

# Tournament of Bands

Rules Congress  
2008

2008 Rules Congress

Sunday, March 2, 2008

**Holiday Inn Denver, PA**

- 11:00 – 11:40      Roll call of chapters and identification  
                             voting participants  
                             State of the Chapters  
                             *Brief review of chapter activities*
- 11:40 – 12:20      NJA / Caption review  
                             *NJA Director*  
                             *Business Manager*  
                             *Caption supervisors*  
   *(Music, Visual, Percussion,*  
   *Drum Major, T & P)*  
                             *Education Director*
- 12:20 – 1:20      By-Law proposals  
                             *7 proposals submitted*
- BREAK*
- 1:40 – 3:30      Rule proposals  
                             *18 proposals submitted*
- 3:30 – 3:45      Concluding remarks

## 2008 RULES CONGRESS PROCEDURES

### Proposals

By-Law proposals will be considered first  
Rule proposals will be considered second  
Proposals will be considered in the order of proposal number, unless the group prefers otherwise.

### Steps in Considering Proposals

- 1) Proposal sponsor will explain why the proposal should be considered. A three minute time limit is imposed on this explanation.
- 2) The group will be asked if there is interest in considering the proposal. This will be done by a demonstration of consensus.
- 3) If the consensus is that the proposal is to be considered, a motion will be entertained to approve the proposal. Following a second to the motion, discussion will take place.
- 4) A vote on the motion will be taken after discussion. Discussion may be limited to ten (10) minutes and may be lengthened by consensus of the group. A majority vote is necessary to pass a proposal. Majority is one more than half of the eligible voters present at the meeting. Each chapter is entitled to two votes, if two representatives are present.
- 5) If the language of the proposal is amended or edited, two options will be available:
  - a. The individuals making and seconding the motion can agree to the changes and amend their motion, or
  - b. The proposal can be voted down, and reintroduced in an amended form.

## 2008 Tournament of Bands Rules Congress Summary

Twenty-five (25) proposals have been submitted as follows:

Bylaw	Number of proposals	Summary of Proposals	Outcome (vote)
New Posting of recaps	1	Score recaps from all contests should be posted for all to read.	
3 Supervisory Duties	1	Include that caption supervisors play a role in judging assignments.	
7 Fees	1	Increase the annual dues for membership	
10 Contest Rules	1	Provide wording to allow for festival or other non-competitive participation	
16 Qualified Judges	1	Publish a list of qualified judges Distribute a contest's judging panel 24 hours before the show	
18 Championship Judging Selection	1	Provides for Chapter Coordinator input and approval into Chapter Championship assignments. Provides for ACC selection by Caption Supervisors and Judging Coordinator	
28 Schedule Of Field Contests	1	Limits the number of participating bands in a single contest to 15 bands.	
1 Group Size	6	The number of participants in each Group Size is to be considered. New models are proposed for performance Divisions within a Group Size.	
2 Travel Reimbursement	1	Change to "Expense" reimbursement, and change how it is done.	
7 Placement/Retrieval Of Equipment	1	Change wording to make more clear.	
11 Entrance Exit	3	Allow the pit to enter when the previous pit clears, and not be part of block time. Change time limits to set only a 10 minute maximum, no minimum. No timing penalties until October.	
15 Amplification	1	Allow voice recordings/narrations but no music or rhythm recordings.	
18 Judges' meetings	2	Change which staff members may attend meetings.	
20 Scoring	4	Change box point allocation; Combine GE; Include percussion and auxiliary; create task force to study the issue.	

#\_\_1\_\_                      Bylaw # \_\_\_\_NEW\_\_                      Rule #\_\_\_\_\_

Submitted by: \_\_Chapter 2 \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name/Chapter)

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-
2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –

A profile sheet may not be the truest reflection of what a band achieved at a certain contest. A band's individual scores may be skewed one way or the other, depending on the other groups in attendance that evening. By allowing everyone to see each band's scores, they can develop a better understanding of why a band scored what they did.

3. Proposal –

Within 48 hours of a contest finishing, a full recap (including subcaption breakdowns and judge's names) will be made available for viewing by the TOB & NJA membership.

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

We have some of the best band programs in the Northeast within our membership. This would give everyone involved a way to compare multiple aspects of a competitive program from week to week as opposed to just the final score.

