in awards volume for those groups who are able to field up to 40).

### **Proposal #14**

**Increase the maximum numbers of performers for all classes to 40.**

*Submitted by Donald Flaherty, GOLD Winter Guard*

**Rationale:** 1. To give more students the opportunity to perform in A Class and Open Class.  
2. More members on the performance stage, enable the costs for all members to be lowered.  
3. New hourly state minimum wage requirements for all staff members, will drive many guards out of business. Increasing the number of performers helps to cover these new pay state mandated pay rates.

**Financial Impact:** Increasing the number of performers increases revenues for all performing groups and the number of fans who attend shows. Positive financial impact for WGI, WGI organizations and show hosts.

### **Proposal #15**

**Restore Rules 5.1, 5.3, and 5.5 to their pre-Covid versions, as stated in the 2020 Adjudication Manual. This restores Minimum Performance Times and Minimum Authorized Equipment Times to their prior thresholds.**

*Submitted by WGI Color Guard Steering Committee*

**Rationale:** 2022 offered a grace period for color guards to recruit and train their membership on authorized equipment. Rule 5.5 reminds us of the DNA of our activity which separates us from other performance arts and our marching arts cousins. These Minimum Times ensure the integrity of our efforts and the "Activity".

**Financial Impact:** None

### **Proposal #16**

**The minimum performance time for A and Scholastic A classes will be lowered to 3 minutes 30 seconds. The minimum equipment time requirement will be changed to 3 minutes.**

*Submitted by Kate Alstadt, A. A. Stagg HS Winter Guard*

**Rationale:** The A class is intended to be focused on training and development. Shortening the show length requirement will allow teams to spend more time on technique training with better regularity without having to worry about filling and cleaning a longer shower.

The shorter time limit also significantly increases music selection options without having to find ways to stretch the soundtrack via means that may not be most beneficial for the production (repeating sections, unnecessary voiceovers, etc.). In a class where appropriate music selection is critical (something achievable to the ability of the performers in the class), having more music options would be beneficial.

**Financial Impact:** None



## **Proposal #17**

**Make the elimination of Minimum Performance Time and Authorized Equipment Time, as applied in the 2022 season, permanent. Maximum Performance Times and Interval Times remain the same.**

**Rule 5.1 - remain as published in the 2022 CG Manual**

**Rule 5.3 - amend to read "No minimum performance time is required."**

**Rule 5.5 - amend to read "No minimum equipment time is required."**

*Submitted by Lauren Moffatt Burns, South Winter Guard*

### **Rationale:**

It is possible to provide a meaningful, educational performance opportunity, even with less time in the production. This was made evident from both the 2021 virtual season and the 2022 live season, when a number of groups chose to take advantage of the elimination of minimum times. From an adjudication perspective, there can still be plenty of content to evaluate given a shorter show. If a show is so short that there is not enough content to evaluate through time, that can become a point of comparison, but it would be a competitive liability consciously chosen by the designer. "No minimum time" gives designers and educators more latitude to create a performance curriculum that is best suited to the needs of their members. It could also contribute to the survivability of many programs, especially in the A class and below, who are struggling to come back after a time when they have suffered losses in membership or were forced to go inactive.

There were a number of exceptional performance vehicles in the past two seasons that would have fallen short under the former timing rules. An analysis of the length of performance times at the 2022 World Championships by class is as follows:

#### Scholastic A # of Performances Under 4:00

Number of Entries:	96	21 representing 21.88% of Preliminary Performances
Semi-Finalists:	56	9 representing 16.07% of Semifinalists
Finalists:	20	3 representing 15.00% of Finalists

#### Independent A # of Performances Under 4:00

Number of Entries:	63	13 representing 20.63% of Preliminary Performances
Semi-Finalists:	36	5 representing 13.89% of Semifinalists
Finalists:	15	3 representing 20.00% of Finalists

#### Independent Open # of Performances Under 4:00

Number of Entries:	32	2 representing 6.25% of Preliminary Performances
Semi-Finalists:	24	1 representing 4.17% of Semifinalists
Finalists:	15	0 representing 0.00% of Finalists

\*Performances at the World Championships in all other classes were over 4 minutes Performance Time. All time data is from preliminary events.

Most notably, the Silver Medalist in the Scholastic A class had a Performance time well under 4:00. Clearly the elimination of minimum time was not a competitive liability for them.

In an effort to attract more members, some teams may choose to use popular music. The average length of a popular song has been declining. According to Fortune Magazine, the average song length on the Billboard Hot 100 chart in 2019 was 3:30, which is 20 seconds shorter than it had been in 2014. In fact, the average song length in 2019 was one minute and 13 seconds shorter than 20 years prior.

A four-minute minimum can create a creative burden on programs who choose popular music as they must often engineer additional content. Eliminating the minimum time would allow designers to focus more on what success looks like for them, rather than adding counts simply to add time.

If a unit chooses to include more equipment or performance time than is required, this could become a point of differentiation that helps set them apart from their competitors, just as less time could become a liability if all things are equal. We already see this occurring in our activity as the Minimum Performance & Equipment Times for all classes A and above are the same, yet most Open and World productions are much longer.

Finally, the elimination of the minimum time requirements will help those units in the Regional A class who may be “on the bubble” between Regional A and A. As it was in 2019 and prior, the minimum times for RA were 30 seconds less than the A class. This meant that if a unit was promoted during the season from RA to A, they had to be sophisticated enough to add time to their show, or to have had the foresight to have programmed the extra time in advance in case of promotion. Realizing that most local circuits follow WGI rules, and that the majority of the country’s color guards compete at the Regional A level and below, it is interesting that the burden of minimum time changes from class to class falls most heavily on the shoulders of these color guards, who tend to have less experienced designers and staff.

Since there is no proposed change to the Maximum Performance Times and Interval Times, units who wish may continue designing productions which would fall under the former timing rules.

This proposal is open to possible amendments, including a reduction in the minimum times rather than their elimination.

**Financial Impact:** None to WGI, local circuits, or show hosts; possible savings for units who may not need to incur additional sound design fees or whose fees may be slightly reduced based on length of production.