



ANAPBA summit XI

Winter Storm, Kansas City, MO
January 12–15, 2017

Executive attendees: Jeff Mann, Daniel Schneider, Rob MacNeil, Jim Sim, Chris Buchanan, John Stewart, Dan Cole, John Hughes, Chris Earl, Allistair Macgregor, Michael Flight

Music initiatives Advisory Committee (hereafter referred to as MIAC) attendees: Tom Weithers, Lisa Nelson, Ken Sutherland, Alex MacIntyre, Tim Boan, June Hanley, Rene Cusson, Daniel Locke

Meeting minutes
Final

Recommendations and action items

Recommendations

- 1 Associations adopt a membership protection policy.
- 2 Redesign the ANAPBA website.
- 3 Modify their instructor rules so that instructors cannot be a registered playing member of a grade 2 band.
- 4 Registrars look for applications from members located outside of the geographic boundaries of the association. Registrars can communicate with other associations to get an understanding of why a soloist may not be registering with their geographic association.
- 5 Tune requirements:

Grade 5

Eight parts of quick march in simple time, looking to implement in 2018.

Grade 4

March, strathspey and reel, each with four parts (tunes may be made up of two 2-parted tunes), looking to implement in 2018. Bands may look to the RSPBA list of tunes for guidance, though bands are not required to use tunes from this list.

There has been an understanding that bands should play different categories of tunes in the medley, though most associations do not have a rule regarding this. The recommendation is for bands to submit one set that is three to five minutes, with a minimum of four tune categories.

- 6 Within the limits of each association infrastructure, each association will open up adjudicator education and professional development to other associations. Due to differences in when each association conducts their training, there are opportunities to spread out the sharing of educational and developmental content throughout the year.

Action items

- 1 Inquire with associations who are not present regarding their participation.
- 2 Send a letter to Quebec to inform them that their provisional membership status is removed, and that they have not met the requirements to become a full member of ANAPBA.
- 3 Assess options for a redesigned website. The cost of redesigning the website must be approved by all associations.
- 4 Discuss in future conference calls the one person, one band issue to further clarify a recommendation on rules.
- 5 Share the updated supplemental roster form with all associations.

- 6 Form a committee and discuss the African blackwood issue. The committee would be comprised of representatives from North America, UK, New Zealand, Australia, and South America.
- 7 Each association makes the contact information for adjudicators available for other associations to use.
- 8 Develop list of points of contact—presidents, music rep, registrars—for use internally.
- 9 Distribute the membership protection policy to each association.

Friday, January 13, 2017

Music initiatives Advisory Committee (hereafter referred to as MIAC)

Introduction

Jeff welcomed the group and had each attendee introduce themselves.

Executive meeting

The MIAC group met separately to cover topics within that group. The executive committee discussed the topics below.

Minutes from last meeting

Minutes from last meeting had been distributed, and are posted on the ANAPBA website. The minutes from last meeting were approved.

Survey on travel money for bands

- Midwest: based on a 100-mile distance for the mailing address of the pipe band to the games.
 - Under 100 miles: \$100
 - Greater than 100 miles: \$150
- RSPBA: no travel money for bands.
- Ontario: if band home address is over 200 miles from games, they get travel money, and the amount varies from games to games.
- Australia: generally don't offer travel money, though a sponsor can offer if they want.
- Alberta: don't offer any travel money. The games may offer if they want.
- New Zealand: don't offer travel money.
- South America: don't offer travel money. Generally do have ground transportation from airport to games.
- WUSPBA: don't offer travel money. Each games may decide, and is, in many cases, based on distance.
- BC: travel money is complicated due to the association spanning USA and Canada. Games have adopted a model where they don't offer travel money, but will offer donations later in the year for their involvement in Scottish activities.

Lead-on concert formation

Discussion on bands playing in concert formation. Midwest has offered this at the Chicago games for the medley competition. The association is continuing to work on the best setup for each corps, judges and audience. They continue to do it because it is something different and novel, and there hasn't been negative feedback from bands because it is still new and novel. The Pleasanton games in WUSBA has been considering using the concert formation for higher-grade bands in the medley competition. Chris Buchanan asked as to why associations are considering concert formation—is it because it is new and different, or does it solve for a problem that exists with competition?

