

---

# HISTORY OF SPEBSQSA/BHS CONTEST & JUDGING

PART 9 – THE MATURING PHASE 2001-2009

## **KEVIN KELLER**

SPEBSQSA/BHS MEMBER SINCE 1978  
BHS CERTIFIED MUS JUDGE, 1998-PRESENT  
MUS BOARD OF REVIEW, 2001-2007  
MUS CATEGORY SPECIALIST, 2008-2010  
CHAIRMAN, CONTEST & JUDGING 2012-2015  
PAST CHAIR, CONTEST & JUDGING 2016-2019  
C&J HISTORIAN  
2020 BHS HALL OF FAME



# CATCHING UP

- With the new categories, a chorus of 12 vs 20 was considered eligible
- One thing I failed to emphasize in this new category system is that songs and arrangements no longer are limited by the requirement that an average singer can perform it. Rather, if a group can do it successfully, that is fine
  - As a result, we see more adventuresome arranging and choice of songs



# CATCHING UP

- Judging Principles
  - Latzko Principle
  - Stucker Principle



## WHERE DID WE LEAVE OFF?

- As each year passes since 1993, more and more songs previously unheard were finding its way on contest stage
- Arrangements are becoming more developed as time limits no longer restrict the arrangers
- Despite the concerns about the style, things were moving along until 1999 and The New Tradition's "Les Mis" package
  - Launched the Style Examination Committee
  - Outcomes largely centered around perceived loss of "Look and Bing"



# SOCIETY TRENDS IN THE 2000'S IN THIS NEW ERA

- There is an ever growing division between those who embrace the opening of the style and “KIBber’s” (Keep it Barbershoppers, although there is disagreement about what era that represents)
- Despite desire to limit 40 judges per category, up to 45 will be invited through the schools of 2001, 2004, 2007 and 2010
- There arises a myth that scores automatically go down after Category School
- The MUS category relaxes the “gotcha” mentality of particular hits in the arrangement through 2007
- The events of 9/11 have an impact in flexibility of judge assignments as well as costs
- Sound system issues at International and throughout the districts is a continuous problem in perception of scoring levels as well as performances
- Almost every year there are modifications to Article I.B.4 dealing with records eligibility
- Continuing time delays in the International Chorus Contest (continued from the previous decade)



# CATEGORY STRUGGLES AND MATURING

- MUS

- Focusing on musicality while adjudicating style
- Consistency of assessing style in context (Other redeeming features, offset by other strong qualities – Lots of differing opinions)

- PRS

- Entertainment / Relevancy
- Judging expectations vs appropriateness and encouraging exploration
- “Closet Singing Judges”

- SNG

- Artistic singing
- Effect vs pedagogy input



Inside every category – how do we ensure “Lock and Ring”?

# 2001

- All categories evaluating the results and recommendations of the SEC and implementing in their category descriptions
- Through the leadership of Roger Payne (CS) Music Category begins the process of relaxing the “gotcha” mentality
- Changes to the C&J Manual
  - Position Papers included
  - Overlap Papers added as a result of SEC
  - Ed Waesche/Rob Campbell MUS Style vs Performance in the MUS CD





# 2001 – MUS AND PRS

B. The MUS and PRS categories are perhaps overlapped to a greater extent than any other pair of categories, due in large part to the similarities in their principal roles. The evidence for this similarity can be seen by examining the following excerpted official writings pertaining to each of these respective categories:

1. MUS: “The sensitive handling of musical elements, such as melody, harmony, and embellishments, demonstrates musicality in a performance. A strong musical performance is one in which everything provided by the composer and arranger is skillfully delivered and effectively integrated in support of the musical theme ... The Music judge evaluates how the musical elements of the song and arrangement support the theme.” (from the Introduction to the MUS category description.) The context is the thematically appropriate performance of the material.
2. PRS: “The Presentation judges evaluates how effectively a performer brings the song and arrangement to life - that is, to what degree is the audience entertained through the performer’s communication of the story/message/theme in its musical and visual setting (from the Introduction to the PRS category description.) The presentation of barbershop music uses appropriate musical and visual methods to convey the theme of the song, and provide the audience with an emotionally satisfying and entertaining experience. The musical and visual delivery is from the heart, believable, and sensitive to the song and arrangement throughout (extracted from Paragraph 4 of the Definition of the Barbershop Style, assigned for adjudication to the Presentation category.) The context is the entertainment value of the presentation.