From a larger scope, this also puts a program's weaknesses in plain view as well, and can give a staff's additional information (beyond the tapes) as they plan each week of their season.

Publicizing the breakdown of a score is done in most subjective scoring activities – drum corps, figure skating, swimming, and other national & regional marching band circuits. Spectators and competitors alike should be able to know why Band X beat Band Y by 0.1 – was it music, visual, or a combination? This then allows those programs to educate their spectators (ie, parents), as to how the judging system works.

# 2

Bylaw # 3

Submitted by: CHAPTER 10

1. Existing bylaw:  
SUPERVISORY DUTIES: CAPTION SUPERVISORS
  
2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –  
TO ADD A STATEMENT ON WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR JUDGE ASSIGNMENTS  
TO THE TOB CONTESTS.
  
3. Proposal –  
ADD LETTER E. THAT STATS: WILL FACILITATE ALL JUDGING ASSIGNMENTS  
TO BOTH THE REGULAR SEASON AND THE CHAMPIONSHIPS.
  
4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –  
CURRENTLY THERE IS NO MENTION ON WHO PERFORMS AND/OR SHOULD  
PERFORM THIS FUNCTION ETC.

# \_\_3\_\_

Bylaw # 7

Submitted by: Regional Directors

1. Existing bylaw:

Fees

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to

Help establish financial stability of chapters

3. Proposal

Consider raising the dues from the current \$25 (perhaps to \$100)

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

The \$25 dues assessment has been in place for many years.

# \_\_4\_\_

Bylaw # 10

Submitted by: Regional Directors

1. Existing bylaw:

Contest Rules

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to

Clarify that units may participate in contests without being scored for competition.

3. Proposal

Add: Bands may choose to participate in a TOB sanctioned show without being scored for placement. In these instances, festival evaluation sheets may be used; taped commentary may be provided; scores may be given, but not reported; or a band may, simply, perform in exhibition.

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

Encourage and allow traditionally non-competitive bands to take part in the performance venue.



#\_\_5\_\_

Bylaw # \_\_16\_\_

Submitted by: \_\_Chapter 2\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name/Chapter)

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-

None – this is a new bylaw

NOTE: Proposal may fit in By-Law 16.

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –

Lack of current, updated information (available to instructors) on the list of judges that NJA assigns to their contests

3. Proposal –

NJA will develop a contact list of all qualified judges that are signed up for a competitive season. This list will include, at the very least, their name, phone number, email address, and any biographical information the judge wants to provide. The list will be published (either in print form or electronically) sometime after the summer clinic but before the first sanctioned event of the season.

At least 24 hours in advance of a show, the judging panel for that weekend will be published. It is the responsibility of the chapter coordinator (of the chapter the show is in) to provide the judging panel each weekend to all bands signed up. These will be provided to the band director at least 24 hours in advance of a show. Band directors should understand that unforeseen circumstances may alter a panel, and last minute changes sometimes are unavoidable.

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

This is a subjective activity that tries to be as objective as possible. Most – if not all – judging activities (including other marching circuits in the northeast) publish their panels for the community to see. As the activity continues to grow and evolve, new judges and directors become involved, and others step away. There has been a lot of turnover in the past few years in this regard, and this should be seen as a way of educating both ends of the spectrum as to who ends up being involved.

There are also more and more instructors who are stepping into the judging realm (and vice versa). This can always lead to accusations of bias of one program over another. Publishing names of qualified judges can add another step of accountability to the current judging system.

# \_\_6\_\_

Bylaw # 18

Submitted by: CHAPTER 10

1. Existing Rule:  
CHAMPIONSHIP JUDGE SELECTION
  
2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address  
TO PROPERLY WORD THE STATEMENT ON HOW SELECTIONS ARE ACTUALLY ACCOMPLISHED.
  
