



## PROPOSALS from Membership 2009

No	Proposer	Rule/ Operation	Proposal	Reason for Change	Financial Implication
1	W Chumley Education Director	New Operation	<b>Show Ordinals on the Recap</b> Use a tabulation program that will show ordinals. Note: I sent the CGN version to Mark/Alan earlier this year and we could easily get the spreadsheet from Brian Yothers again.	<b>Recaps don't show ordinals.</b> Showing subcaption rankings will provide valuable information to both the units and to the judges. This information is vital to ongoing discussions and to the improved skills of the judges.	<b>No financial implication.</b>
2	W Chumley Education Director	New Operation	<b>Hold a Prelim/Final Contest Midseason</b> Have at least one prelim/final contest during the regular competition season. This could be at the Stoke show.	<b>All season shows are prelims only.</b> Holding the midseason regional would make for a "special" and different show during the season. This format would allow for some excitement midseason. Granted, not all units might attend but we could make this show a requirement for the Opens as we did this year.	Would cost more for venue rental, but that could be offset by revenue from ticket sales.
3	W Chumley Education Director	New Operation	<b>Provide instructor feedback shows, or guest commentators, for shows.</b> This could be handled by class, or for the entire show schedule. If we swapped the show order (for example, the Opens going first at a show), then those instructors would be free to provide comments for the other classes. Of course, you may achieve similar results by using instructors whose units are not at a particular show. This might be an interesting idea to combine with the midseason regional whereby one class would receive comments only during the "prelim" and then compete in "finals."	<b>All shows are competitions only.</b> This would allow WGUK to provide an expanded service to any class that needs the information. It leverages the existing talent in the instructor community in a new way.	<b>No financial implication.</b>

4	<b>W Chumley Education Director</b>	<b>Current Operation.</b> Performance order is seeded based on previous scores (after the first two shows of the season which are currently randomised based on post mark order).	<b>Remove seeding</b> Remove seeding at all regular season shows.	Removing the seeding ensures that every team receives consistent and equal treatment at every show. Removing the seeding ensures that the judges rank and rate every unit regardless of their appearance order. It forces the judges to “work hard” and to “work equally” for every unit. Removing the seeding ensures that the units not ranked at the top have a chance to rehearse longer and to performer later in the day. Removing the seeding encourages the audience to arrive earlier and to support all units.	<b>No financial implication.</b>
5	<b>W Chumley Education Director</b>	<b>Current Operation.</b> Performance order is seeded based on previous scores (after the first two shows of the season which are currently randomised based on post mark order).	<b>Performance Order at Finals</b> Remove seeding for Open preliminary at Finals if the class contains eight (8) or fewer teams. Remove seeding for Cadet, Junior, and A Championship if the class contains eight (8) or fewer teams. If any class contains more than eight (8) units for preliminary or championship, then the class will be divided into thirds based on the current seeding method. Within those thirds, the performance order will be randomised. For example, based on seeding for a class of 12 we might see a performance order of 10-9-11-12-7-5-6-8-1-2-4-3. Randomise any playoff as occurs today. Open Finals will appear in reverse order of score from the preliminary.	Removing the seeding ensures that every team receives consistent and equal treatment at every show. Removing the seeding ensures that the judges rank and rate every unit regardless of their appearance order. It forces the judges to “work hard” and to “work equally” for every unit. Removing the seeding ensures that the units not ranked at the top have a chance to rehearse longer and to performer later in the day. Removing the seeding encourages the audience to arrive earlier and to support all units. Removing the seeding at Finals ensures consistency across all competitions.	<b>No financial implication.</b>
6	<b>M Ibbs Kidsgrove Scouts</b>	<b>Rule 1.5</b> Musicians and musical instruments must be static whilst playing/performing. Proficiency of such playing shall not be judged.	Remove the rule / wording of musical instruments in rule 1.5 to allow the use of musical instruments.	The rule was changed to " static" for 09 yet this rule was broken and allowed during the 09 season. It could also stifle creativity in the future.	<b>No financial implication.</b>