Rob did clarify that their association has used the formation because of indoor competition, and because of the need to compete on a stage. Australia shared that there has been merit for the concert formation for their indoor competition, but not for outdoor. The mentality for their association is that if it is good enough for the World's Pipe Band Competition, it is good enough for their competition. RSPBA did run a British competition years ago with concert formation, and the feedback that they got from the judges is that they couldn't get the technical feedback that they needed while adjudicating. Local indoor competitions in the RSPBA do use the concert formation.

The example of Shotts turning to face the audience in 2008 came up, and though the audience loved it, the band was heavily criticized that their ensemble suffered because they did this. It was noted that the band is there to be adjudicated, and they must approach the performance from that perspective, and that the current formation is an important part of defining Scottish bagpiping and drumming competition.

Summary

There is no driving demand to move to the concert formation. Though there doesn't seem to be a driver for the concert formation, attendance at highland games have been dropping quite steeply over the last few years. It is possible that a concert formation would increase attendance at games and could be seen as a start to solving attendance problems. What is clear is that the group needs more information on the issue, and that associations may continue to experiment to see what might come from using it, and share that information with the combined group.

P3 visa issues

This is an issue about US immigration law, and to a lesser extent, Canadian immigration law. The issue is with Canadian judges coming in to adjudicate in the states, or when US adjudicators come in to judge in Canada. One particular Canadian judge had been stopped at the border, and subsequently prevented from coming into the US for five years.

P3 visas are one solution to the problem. It is a visa specifically for people who are involved with cultural and arts organizations. The last time round getting people P3 visas in BC Pipers took less than 30 days, which shows that the template they have in place is working. Canadian international law does allow for those outside of the country to come and adjudicate amateur events. They have subsequently changed the name of "Professional" competition back to "Open". Many adjudicators within Canada, particularly from the East, who have been surveyed on whether they would like a P3 visa have ultimately declined, because they feel they may be flagged, and though it may get them legally across the border for one competition, adjudicators are not confident it will get the across

the border at a different part of the country. This is because the visa is for a defined itinerary for a one-year period. The other concern is that associations cannot help out with the issue, as individual games and sponsors must take the initiative with adjudicators on the issue. Also, it is likely that border enforcement will only get tougher.

Better idea of finances—how ANAPBA membership donations are collected and managed; differences between full and provisional membership, and moving from provisional to full membership

Ontario is concerned that each association is not contributing equally across the board. They suggest that associations do want to join, but that the burden may be a little too high, particularly for the smaller associations.

Western suggests that we tier contributions based on the size of the association. BC also thinks that getting smaller associations to the summits are a product of their size.

The group will inquire with those associations who are not present during the conference call portion of the summit to see how they feel.

Quebec's concern is what, exactly, ANAPBA can offer their association. They cannot justify the cost of coming to the summit.

New Zealand suggests considering an associate fee for countries outside of North America.

On provisional membership

The Alliance made the Quebec association a provisional member six years ago, but they have not met the criteria to become a full member.

Summary

The contribution is intended to support the summits that happen every two years, and to care for the infrastructure of the Alliance. The group needs to think how they can engage with the associations that are not actively involved with the Alliance.

WUSPBA moved that the association removes any membership status for Quebec, and BC seconded. The vote was unanimous. The Alliance will send a letter to the Quebec association.

Sanctions reciprocity

Chris Buchanan suggests that each association has a more robust code of conduct in place for their members. Rob also suggests that a problem that one association deals with may also be dealt with in another association. EUSPBA has barred members for other associations, but it has always been on a case by case basis. Jeff feels that we need to be collective in order to send a strong message, a message that would communicate the type of behavior and code of conduct we expect from all members. The Alliance will look at Australia's membership protection rules to see if there is information there that may be repurposed.

Jeff suggests that the group continues this conversation to establish a recommendation of comparable membership protection programs, and a message that may come from ANAPBA.

Website

The ANAPBA webmaster is recommending that the Alliance website be redone, which may cost \$200-\$300.

MIAC meeting notes

The Music Representatives Committee convened with just four members because three members had other commitments to either judge or compete in Winter Storm. We reviewed the changes to the band music requirements since the previous Summit and updated the ANAPBA table. Given the lack of members present, we decided to defer the updates on the solo music requirements table. The Chairman will contact the Music Representatives from each member association and have each association update any relevant portions of the tables. He will then consolidate the responses into final documents which will be made available on the revamped ANAPBA website.