3. Proposal –  
CHANGE THE SECOND TO LAST SENTENCE TO READ: CHAPTER COORDINATORS MUST BE CONSULTED AND GIVE APPROVAL OF THE ALTERNATIVE SELECTION (S) PRIOR TO THE CONTEST. CHANGE LAST SENTENCE TO READ: JUDGES WILL BE SELECTED FOR BOTH CHAPTER AND ATLANTIC COAST CHAMPIONSHIP BY THE CAPTION SUPERVISORS AND THE JUDGING COORDINATOR
  
4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –  
IN AN EFFORT TO AVOID ANY MEMBER CONCERNS WITH JUDGES BEING ASSIGNED TO THE CHAPTER CHAMPIONSHIP WHO HAVE NOT BEEN IN CHAPTER (IN OUR CASE THIS YEAR THERE WERE 5) HAVING CONSULTATION AND APPROVAL FROM THE CHAPTER COORDINATOR COULD AND SHOULD HELP ELIMINATE ANY POTENTIAL PROBLEM WITH THE ASSIGNMENTS. THE LAST SENTENCE, AS IS, DOES NOT APPEAR PRACTICAL –IT HAS THE CHAPTER HEADS AND THE REGION DIRECTORS INVOLVED IN CHAMPIONSHIP SELECTION –THIS ALMOST CANNOT BE DONE AND IN OUR OPINION IS NOT NECESSARY.

#\_\_7\_\_

Bylaw # \_\_28\_\_

Submitted by: Stephen L. Straka/Chapter 2\_\_\_\_\_

(Name/Chapter)

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-  
By-Law 28 addresses “Schedule of Field Contests”, but does not address this specific issue.
  
2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –  
Marching band programs hosting home show competitions should limit the number of bands participating at each event, to allow all schools interested in hosting a competition a fair and equal chance of having a successful home show due to the limited time frame during the fall season.
  
3. Proposal –  
Limit the number of participating units to 15 bands per music festival or competition.
  
4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –  
To allow a more even distribution of performing ensembles across several competition festivals scheduled for the same date.

Submitted by: CHAPTER 10

1. Existing Rule –  
RULE CONCERNING GROUP SIZES
  
2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –  
GROUP ONE (1), .AS AN EXAMPLE CAN GO FROM 10 TO 35 MEMBERS WHICH HAS A DEFINITE BUILT IN DISADVANTAGE AS OPPOSED TO GROUP 2 (AND OTHER LARGER GROUPS WHERE 37 PLAYERS CAN COMPETE WITH 47 PLAYERS AND THE DIFFERENCES ARE NOT QUITE AS TOUGH TO DEALWITH ETC.)
  
3. Proposal –  
CHAPTER 10 RECOMMENDS REVISITING THIS ISSUE TO SEE IF A COMPROMISE CAN BE MADE TO BREAK GROUP ONE INTO TWO SECTIONS EX. 0 TO 20 MEMBERS GROUP B; 21 TO 35 MEMBERS GROUP A.
  
4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –  
THIS WOULD ALLOW FOR PROGRAMS WITH A LIMITED ENROLLMENT AND STUDENT RESOURCE TO BE ABLE TO COMPETE WITH A CHANCE AT ACC'S. THIS GROUP, WHICH CAN BE VIEWED AS A BUILDING BLOCK TO A BETTER AND BIGGER PROGRAM NEEDS TOB ENCOUGED IN THE INITIAL INFANT STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT. – AN EXAMPLE IN OUR CHAPTER WOULD BE RED BANK CATHOLIC WHO YEAR AFTER PUTS OUT A REALLY NEAT AND EFFECTIVE SHOW BUT DUE TO SIZE LIMITATION AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES CANNOT BREAK INTO THE TOP 25 CONSISTANTLY AGAINST THE LARGER GROUP 1 UNITS – THERE ARE MANY BANDS ALL OVER TOB WITH THE SAME PROBLEM.

# 9 Rule # 1

Submitted by: Chapter 2  
(Name/Chapter)

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-

1. GROUP SIZES:

Bands will be grouped according to the number of players in the band proper as follows:

Group 1 - up to 35 musicians and a maximum of 35 auxiliary

Group 2 - 36 to 55 musicians and a maximum of 55 auxiliary

Group 3 - 56 to 80 musicians and a maximum of 80 auxiliary

Group 4 - 81 or greater

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –

Group size has become antiquated based on the size of bands

3. Proposal –

1. GROUP SIZES:

Bands will be grouped according to the number of players in the band proper as follows:

Group 1 - up to 30 musicians and a maximum of 35 auxiliary

Group 2 - 31 to 50 musicians and a maximum of 55 auxiliary

Group 3 - 51 to 80 musicians and a maximum of 80 auxiliary

Group 4 - 81 or greater

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

To allow groups to compete with the declining membership

#\_10\_\_\_ Rule # 1

Submitted by: CHAPTER 4

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-

GROUP SIZES:

Bands will be grouped according to the number of players in the band proper as follows:

Group 1 - up to 35 musicians and a maximum of 35 auxiliary

Group 2 - 36 to 55 musicians and a maximum of 55 auxiliary

Group 3 - 56 to 80 musicians and a maximum of 80 auxiliary

Group 4 - 81 or greater

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –

Classification of bands for competition – more equal distribution

3. Proposal –

GROUP SIZES:

Bands will be grouped according to the number of players in the band proper as follows:

Group 1 - up to 30 musicians and a maximum of 30 auxiliary

Group 2 - 31 to 50 musicians and a maximum of 50 auxiliary

Group 3 - 51 to 75 musicians and a maximum of 75 auxiliary

Group 4 – 76 or greater / 76 to 100\*

\* Add Group 5 – 100 or greater for the ACC only – the Group 4-5 Championship would be scheduled as previous Group 4, but split as 4-5 to allow for the greater variations of Group 4 bands to occur at ACC

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

Allow for more equal distribution of band sizes within TOB

Increase the number of bands in Groups 2-3-4

#\_\_11\_\_

Rule # 1 (?)

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_CHAPTER 4

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-

GROUP SIZES:

Bands will be grouped according to the number of players in the band proper as follows:

Group 1 - up to 35 musicians and a maximum of 35 auxiliary

Group 2 - 36 to 55 musicians and a maximum of 55 auxiliary

Group 3 - 56 to 80 musicians and a maximum of 80 auxiliary

Group 4 - 81 or greater

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –

Classification of bands for competition – add a “B Division” to each Group Size – allowing less competitive groups to attend and participate

3. Proposal –

Create 2 competitive levels of bands in each GROUP SIZE – A & B (someone can be creative with names?)

DIVISION A – bands that compete on a regular basis and follow the current scoring system in place for TOB, no change

DIVISION B – bands that are exploring the arena of marching band competition, or have limited resources and prefer to participate on a limited basis

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

A – bands would continue to compete and participate in TOB events as they have in the past

B – bands will compete in 2 minimum and 4 maximum contests during the fall season and complete their season at the chapter championship level. Scoring is based on TOB system, but bands receive to bronze/silver/gold awards without announcement/publication of numerical scores

No change of scoring, no new sheets, just an schedule and announcement procedure change for the host bands – B Division competes prior to A Division

Bands selecting B Division would remain in the B Division for the season – no promotion

This allows bands to be introduced to the TOB system, and the scoring that we offer. It also allows bands to explore and grow in the system without the pressure(self or school) to win or score better than a neighboring band. It matches a festival type plan, but does not change they way bands are scored. Limiting the season eliminates the need for promotion to another class – but allows a championship option at the chapter level. Bands that elect B Division are probably not the bands that would qualify for, or plan to attend, ACC under the current system

Submitted by: CHAPTER 6

1. Existing Rule:

Group size

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address

The overall sizes of our marching bands are decreasing as proven in the study commissioned by the last Rules Congress. By adjusting the group size ranges, we will provide more equity and fairness in the competing groups, especially in Group I

3. Proposal

Amend the Group Sizes as follows:

Group I – up to 30 musicians and a maximum of 20 auxiliary

Group II – 31 – 50 musicians and a maximum of 30 auxiliary

Group III – 51 – 75 musicians and a maximum of 40 auxiliary

Group IV – 76 or greater (no limit to auxiliary)

4. Explanation of rationale for the proposal

The current climate of change within the marching band community sees a gradual decline in participation in the marching band activity. Along with this decline is a severe reduction in auxiliary participation. By the rule's current wording, it is possible for Group I bands to compete with units having 2 or almost 3 times as many students. This puts many of our developing organizations at an extreme disadvantage (Similar situations can be found in other groups, but not nearly as severe or frequent).

This change should more accurately put groups with worthy competitors on a more "even playing field".