7	<b>M Ibbs Kidsgrove Scouts</b>	<b>Rule 1.5</b> If musicians are used the total number must not exceed four and their ages must be consistent with Rule 1.1.	Remove associated age rule for any musician used within each class, to allow open age for musician used.	Restricts the use in lower classes.	<b>No financial implication.</b>
8	<b>M Ibbs Kidsgrove Scouts</b>	<b>Current Operation</b> At present random draw used for the first show and then seeded order there after using average of there last two shows.	For all units to perform in a random order during the season, bar finals for open class which would then use there prelim score.	Puts more pressure on the judges to judge the show of the day rather than to run with seeded order.	<b>No financial implication.</b>
9	<b>M Ibbs Kidsgrove Scouts</b>	<b>New Operation</b>	Add mid season power regional to the calendar using prelims and finals for the show. finals would be performed in prelims seeding. This could be either percentage through to finals / above a score level or every one through dependent on amount of applications for this event.	This would help build the season into the second half run to finals.	<b>No financial implication.</b>
10	<b>M Ibbs Kidsgrove Scouts</b>	<b>New Operation</b>	To use a double panel where / if available for all championship finals.	This would remove any concern that certain judges would favour certain units.	<b>No financial implication.</b>
11	<b>M Ibbs Kidsgrove Scouts</b>	<b>Rule 5.5</b> Penalties relating to timing offences will be at the rate of 1/10 point for every 3 seconds or part thereof unless otherwise stated (over a maximum or under a minimum timing requirement).	Add a specific penalty rule for any unit under time during the season where a minimum performance time is stated. The penalty should be propotional to the amount of un-performed time. i.e. Minimum time= 4mins, guard performs for 3mins, final score is reduced by 25%.	An unfair advantage could be gained by performing a show under time i.e. cleaner with no come back from the system.	<b>No financial implication.</b>

12	<b>Matt Johnson Judge</b>	<b>Rule 3.1 Time Limits</b> Add New Rule 3.1.6 During shows scheduled in the month of January only, guards shall not be penalized for having a performance time less than the minimum stated above.	That penalties for minimum performance time be waived for January shows. This is roughly in line with the change passed by the 2009 WGI Advisory Board, waiving minimum performance time and minimum equipment time penalties for the first two Regional weekends.	Many units are still developing their productions in January. Penalizing units in this development phase, and who are likely aware that their production is incomplete, is not helpful. The judging system already has scope to deal with incompleteness, particularly in the early stages of the season. The implementation of this rule change would not adversely affect units who are coming to the season with full-length productions. Units which do come in under the minimum performance time should be informed of this, but no penalty should be applied.	<b>No financial implication.</b>
13	<b>SK</b>	<b>New Operation</b>	Basically, the suggestion is that any guard's performance at each show they take part in contributes a given percentage of your overall score going in to finals. In other words, guards will go to finals already having a score that they have carried forward from previous performances. The actual percentage could be determined by the board, but we would suggest between 10% and 20% of the total.	<b>Advantages;</b> - guards have to put a better show out earlier to avoid low scores early on - each show carries more weight, the results mean more - it encourages better turn out at each show, more income for organisers - it should even out "rogue" scores at finals and reduce the risk of winners all season being overturned at finals <b>Disadvantages;</b> - guards could give up if they do really badly early on - finals could be less of an "event" in a given class if a guard runs away with it	<b>No financial implication.</b>
14	<b>Matt Johnson Judge</b>	<b>Rule 6.1</b> A full explanation of the judging system and methods employed for the judging of all Classes is to be found in the current WGUK booklet "The Winterguard Judging System".	Remove Rule	This booklet does not exist. References to the WGUK judging sheets and possibly the WGI Judging System rulebook would better serve here.	<b>No financial implication.</b>

15	<b>Matt Johnson Individual</b>	<b>Code of Conduct</b> "When participating in the Olympic Retreat and Award Ceremonies, you should portray a professional image by not talking, marching with dignity, pride and in unit with other Guards and above all by standing still when at attention or parade rest - even if you win!"	<b>Revise wording</b>	I think there is agreement regarding the spirit of the Code of Conduct in general, including behaviour on retreat in as far as not being "bad winners" or "bad losers". However, this particular section above strikes me as being from a bygone age. I am not sure of a concrete change to this rule, but acknowledgement that the retreat/awards ceremony should be a good-natured celebration of the day and our activity would be a more realistic and reasonable expectation.	<b>No financial implication.</b>
16	<b>Matt Johnson Judge</b>	<b>Current Operation:</b> At the moment, all communications between judges and instructors must pass via the instructor's guard director and the judging caption head.	Allow direct communication between individual instructors and individual judges during the competitive season.	We currently make it too difficult for instructors to contact judges during the season to seek feedback. The current system means that any feedback received is seldom timely, and it is my understanding that during the 2009 season -- through no fault of anyone -- there have been instances where requests from instructors for clarification from judges did not reach their intended recipient. Instructors and judges must have mutual respect for each others' roles in the activity, with both having the ultimate aim of ensuring the best education and results for our performers. It is time that, as a community, we show trust in each others' integrity, rather than continuing the cumbersome "protective" methodology used in recent years. There should be a check-and-balance system in place; possibly having emails copied to the judging caption head for reference or notifications of phone calls between judges and instructors.	<b>No financial implication.</b>
17	<b>NAPA</b>	<b>Current Operation:</b> The winterguard board consists of the following elected representatives: Chairperson Deputy Chairperson 3 Board members	To increase the number of additional board member places from 3 to 5	To allow for a wider representation of the membership	slight additional costs in running of the activity.