We briefly reviewed the proposed agenda for the Summit and attempted to prioritize the issues to ensure that we had adequate time to address the issues which we expected to require lengthy discussion. We had a last minute addition to the agenda proposed by Ken Sutherland who suggested we compare score sheets and discuss the rationale for the different approaches. We decided we would take up this issue in conjunction with the discussion of adjudicator training. We agreed to discuss the possibility of preparing a rubric that associations could use when deciding to upgrade and downgrade bands and that this discussion should fall under the Competitive Performance Levels (CPL) discussion.

At that point Bruce Cargill, Convener of the Grading Committee for the RSPBA, joined the meeting by conference call. He discussed the RSPBA experience with the Supplemental Roster developed by an ANAPBA committee last spring. Bruce said that the roster was well-used and the experience has been very positive. In fact, the RSPBA has been asking bands from other areas (e.g., Australia and New Zealand) to complete the ANAPBA Supplemental Roster form. As an action item we agreed that since we had executives of Pipe Bands Australia and The Royal New Zealand Pipe Band Associations present at the Summit, we would share the ANAPBA master document directly with these associations and ask them to make it available to their bands.

Under the present system a band is supposed to file the Supplemental Roster with both the RSPBA and their home association. In the future, Bruce will drop a quick e-mail to the home association whenever a roster is filed so they can follow up with the band, if necessary. As an action item we will prepare a list of contact information within the next few weeks with the direct contacts within each ANAPBA association for the individuals most knowledgeable about (1) roster issues and (2) grading issues and provide this to Bruce.

Bruce informed us that the RSPBA has a proposal on the agenda for their AGM in March to extend the deadline for transfers from a higher-graded band to a lower-graded band from 14 days to 42

days. This 42 day period coincides with the close of entries for the major championships. The deadline for lateral transfers into a band in the same grade and from a lower-graded band into a higher-graded band would remain at 14 days.

Bruce also discussed the criteria for assigning a band into grades 4A and 4B and 3A and 3B. Bruce indicated that if a band could play a reasonable Mini-MSR, then they would be graded 4A. This means that all North American bands in Grade 5 would be assigned to Grade 4B. Issues may arise with bands at the lower end of the North American Grade 4 which might be either 4B or 4A. In those cases, Bruce will consult with the home association to get some guidance on which would be appropriate. Bruce indicated that the border between 3A and 3B was more subjective and he would again be contacting the home association to discuss the grading.

Bruce informed us that the RSPBA was moving toward an online registration system. The project will involve a phased implementation that will start with Grade 1 bands and be opened to the other grades over the next few years. The system will let band secretaries both file rosters and modify rosters already on file.

After the call we agreed that the list we had just agreed to provide to Bruce would also be useful for contacts within ANAPBA itself and agreed to add to this list the contact information for the individuals to contact with questions about adjudicator qualifications.

Saturday, January 14, 2017

Groups met separately to cover agenda items in their individual groups.

Follow-up from yesterday

Membership protection statement

The group presented a statement with regards to sanctions reciprocity.

“Contemporary society expects that all people be able to pursue their lives free from bullying, harassment, discrimination, abuse, or other egregious behaviour.

“As leaders within our piping and drumming communities, we strongly endorse this expectation and believe that we are to provide a safe space for all our members in the practice and pursuit of the art.

“The members of the Alliance of North American Pipe Band Associations therefore commit to ensuring that each of our individual associations and constituent entities enact the required policies and procedures to protect our members from these and similar unacceptable acts and behaviour. These policies and procedures shall include appropriate corrective actions as necessary in order to safeguard the protection of our members.

“Furthermore, we shall work collectively to develop these policies and procedures that are comparable between associations and reflective of local jurisdictional law. We undertake to establish and implement these policies and procedures within one year’s time.

“Finally, these policies and procedures will include a process to recognize and reciprocate any reasonable corrective actions applied by another affiliated organization within local jurisdictional law.”

Jeff moved that the association adopt this member protection statement. Dan seconded. The vote was unanimous.

Each association will take this statement to use as a framework to implement a policy within their own individual association.

Website

Jeff shared that Iain McDonald has some template that would update the ANAPBA website. The cost would be a few hundred dollars.

Midwest moved that the Alliance updates the website and takes steps to keep it up to date. Alberta seconded. According to ANAPBA rules, all associations must approve the expenditure. Because some associations are not present, Daniel Schneider will send an email to get votes from all associations.