It should be noted that unites may still elect to compete in a higher class, but may not participate in a class where they exceed the maximum of either number.



#\_\_13\_\_

Rule #\_\_\_\_Possibly an addition to Field Rule 1

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_Chapter One\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name/Chapter)

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-

None

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –

There has been a constant decline in the number of bands in Tournament of Bands over the past five years. There is a market for a competitive strata beyond what is currently offered in TOB. There needs to be an avenue of competition that meets the needs of bands who may be limited in facilities, staff, finances, or scope and sequence of district's vision for the high school marching band.

3. Proposal –

See following

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

See following

A CLASS and OPEN CLASS Proposal

Version 3

Possible addition to Field Rule 1

Definition:

TOB will offer two competitive strata for scholastic marching bands. The Open Class would showcase the highest level of design and performance in the circuit. Not every program has the same financial resources, staff accessibility, or competitive goals and objectives. The "A" Class is designed to service a different group of competitors with limiting and developing programs. Unique circumstances may exist. There needs to be a competitive arena offered that services this unique group of bands. Both classes would be offered at all shows to provide the maximum opportunities for competition.

Scholastic A Class criteria:

- IA/EA music and visual focus on training / positive reinforcement for success
- GE focus on communication and performance entertainment / positive reinforcement
- Competitive Strata:
  - New TOB member

- Returning TOB after not competing in TOB in 2007
- Did not make top 15 of 2007 Atlantic Coast Championships (I, II, III)
- Did not make top 10 of 2007 Atlantic Coast Championships (IV)

#### Scoring Parameters:

- Both A and Open Class score sheets are identical in wording. There would be no extra cost to NJA or TOB for printing. A simple check box could be added to the bottom of each sheet to indicate A or Open class, if desired.
- The emphasis and priority in scoring the A class bands is training and technical achievement. Design components are secondary to developing strong training basis and excellent performance skills. The HOW takes precedent over the WHAT in ALL captions.
- The elements of design and generation of effect are major components of the Open Class. The WHAT components are directly influenced by the HOW components. This is NO CHANGE from the adjudication philosophy we currently use.
- Judges will be trained by caption managers on the tolerance of the two scoring systems. This is the same as TIA works in the indoor season with its A classes.

#### Performance order:

Group I      “A” class followed by “OPEN” class bands  
 Group II     “A” class followed by “OPEN” class bands  
 Group III    “A” class followed by “OPEN” class bands  
 Group IV     “A” class followed by “OPEN” class bands

#### Promotion:

Any band wishing to attend the 2008 Atlantic Coast Championships must compete at least once by the second weekend of October. This will allow for any A Class band to be evaluated (if necessary) for promotion.

During the season an A CLASS band may be promoted to the OPEN CLASS by a meeting of a committee consisting of the Chapter Coordinator, Visual and Music Caption Heads, Education Director, and Regional Directors. This may also be handled as a conference call. The band recommended for promotion must be significantly ahead of the competitive strata of the A CLASS at the end of the second weekend of October.

An A CLASS band will be promoted for the 2009 season by attaining a raw score of 90.0 by at the 2008 ACC Championships.

#### Impact to TOB and Programs:

NO IMPACT or CHANGE on the TOB ACC (OPEN) Championships.

“A” Class is designed to service a different, unique group of competitors with special needs.

Impact to show sponsor is minimal. Trophies would be redistributed to reflect the appropriate classifications. Judges fees would not be impacted.

The only result could be more bands involved in each chapter resulting in more bands attending local shows.

Bands must still declare their intentions to attend the Atlantic Coast Championships by a certain date (October 1?) as in the past.

# \_\_14\_\_

Rule # 2

Submitted by: CHAPTER 6

1. Existing Rule:

Travel reimbursement

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address

Some of our bands have been forced to forfeit ticket moneys to their local school districts to pay for buses and other travel. The bands had been using these moneys for incidentals such as equipment repair, purchase, uniform drycleaning, etc.

3. Proposal

Change the heading to EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT

TOB members will be reimbursed for a portion of their marching band expenses in a combinations of total cash and/or adult tickets. If a sponsor..... Prior to the start of the competition season, individual chapters can elect not to do the expense reimbursement for chapter contests and members only. Any TOB member outside that chapter will receive the reimbursement according to the chart below.....