4. TEMPO  
MUS - Does the tempo support the theme of the song by allowing the cleanest delivery of the theme - rhythm, lyric, harmony, etc.?  
PRS - Does the tempo help to make the song more entertaining?
5. LYRICS  
MUS - If the lyrics are the theme, are the lyrics supported by the melody, harmony, and performance of musical effects?  
PRS - Am I, as a member of the audience, feeling the emotional message being delivered?
6. METER  
MUS - Is there a discernible underlying sense of meter?  
Is the meter consistent?  
PRS - Is the story or entertainment value interrupted by meter errors?
7. RANGE and TESSITURA  
MUS - Is this a good piece of music for these voices?  
PRS - Was the entertainment value diminished by out-of-range passages?
8. CONSTRUCTION and FORM  
MUS - Does the form and construction of this piece work as a musical composition?  
PRS - Was entertainment value enhanced or hindered by the way the arrangement or song was constructed?
9. EMBELLISHMENTS  
MUS - Were the embellishments appropriate and performed artfully, and do they raise the musicality of the performance of the song?  
PRS - Did the embellishments contribute to the entertainment value of the presentation?





# 2001 – MUS AND SNG

## II. CATEGORY TERMINOLOGY

While a wide range of recommended corrections (“fixes”) may be well within the judge’s coaching ability, care should be taken during evaluations to relate the problem and possible solution to the principal role and perspective of his own category.

- A. Music adjudicates how musically, artistically and stylistically the performer brings the song/arrangement to life. Singing adjudicates the degree to which the performer achieves artistic singing in the barbershop style. Thus, some terminology will be unique to each category, and some will be shared.
- B. Terms more likely to be used by the Music judge include *chord progressions, homophony, consonance, embellishments, theme and construction*. Singing is more apt to use such terms as *vocal quality, well supported, freely produced, formants and articulation*.
- C. Since both categories are concerned with locking and ringing chords artistically, they use much of the same vocabulary; for example, *intonation, resonance, unity, synchronization, sound flow, expansion, volume relationships, blend, tone color and artistry*. Because Music and Singing look for musical singing and correct singing, respectively, these terms are used in essentially the same fashion by each.
- D. Singing deals more with terms involving the intricacies and specifics of vocal production per se, while Music takes a more general approach to a musical barbershop sound. Judges must take care to use terms and to provide assistance in

## V. RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY

- A. In evaluation sessions, Music should de-emphasize recommendations on specific vocal-production techniques best left to Singing. Also, though consonance is vitally important, Music must give adequate weight to theme and delivery.
- B. We recommend to the SCJC that Singing’s responsibilities in the area of style be limited to only the most extreme cases relating to paragraph one of the Definition of the Barbershop Style. Instances of a Singing judge’s levying a style penalty where none is given by Music must be avoided.
- C. It is confusing to our competitors when the two categories score a given performance differently and the Music judge(s) states that his or her (usually lower) score is heavily based on consonance. One explanation for this stems from the fact that Singing is more concerned with proper vocal production and technique. When fine vocal technique and production are present but other aspects of making a good barbershop sound (balance, intonation, synchronization and the like -- all still important to Singing, of course) lag behind, Music can be expected to view consonance in a less positive light than does Singing.

Secondly, since purely vocal matters constitute a smaller proportion of the Music category, Music’s view of consonance is more intertwined with other aspects of the performance (theme, delivery and so on) than is the case with Singing. Thus, it can be said that Music looks at consonance as something “in service of” other aspects of musicality. When a group sings with inconsistent intonation, then, Music would be expected to be bothered more than Singing in light of the deleterious effects on theme and artistry. We heartily recommend cross-category training in this entire area.