One person, one band

Rob shared a comparison of instructor and dual-musician rules for each association. [See attached.] Due to the complexity of the issue, it would be difficult for associations align their rule. Midwest suggests that, with regard to drummers, the instructor rule allows the drumming instructor to play lead, if they choose. BC suggests that the group looks at what we are trying to achieve with the instructor rule. Since the rule is designed to give instruction to lower grade bands, he proposes that the rule should start to limit the capacity of the instructor as the band advances to higher grades. This would prevent bands from using instructors to pad their bands unfairly. Alberta mentioned that one of the advantages of ANABPA is the ability to check with other associations to compare rosters.

Summary

The group agreed that the best approach to this issue is to influence their associations to modify their instructor rules so that instructors cannot be a registered playing member of a grade 2 band. The group will discuss this issue in future conference calls to come up with a recommendation.

Band rosters

Rob shared the supplemental roster form that was created as part of a recommendation to come up with a roster form from the 2015 summit. This form was introduced in April of 2016. Rob will make a few adjustments to the form based on feedback from John Hughes. Rob will get the form out to the rest of the group shortly after changes are made to the form. We will also put the form online.

Solo grading and registering with another association in a higher grade

The issue is with regards to soloists who do not agree with their individual grading in their home association registering with another association in a higher grade than that recommended by their home association. Jeff requests that each association ask their registrars to look for registrations that come in from outside of their association, and that each association communicate with one another on such issues.

Bands challenging up in competition

The extent to which bands play up in different associations vary, including the games at which bands may play up, whether they have to pay entry fees if they do, and whether they get prize money if they place.

Grade 4 mini-MSR and Grade 5 music requirements

Grade 5 music requirements

- ASPD: Submit 1 set march medley (3–5 minutes)
- ACPBA: Submit 1 set (4 parts any time signature); Medley (3–5 minutes)
- BCPA: submit 1 set (4 x 2 parted marches from the RSPBA list)
- EUSPBA: 6–8 part of quick march in simple time
- MWPBA: submit 1 set (2:45–4:30 minutes)
- PPBAM: submit 1 set, 8 parts of quick march
- PPBSO: submit 1 set (2:45–4:30)
- SPBA: submit 1 set (2:45–4:30)
- WUSBPA: submit 1 set (2:45–4:30 minutes); march, slow march, march (2–4 parts quick march in any time signature, a slow air, and 2–4 parts quick march)

BCPA is the only association that aligns with the RSPBA.

Grade 4 music requirements

Association	Timed medley	March Medley	Mini MSR
ASPD	Submit 1 (3–5)	Submit 1 set (3–5 minutes)	
ACPBA	Submit 1 (3–5)		4/4/4 (may be two 2-parted tunes for any. Strath may also appear in the medley)
BCPA	Submit 1 (3–5 minutes)		4/4/4 (may be 2-parted and must be from the RSPBA list)
EUSPBA	Submit 1 (3–5)		4/2/2 or 4/4/4 (all may be one 4-parted tune or 2-parted; four-parted strath must be from the RSPBA tune list)
MWPBA, minimum of four different tune	Submit 1 (3–5)		4/4/4 (all may be 2-parted tunes)

categories			
PPBAM	Submit 1 (3–5 minutes)	Submit 1 set (2:45–4:30)	
PPBSO, minimum of four tune categories	Submit 1 (3–5 minutes)	Submit 1 set (2:45–4:30)	
SPBA	Submit 1 (3–5 minutes)	Submit 1 set (2:45–4:30)	
WUSPBA	Submit 1 (3–5 minutes)		4/2/2 (two-parted marches permitted)

Recommendation

Grade 5

Eight parts of quick march in simple time, looking to implement in 2018.

Grade 4

March, strathspey and reel, each with four parts (tunes may be made up of two 2-parted tunes), looking to implement in 2018. Bands may look to the RSPBA list of tunes for guidance, though bands are not required to use tunes from this list.

There has been an understanding that bands should play different categories of tunes in the medley, though most associations do not have a rule regarding this. The recommendation is for bands to submit one set that is three to five minutes, with a minimum of four tune categories.

Grading

BC's strategy is to overlap the top bands on one grade with the lower bands in the next higher grade.

BCPA band grade	Juvenile age band	Equivalent RSPBA band grade
5	Yes	Novice juvenile "B"
5	No	4B
4	Yes	Novice juvenile "A"
4	No	4A
3	Yes	Juvenile
3	No	3B or 3A, depending on band caliber
2	—	2
1	—	1

In order to help the progression from one grade to another, the group suggested that we make resources like videos available online for bands to use.