4. Explanation of rationale for the proposal

It is our hope, that by changing the wording of the rule, eliminating the word "travel", the school districts cannot legitimately ask the bands to give back ticket proceeds to the district. The spirit of the rule and the implementation will not change.

# \_\_\_15\_

Rule # 7

Submitted by: CHAPTER 10

1. Existing Rule :  
PLACEMENT/RETRIEVAL OF EQUIPMENT
  
2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –  
STATEMENT IN RULE NEEDS TO BE MODIFIED (WORD SMITHING ETC)
  
3. Proposal –  
ELIMINATE PHRASE IN 2<sup>ND</sup> PARAGRAPH LAST SENTENCE THAT READS:  
“REGARDLESS OF CONDITIONS ” (CHANGE TO READ: “NO PARENTS MAY  
ENTER THE FIELD”).
  
4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –  
LEAVING IT AS IS WOULD SEEM LIKE A CONFLICT WITH BY-LAW 27 THAT  
STATS THAT THE CHIEF JUDGE CAN ALTER OR CHANGE A RULE IF IT IS  
NECESSARY FOR SAFETY (EXAMPLE WIND & PROPS ETC)

Submitted by: Mr. Thomas Kershaw, Jr. / Chapter I  
(Name/Chapter)

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-

11. ENTRANCE - PERFORMANCE - EXIT TIMING:

Each band will be given a block time of 14 minutes. During the block, announcements will be made, each band will enter, present the performance, and exit. The logical conclusion of the visual and music performance must be a minimum of seven (7) minutes and a maximum of ten (10) minutes. A description of this must be included in the declarations. Performance timing will start with the first step or note of music by any performer other than the commanding officer, following the salute. All playing and maneuvering must cease by the 10 minute mark. All judging will continue to the obvious conclusion of the performance. Appropriate penalties will be assessed if the performance is under or over the required performance time. The penalty shall be assessed at 0.5 points for every 15 seconds or part thereof over or under time. Each band may use the balance of the block time to enter and exit the competition field. The timing of the block time will start when the Timing & Penalty judge signals the band (set at a designated spot just outside the perimeter of the field) to enter the field and the pit to enter the track area. The timing of the block time will stop when the last member exits the perimeter of the competition field, as outlined in Rule # 5 and the pit has cleared the pit area at the "0"/ goal yard line. The block time may stop if a special situation, such as announcer or judge delay, warrants.

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –

- Lack of bands participating in early season TOB shows.
- Lack of TOB shows running 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> weeks of September.
- Directors & Staffs putting students in poor performance situations to avoid timing penalties.

3. Proposal –

- Bands are to be given timing warnings until the weekend of shows that begin the band's profile.
- From the first week that begins a band's profile, timing penalties should be assessed.

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

- Many bands do not participate in early and mid-September shows due to being incomplete.
- Other circuits have very successful early season shows due to the lack of minimum performance timing penalties.
- Bands would be more willing to participate in early and mid-September shows knowing that they would not be penalized and would be able to be evaluated on what they choose to present.
- TOB would be able to have more participation in the early and mid-September part of the season.
- TOB would be able to have more schools host shows during this part of the season due to increased demand and participation.

Submitted by: Mr. Thomas Kershaw, Jr. / Chapter I  
(Name/Chapter)

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-

11. ENTRANCE - PERFORMANCE - EXIT TIMING:

Each band will be given a block time of 14 minutes. During the block, announcements will be made, each band will enter, present the performance, and exit. The logical conclusion of the visual and music performance must be a minimum of seven (7) minutes and a maximum of ten (10) minutes. A description of this must be included in the declarations. Performance timing will start with the first step or note of music by any performer other than the commanding officer, following the salute. All playing and maneuvering must cease by the 10 minute mark. All judging will continue to the obvious conclusion of the performance. Appropriate penalties will be assessed if the performance is under or over the required performance time. The penalty shall be assessed at 0.5 points for every 15 seconds or part thereof over or under time. Each band may use the balance of the block time to enter and exit the competition field. The timing of the block time will start when the Timing & Penalty judge signals the band (set at a designated spot just outside the perimeter of the field) to enter the field and the pit to enter the track area. The timing of the block time will stop when the last member exits the perimeter of the competition field, as outlined in Rule # 5 and the pit has cleared the pit area at the "0" goal yard line. The block time may stop if a special situation, such as announcer or judge delay, warrants.