Two aspects of consonance as judged by Music are how the group is ringing what is written in the arrangement and what the potential is for these chords to ring. The latter is affected by whether there is a predominance of barbershop sevenths and major triads or, conversely, a goodly number of less ringable chords such as minor triads, minor sevenths and dissonances. Of course, chord voicing has a significant



# 2001 – PRS AND SNG

## I. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SNG & PRS

- A. The theory of overlap among the scoring categories is that each scoring category views the same performance, but from a unique perspective. Some of the performance events that are observed may be the same (or “overlapped”), but described using varying terminology because of the different perspectives at play, or at times, using similar terminology, but relating it to the central role of that judge’s category. The overlap areas will not necessarily contribute equally to the score in each category. The purpose of this paper is to state some principles that should be used by SNG and PRS judges in dealing with issues where this overlap exists.
- B. In general, the SNG judge evaluates the technical and qualitative aspects of the performer’s sound and vocal production, while the PRS judge evaluates the aspects of the performance that communicate the message of the song and generate emotional impact. Certainly, technical aspects of singing, such as intonation, synchronization, vocal production and artistry, have a great impact on the generation of emotional impact. Just as certainly, techniques used by a performer to communicate a message, such as volume and tempo planning, vocal coloration, and staging and choreography have a great impact on the perceived sound. The PRS judge must remember to approach the scoring and evaluation of the technical singing aspects in terms of the effect they produce in generating emotional impact. Likewise, the SNG judge must remember to approach the scoring and evaluation of the presentation aspects of the performance in terms of how they impact the vocal production and sound of the performer. We have the potential to cause confusion in the contestants when a PRS judge tries to offer fixes to the vocal production or vocal skill aspects of the performance, or when a SNG judge tries to change the performance plan.

- A. “Ringing, in-tune sound” and “In good quality” are obviously primary concerns of the SNG category. These factors will have greater weight in the scoring by the SNG judge than by the PRS judge. The technical performance of these factors and ways to correct any perceived problems should be addressed solely by the SNG judge in the evaluation. The PRS judge can note the influence of these factors on the effect of the performance, but should not attempt to offer corrections to technical issues around problems in these areas.

While the PRS judge might mention, for instance, a tuning problem in a featured chord, a segment of a song, or general intonation problems, he should not attempt to address what he thought the tuning issue was (“the baritone was flat on those two notes”). He might mention a perception of a mismatch between parts, or breath support problems, but if he does, he should relate it to the impact on the effect generated during the performance. He should never attempt to fix vocal production issues, even if qualified, as this will create confusion with the contestants.

The SNG judge might mention PRS issues as they impact these factors. For instance, if the group does physical antics or uses a singing posture that he believes impacts the quality, tuning, etc., he certainly should bring that up in his evaluation. However, he should be careful to only relate it to the impact on the above, and should not attempt to suggest changes to staging, choreography, etc., to avoid creating confusion. The contestant should get feedback from the PRS judge on the impact of the staging or choreography on the effect produced, and from the SNG judge on how it affected the SNG score, and the contestant then has to determine the best compromise between the two.

Other areas of vocal production, such as the placement of the tone (nasal, throat singing, etc.), and the vocal timbre and coloration used, certainly affect both categories. Again, the PRS judge should be only scoring and commenting on these areas as they relate to the effect produced on the impact of the performance, and should not evaluate nor comment upon whether he feels they are good or bad vocal techniques. Likewise, the SNG judge should only comment on these areas as related to the technical requirements of his category, and how to use better vocal techniques to improve and enhance the performers plan. The SNG judge should address anything that he perceives to be incorrect vocal technique, but should do so when it pertains to proper sound production and techniques to enhance the impact of the vocal performance.

- B. “From the heart” is obviously the primary concern of the PRS judge. This factor . The impact, or lack thereof, of the vocal and visual presentation plan and how to change or improve it to maximize the impact of the performance should be addressed primarily by the PRS judge in the evaluation. While the SNG judge might mention his perception of the presence or absence of ‘from the heart’



# 2001 POSITION PAPERS

- MUS
  - Complexity and Over-Embellishment
    - Obscures the song itself
    - Predominantly homophonic texture
    - Melodic Alteration
- PRS
  - Female Impersonation
  - Obscure Lyrics
  - Patriotic and Religious
    - Primary Intent
  - Taste
    - Societal norms





# 2002

- Error in the Scoring program creates a Top 11 in the International Quartet finals
- Asterisk judges introduced



# 2003

- Verbal comments are opened up a tiny bit

*"Non-singing dialogue is generally not a part of a contest performance. However, brief comments made with supporting visual communications may be permitted more clearly to establish mood/theme, to assist the transition of packaged songs, or to add to the effect of closure of mood/theme. Spoken words deemed to be excessive or detrimental to the performance shall be penalized by the presentation judge(s) up to and including forfeiture."*