Reports from international associations

The following presented to the group.

- Vice chairman, RSPBA—John Hughes
- President, Pipe Bands Australia—Chris Earl
- President, Royal New Zealand Pipe Band Association—Allistair Macgregor
- President, Scottish Pipe Band Association of South America—Michael Flight

ANAPBA championship games

Potential venues

- Fort Edmonton
- Pleasanton
- Chicago
- EUSPBA games

One challenge to work through is how to protect all organizations from liability.

Nothing more substantial came from this conversation.

CITES African blackwood issue

Rob proposes that a committee with at least one representative from each country get together and come up with a recommendation on what the Alliance and each association can do to help individuals identify what they need to do when they travel internationally with their instruments. This would include representatives from the UK, South America, Australia, and New Zealand. This committee will get together within the next six weeks, and will communicate back with the rest of the group. Rob will get together with those who are interested in being involved in the committee.

Report from MIAC

The following are notes from the MIAC meeting.

We started by discussing experiences with the concert formation. Several associations have only used the concert formation for indoor events (often with mini-bands). The only outdoor experience to date has been a single use in WUSPBA and two contests in the MWPBA. The WUSPBA experience was not universally seen as positive, but discussion indicated that that was likely due to an inappropriate choice of venue. Two of the Committee members had judged the MWPBA events. They both agreed that the experience was very positive with the concert formation providing an unobstructed sound from the entire band and a stable platform for writing the score sheets. They also agreed that the crowd response seemed to be very enthusiastic and that the concert formation drew crowds approximately 50% larger than the crowds earlier in the same day for the traditional events where the bands performed in a circle with their backs to the audience. We agreed that could be the future of our art because modern audiences expect a high degree of entertainment value, even in what we see as a contest setting. There seemed to be a consensus that while higher-graded bands might benefit from the concert formation, the more widely spaced formation might cause unison and tonal problems for lower-graded bands with less experienced players. We discussed to pros and cons of drafting more detailed rules versus a more “freestyle” approach. At a minimum, we agreed that bands will need to know some parameters in advance to properly prepare (i.e., size and shape of the space, whether the adjudicators will be mobile or static, and if static, where they will be located, etc.).

The next issue we addressed was adjudicator training (both for new adjudicators joining the panels and refresher education for experienced adjudicators). We started by discussing the different certification processes used by ANAPBA members. Every association uses a combination of experience, education and apprentice or shadow judging. There were, however, differences in the balance between the methods used in each association. For continued training of adjudicators already on the panel, every ANAPBA member used a mix of formats, including lectures, small and large group interactive discussions, and electronic training (through a recorded video archive and /or live streaming). As an action item, the Committee decided to explore the possibility of establishing an online central archive for the sharing of electronic training resources.

At this point Rob Mathieson, Secretary of the Adjudicator Panel for the RSPBA, joined the session by conference call. Rob joined in the the discussion of new adjudicator training by describing the RSPBA process, which is more rigorous than that of any of the ANAPBA members. In the RSPBA, adjudicator candidates must complete two week-end long seminars and apprentice adjudicate at 3 championship contests or sufficient smaller contest so that an equivalent number of bands have been adjudicated. The sheets prepared during these contests are then reviewed by the Panel for both accuracy of results and adequacy of the written justification for the placings. Rob indicated that the training materials were going to be re-written in the very near future and he agreed to share the materials once they have been revised.

The RSPBA view ongoing experience in judging as a positive value. The expectation is that an RSPBA adjudicator must be available to adjudicate 2-3 major championships and approximately 6 minor events. Based on that availability, an adjudicator will normally be assigned to 2 majors and 4 minors. If a adjudicator is available for less than the expectation, he may be relegated to smaller events and lower grades for a few years. If a adjudicator does not make any dates available for two consecutive years, he must begin the certification process from the beginning. We very briefly discussed the concern that the ANAPBA adjudicator panels were oversubscribed and long intervals between assignments might adversely impact performance.

The RSPBA does not have any formal training for adjudicators who are already on the panel. The RSPBA does conduct AIM meetings (Adjudicator Information Meetings) but these are focused more on rule issues and changes to procedures rather than the process of judging.