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –

- Running on of the pit instruments, our most expensive equipment.
- Not every school has a 20 man pit crew or powered machines to haul equipment.
- Lack of prep/warm-up time for pit members.
- Lack of focus and composed decorum of the pit members due to frantic set-up.

3. Proposal –

- Allow entrance of any front sideline instruments & podium once prior band's performance has concluded and the prior band's pit has vacated pit area without impact or deduction to a band's official 14 minute time slot.

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

- More bands are using a full compliment of front ensemble instruments.
- The current time for set-up does not allow students to set-up and prepare for their performance due to the extensive set-up involved. Other members of the ensemble do not incur this situation.
- More time insures proper care and treatment of a band's most expensive and delicate instrumental assets.
- This change does not change a show's line-up interval. It only allows for TOB to best serve the bands by allowing bands to utilize time in the most efficient and academic means possible.

#\_\_18

Rule # 11

Submitted by: Tim Niebergall, Potomac Falls High School, Chapter XIII  
(Name/Chapter)

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-

#11 – Entrance – Performance – Exit Timing

“The logical conclusion of the visual and music performance must be a minimum of seven (7) minutes and a maximum of ten (10) minutes.”

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –

Differing school systems, band circumstances, district regulations (with regard to football game halftime lengths) and policies potentially preclude bands from being able to design a show that can achieve the minimum seven-minute length. In our case, halftime shows must conclude at the approximate 6’ 30” mark.

3. Proposal –

Remove the minimum performance aspect of the rule:

“The logical conclusion of the visual and music performance must be a ~~minimum of seven (7) minutes and~~ a maximum of ten (10) minutes.”

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

There is no need for the minimum timing. Bands will be unable to compete at a high level without honoring a reasonable show length. It is just as hard to craft a competitive show in six minutes, as it is to make an eight-minute show work. Letting directors craft their shows based on the needs of their specific circumstances will allow more creativity and eliminate the potential exclusionary affect of this rule.

#\_\_19\_ Rule #\_\_15\_\_

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_ Mike Lane / Chapter 12 \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name/Chapter)

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-

15. AMPLIFICATION:

There are no restrictions to the number or types of amplification other than the performance must be "live" and not "prerecorded". It is the unit's responsibility to provide their own electrical source, not the show host. Due to the safety factor of utilizing this type of equipment, it is the responsibility of the Chief Judge to address the problems created by adverse weather.

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –

This in essence is a good rule, however with the constantly evolving world of technology, sometimes the shows can be enhanced with some narration that could have been pre-recorded or by use of various sound effects.

3. Proposal –

All music from traditional wind and percussion instruments, or electronics instruments must be performed live and in real time by a student present at the time of performance. Sounds other than music, such as narration or sound effects may be used without penalty.

If what you want to play electronically has elements of melody, rhythm or harmony, it must be performed live.

A student may play synthesized sounds live and in real time, or initiate the playback or trigger the sequence of any non-music as part of a show segment.

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

I feel this rule will allow us to constantly be innovators in the activity and allow for the evolution of technology to enhance our performances, while not taking away from what is true to marching band by the live performances of all standard instruments.



Submitted by: CHAPTER 4

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-

18. JUDGE'S MEETING:

The judges meeting will begin fifteen (15) minutes after the last judged band. Units will limit staff members to a total of four (4) at a time at the post-contest meeting (five (5) where a Percussion Judge is assigned to the contest). . . . .

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –  
Staff at judge's meetings

3. Proposal –

18. JUDGE'S MEETING:

The judges meeting will begin fifteen (15) minutes after the last judged band. Units will limit staff members to a total of four (4) at a time at the post-contest meeting. Additional staff may attend based on special judges assigned to the show: 1 for percussion, 1 for auxiliary, 1(accompany student) for drum major, 1 for woodwind, 1 for brass.

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

If we allow 1 extra staff to attend judge's meeting for percussion, we should allow same for each special award at the show.