- First SCJC Award of Excellence given (Steve Plumb)



# 2004

- Exploring the concept of an International Judging system
- Due to shortage of MUS judges in District contests, two HI judges served on certified panels in fall contests (Lindeman and Ramsson)
- **Max Q** performs with the **Vocal Majority** in a convention show in the same venue as the contests. This show format will continue for a few years and SBOD issues positions to the SBOD/HH with regards to judges and to competitors/fairness
  - Similar issues with Collegiate Contest eventually with performing on the same stage
- First practice panel at International introduced
  - Continued until 2016
  - Several purposes
    - Judges wanting to judge Int'l get practice
    - Testing new concepts





# 2005

- Chorus Preliminary Contest at International with Wild Cards
  - Wild Card Chorus playoff of 16 wild card choruses
  - Top 6 advance to the Chorus Finals with the District chorus representatives
- SCJC wants control of all elements dealing with International
  - Lights, risers, sound, microphones, etc.



# 2006

- SNG creates a Levelling CD (MUS will use in 2008)
- MUSt committee (Musts, Shoulds)

The true preservation of the barbershop style is in preserving the hallmarks. When something comes along that is new, different, and creative, Music judges listen and determine if it works musically. We also scan the rules and category description wording to make sure it is compatible with current category concepts: for example, the director of a chorus turning to the audience at a poignant moment and singing an “I love you” solo while the rest of the chorus oo’s the three chords. It works musically, but it is not permitted under the Contest Rules. All judges should penalize; BUT, it works musically and does not compromise the hallmarks. So, on many sheets, it escapes unscathed. A problem?

How to allow the style to evolve naturally in light of our current rules and descriptions is one of the main dilemmas facing Music judges (and in the case of actual rule violations, all judges). Styles like ours evolve through our arrangers and performing groups, and C&J should not “legislate from

the bench” when it is possible to give the guys some leeway. Pushing the envelope is a good thing, and this is true *because* our hallmarks are so very solid. Most of the envelope-pushing is really quite minor and does not affect the hallmarks at all. Take, for example, the use of that open-

# 2006

## ■ Real World Relevancy Test

- “Trep” Treptow becomes a thought leader in trying to get C&J thinking beyond current standards
  - Barbershoppers are trained by barbershoppers
- A study is created to assess do audiences find what we do entertaining and how does that align with how we judge?
  - Born out of the “American Harmony” video production – are we relevant?

When our groups compete, they are measured against a set of “scoring standards” that define “success.” Thus it is a common practice for quartets and choruses to hone their performance skills to meet these scoring and judging standards. We judges then measure their performances against these standards, and determine who was “most successful.” During Evaluations we tell them about how to improve; e.g., we explain the “five themes” etc. Many contestants make the changes we suggest and build them into their performances, which we then see at the next contest. In this way, the C&J System not only measures, but also molds the very character of barbershop performances.

Judges also act as coaches to Society performers, helping them to better meet the standards that judges will employ in measuring barbershop performances. Without outside influences, this is what is known as a “closed loop.” As a result of this phenomenon, barbershop is more contest-driven than it is free-market-driven. This is a very unusual situation for an art form. (A handful of AIC quartets, most likely)

“Creativity, by and large, happens outside of the contest arena.” – Bobby Gray, Jr.

It seems though that many contestants would simply like us to tell them what to do. But this is exactly what we should not do. Instead, we should help them help themselves, lest we steal their opportunity to find their internal creative force. We can suggest many of the tools they may wish to use, but when we suggest how and when to apply them, isn't that the point at which we become the artist? Is that what we want to be as a coach or a judge? Instead, we can choose to relate to performers on a much deeper level. By encouraging, or at times even forcing, performers to locate the artist within, we can help barbershop move further toward true artistry.

“Treat people as if they were what they ought to be and you help them to become what they are capable of being.” - Johann W. von Goethe.

New Directions, June 2003

# REAL WORLD RELEVANCY TEST

- Joe Hunter and Connie Keil led the efforts
  - Kevin Keller supported with statistical analyses, etc.
- Conducted in the Spring of 2007 at most Prelim contests for the Quartet Finals
- “Outsiders” invited to judge and rank order competitors from 1-10

## ■ Outcomes

- Some results mixed – audiences couldn’t agree with themselves
- Where there was audience agreement, their order aligned with the PRS Category

## BENEFITS

1. We get a reality check on our current system. It is always beneficial to open things up when you have a closed system, no matter how effective.
2. It opens up our thinking and brings in some fresh perspectives and ideas.
3. It creates new relationships and possible strategic alliances in the local communities.
4. It provides a template for possible similar programs/studies for the MUS and SNG categories.