Next Rob explained the RSPBA pilot project for adjudication which has been in place in various formats for three years. Rob distinguished between "confer" and "consult." Confer is the process which permits the adjudicators to discuss the band performances during an event as long as the bands are not actually playing (unlike the general RSPBA rule which prohibits the adjudicators from speaking to each other at all during an event). The discussion must be limited to musical issues only and not involve placings. In contrast, consultation takes place immediately after the event is finished and after the score sheets are surrendered. This is a 10-20 minute discussion that is moderated by an RSPBA executive. The discussion focuses on situations in which there is a differential of more than 6 places between adjudicators. This is intended as "on-the-job" training. The consultation permits adjudicators to hear the thought processes of their fellow adjudicators and possibly share some vocabulary as to the most efficient way to document issues on the sheets. The Adjudicator's Panel is requesting permission at the AGM this year to extend this pilot to all the championship contests. In those contests where the pilot has been used, it has reduced the number of discrepancies. Rob speculated that the improvement was due in part due to the ability to confer and bring issues to the attention of a fellow adjudicator before the sheets were surrendered and in part to the adjudicators being more careful when assigning the bottom places, knowing that they may have to justify that result to their fellow adjudicators during the consultation.

We took advantage of Rob's availability and went on to discuss the MAP program in Grade 4A which is the basis for the Mini-MSR events offered by most ANAPBA associations. Rob was clear that on this issue he was only providing a single adjudicators perspective and did not speak for the grading committee or any other adjudicators. Rob thought that a number of bands with significant numbers of adult learners had difficulty with the transition and were often forced to drop back to Grade 4B. However, Rob questioned whether a band that was only able to maintain an adequate tone by playing simple 4/4 marches really belonged at the higher end of Grade 4 in the first place when the other bands were capable of tackling more difficult music. On the other hand, the program was a big success with the Novice Juvenile bands and helped raise the standard there. All in all, Rob thought that there were still some problems, but that sticking with some version of a simple MSR in Grade 4 promoted band musical growth and that the advantages outweighed the disadvantages.

Finally we discussed different approaches to score sheets. Different associations sheets varied from essentially blank pages to those with lots of check boxes. We agreed that there were pros and cons for each approach. For example, the check boxes were generally more time efficient but the sheets with more blank space offered the possibility of drafting assessments tailored to the specific performance being adjudicated. In part, the differences were based on past usage and reflected the historical expectations of the local bands. For those associations that had check boxes on the sheets, the use was universally optional. However, if check boxes are offered, there is often a perception by the bands that a adjudicator who does not use the boxes is not doing his work. Rob Mathieson share his personal approach. He likes an emptier sheet but personally places four headers on his sheets before the bands play. The headers are based on Introduction, Intonation, Integration and Interpretation. These virtually force him to enter a comment in each area. However he did admit that the headings he uses vary by the different grades being adjudicated and are tailored to the level of his intended audience. Therefore, this is a personal approach that cannot be implemented on score sheets but might be useful for adjudicator training.

Following the presentations to the whole group by the international guests we convened again for a short session.

Andrew Morrill raised two problems they have seen in WUSPBA. The first is over-crowding in Grade 4 and the second is complaints over a disconnect between the band and solo tune requirement within the same nominal grade. The Committee agreed that (1) the tune requirements were deliberately different because band and solo piping are separate disciplines and (2) that crowding might be cured by either (1) adding a grade below Grade 4 (e.g., a Novice Grade or equivalent such as already exists in many associations) and/or (2) formally splitting Grade 4 by age at the WUSPBA level into a Senior Grade 4 and a Junior Grade 4 (rather than randomly splitting the Grade 4 events into heats on a games-by-games basis). Andrew will take these suggestions up with the appropriate WUSPBA officials.

We discussed the use of sheet music by drummers during a contest. We agreed that the use this year by a single individual appeared to be a unique situation that did not require any specific rule-making at this time. If this continues to be a contentious issue that needs regulation, then we can revisit the issue.

Since there was still time available, we moved forward and addressed the Competitive Performance Level issue scheduled for the Sunday morning session. We compared the different practices of placing the CPL assessment on the score sheet versus on a separate sheet that was only provided to the grading committee. Although the use of separate sheets adds an additional administrative step, most members agreed that it promoted increased honesty from the adjudicators. We also discussed the fact that some smaller associations do not use a CPL system for band evaluations. That is only done in the smaller associations where it was agreed that grading might be done efficiently based on the personal experience of the grading committee. Even in solo grading, the decision of how to implement CPL assessments depends on how the CPL is used in grading decisions.