#\_21\_\_

Rule # 18

Submitted by: CHAPTER 10

1. Existing Rule / -  
JUDGES MEETING
  
2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –  
LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF BAND STAFF ALLOWED INTO MEETING SEEMS  
LOW
  
3. Proposal –  
AMEND NUMBER OF STAFF TO 6 MEMBERS ALLOWED AND THEN ADD ON  
SPECIALS ETC. USUAL COMPLIMENT WOULD BE BAND DIRECTOR AND ASST.  
PLUS 2 VISUAL & 2 MUSIC AS AN AVERAGE EXAMPLE ONLY.
  
4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –  
THE MOB ENTRY BY STAFF MEETING IS NOT TO BE CONDONNED BUT 4  
SEEMS TO BE VERY LOW CONSIDERING AVERAGE STAFF COMPLIMENT ETC.

#\_\_22\_\_ Rule #\_\_20\_\_

Submitted by: \_\_Chapter 2\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name/Chapter)

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-

Scoring

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –

NJA should be requiring CG/DL judges at all shows, since we have MANY outstanding programs within our reach. Credit is not being given to outstanding CG / DL programs.

3. Proposal –

- Average the IA Visual, EA Visual, and Auxillary judge for 30% of a band's total score.
- Average the IA Music & Percussion judge for 10% of a band's total score.
- All other captions (EA Music, both GE Captions) are considered at full weight.

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

The TOB/TIA organization is one of the largest, most comprehensive marching circuits in the nation. However, we are not giving proper credit during the marching season to the outstanding color guard and percussion programs present. By treating them as “extra”, we are excluding them from the overall composition of a program.

By adding those captions into the total score, we are giving the two IA judges a more defined role. For the IA Visual judge, they can focus on the band proper (since the Aux. caption is both an individual and ensemble caption). For the IA Music judge, it allows them to focus solely on the winds (where most of the IA judges expertise lies).

This could cause an impact on show sponsors who do not regularly schedule CG/Perc judges. However, the amount of shows that do provide those judges far outweighs the ones that do not.

By including those scores in the final outcome, it may be an incentive for bands in other circuits to experience a TOB show, since no other circuit in the area has a system even close to this. Being on the leading edge of this scoring philosophy would be nothing but a plus for the organization.

Placing more weight on these captions will put more onus on designers to incorporate those elements of their bands into the total composition. Thus, in theory, we should see more cohesive, complete shows throughout the circuit!

#\_23\_\_

Rule #\_\_\_\_20\_\_

Submitted by: John A. Boyd, Chapter XII  
(Name/Chapter)

1. Existing Rule / Bylaw-

Not addressed specifically in the rules

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address –

Box 3 is such a vast score range and a large number of bands achieve that box for a large part of the year. The rubric on the back of sheet describing the achievement and design ranges states that a band scoring an 80 is the same developmentally as a band scoring a 93.

3. Proposal –

Adding a box and breaking the numbers down in the following way:

Box 1:	60 – 69.95
Box 2:	70 – 79.95
Box 3:	80 – 84.95
Box 4:	85 – 89.95
Box 5:	90 – 100

Or

Box 1:	60 – 74.95
Box 2:	75 – 79.95
Box 3:	80 – 89.95
Box 4:	90 – 94.95
Box 5:	95 – 100

4. Explanation of rationale for proposal –

In this system there is better rationale for scoring in the Box 3/Box 4 area. The entire point is to put the Box 3 area in a 10-point or even 5-point range rather than 13 points.

Submitted by: CHAPTER 6

1. Existing Rule:

Scoring

2. Problem or issue the proposal is intended to address

Some of our units have expressed displeasure with music commentary from GE Visual judges and with visual commentary from the GE Music judges.

3. Proposal

We propose that the caption should be called “General Effect” with 2 judges being used and to adjust the total scoring system as follows:

20 points IA Visual

20 points EA Visual

20 points IA Music

20 points EA Music

20 points General Effect using 2 judges each with 20 points that are averaged.

4. Explanation of rationale for the proposal

By using 2 general effect judges with their scores averaged, each judge will be evaluating the overall general effect with the same sheet and will have latitude to cover both music and visual. NJA will strive to assign one person of a primary music background and one person of a primary visual background to balance the subjective commentary.