All the member associations are currently attempting to implement a continent-wide band grading standard. We discussed that a rubric setting out the expectations for a successful band in each grade might be useful. As an action item we agreed that the Chairman would create an initial draft for a band "grade expectations" rubric and circulate it by email to the members of the Music Representatives Committee. Once they were satisfied, then we would circulate the rubric to all associations with the suggestion that they provide the rubric to all adjudicators. We feel that the availability of a common rubric would improve the consistency from one association another. Some members also thought such a rubric might be useful for adjudicators on the day of a contest when ranking bands by providing a standard against which "exceeds expectations" and "fails to meet expectations" could be measured. If successful, we can consider an extension of the process to solo evaluations.

Sunday, January 15, 2017

Revisiting adjudicator development and qualification programs

Recommendation

Within the limits of each association infrastructure, the group recommends that each association will open up adjudicator education and professional development to other associations. Due to differences in when each association conducts their training, there are opportunities to spread out the sharing of educational and developmental content throughout the year.

Adjudicator availability

BC shared the multi-association adjudicator availability for that they have been using. The adjudicator information that each association makes available online differs. Most associations have an adjudicator list online, and some do provide credentials and contact information. BC asked whether growing and promoting this information is beneficial for the group. They did agree that there would be contact information made available from each association.

Financial report

Income statement

Revenue 2015-2016

2015 beginning balance	\$1,475.07
Contributions	\$2,500

Expenses 2015-2016

2015 summit	\$1,406.63
2016 summit sunk cost	\$500.00
2017 summit	\$1,291.92
Web hosting	\$149.99
Banking and finance fees	\$75.00
Administrative	\$332.39
Total expenses	<u>\$3,755.93</u>
Income/loss	<u>(\$1,255.93)</u>
2016 ending balance	\$219.14

Ontario moved that we approve the financial report, seconded by WUSPBA. The group unanimously approved.

Summit frequency

Some felt there was merit in holding a summit annually; however, the cost associated with doing this may be difficult for some associations. Additionally, every association must provide their contribution to the Alliance in order for that organization to cover the costs of holding the summit. Most associations were in favor of holding summits bi-annually.

Election of officers

Jeff has decided to step down as the chairman so that he may pursue other opportunities. Rob nominated Jim as chairman. There were no objections.

Rob nominated Daniel as secretary and treasurer. Jim seconded. There were no objections.

Jim moved that the association elect Jeff as Chairman emeritus. The nomination was met with applause, and was approved unanimously.

MIAC report

The following are notes from the MIAC meeting.

In this session we discussed whether there were any issues with Dual Musicians and Registered Instructors. No one reported any real problems within their home association. However these rules (1) were open to abuse by bands traveling to compete in another association who might be able to hide the existence of instructors on the roster and (2) and may be a trap for bands who travel without doing adequate research that might only be confronted with the local rule on the day of the contest. However, this is a administrative and communication issue.

The Chairman summarized the communications from the RSPBA on these issues during the development of the Supplemental Roster. The RSPBA will not interfere with local transfer rules or object to players who appear simultaneously on more than one ANAPBA roster so long as only one of those bands competes in an RSPBA event during any given season. If both bands were to compete, the usual RSPBA rule of "one player, one band" will apply.

Our discussion concerning Dual Musicians revealed that the rule were not as diverse as they first appear. One association permits the dual musician to play in only two bands, despite the fact that the rules defines four different instrument categories. In other associations the rules do not explicitly limit Dual Musician to two bands but, in practice, no association has ever had an individual registered as a Dual Musician in more than two bands at the same time. The Committee decided that there was no need for any further action at this time.

The Registered Instructor rules do differ in a number of respects from one association to another (i.e., concerning the grades in which an instructor is permitted and whether the instructor can, may, or must play as the Pipe major and lead drummer). Although uniformity is desirable and many members of the Committee indicated that a "one player, one band" philosophy might be the ideal solution, the Committee acknowledged that implementing this may be impossible due to pushback at the local level.

Dates for next meetings

- Next summit will be held at Winter Storm 2019.
- Next conference call will be held September 17, 2017.
- MIAC will be setting up a music board meeting, and will determine that date after the conclusion of the summit.

Closing remarks

Jeff offered closing remarks. The group felt that there was value in what they discussed during our meetings at this summit. Jim closed the meeting.