## CONCLUSION

This is a win-win program. The costs to accomplish this program are low and the potential benefits are high. The biggest commitment

New Directions Sep 2006

# 2007

- Buffalo Bills contest at 2007 Midwinter
  - Adjudicated under the 5 Category System of the 1950's/1960's
- For the Int'l Quartet Finals, Larry Clemons, C&J Chair, allows judges to discuss any controversial performances prior to assigning a score
- Larry Clemons also begins educational videos of International performances from the pit (2007, 2008, 2009)



## 2007 – PENALTIES COME BACK IN FULL FORCE

- Westminster Stomp (Strike Up the Band Medley) (Start at 1:44)
  - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cDgZ-5GMeg>
  - The only real “rule” was in the MUS CD “Lengthy non-singing times are not permitted” but no guidance
  - PRS penalizes this, despite PRS leadership writing about the dangers of judging barbershop expectations
  - The words “penalty” are mentioned to Ed Watson, BHS CEO, and there is no mention on the scoresheet – he and BHS members are confused





## 2007 – PENALTIES ARE ASSIGNED TO ALL POTENTIAL ELEMENTS IN MUS AND PRS IN BOTH RULES AND CD'S

- Despite numerous efforts by judges attempting to explain the chaos that could occur, the mandates held and at the 2007 Category School, the categories grappled with what got penalized and by how much
  - All categories adjudicated the barbershop style ala 1993 Common Ground
  - 1 in 8 songs would receive a penalty from someone!!!!
- The Fall 2007 contests saw penalties inconsistently applied
  - Penalties given and not given for the same thing
  - Differences in penalties given within categories
  - Differences in penalties between categories
  - Differences in penalties across contests
  - Similar to the early days of the categories, MUS would not apply a stylistic penalty while PRS and SNG would




## RECOVERY AFTER THE FALL OF 2007

- At the Fall 2007 SCJC meeting the Fall 2007 contest data was examined
  - Most penalties were based upon style
  - Most penalties were not consistently administered across the categories
- Rather than attempting to train all judges in nuances, it was decided to go back to allowing MUS to adjudicate style




# RECOVERY AFTER THE FALL OF 2007

- After the first few contests in the Spring of 2008, there was still inconsistency within the MUS Category
  - With internet all of the world can see the issues – lots of grumbling
  - MUS CS Keller published a rubric that guided significance of the event
- Adjustments led to 1 in 20 songs having a penalty assigned
- After meeting with CEO and the SBOD, only penalties of 5 points or more will appear on the scoresheet (Int'l and Fall 2008 ongoing)



	Reductions	Frequency
6. Scoring reduction levels should be applied per the following guidelines:	1	9
a. None - Yes, it goes against something in the Category Description, but there are other wonderful musical things that make up for it. Or, yes, there was a blemish or two but it was unobtrusive.	2	10
b. 1 - Small but obtrusive blemish on an otherwise fine arrangement	3	7
c. 1-3 - Several obtrusive blemishes on an otherwise fine arrangement	4	5
d. 1-4 - An arrangement that doesn't meet "enough" minimum expectations, but the audience thinks it is barbershop	5	2
e. 3-7 - Enough that a barbershop audience member may question parts of it, but the piece has barbershop character.	6	2
f. 5-9 - It makes a barbershop audience and a MUS judge uncomfortable. This may be due to either one or two overriding issues or a lot of minutia.	7	2
g. 10+ - Significant barbershop deficiencies according the rules and Category Description, but there is still barbershop texture to the arrangement.	8	0
h. Forfeiture - Nothing redeeming about this performance as it relates to contestable music and/or the hallmarks of the barbershop style. As described in The Judging System, Section II, there is "an unequivocal and definite violation of the rules" resulting in no quality rating being appropriate.	9	0
	10	2
	11	0
	12	1
	13	0
	14	1
	15	1
	21	1
	29	1



BARBERSHOP HARMONY SOCIETY

Without context, people can be confused by penalties and style.  
Largest penalty was "In the Evening By The Moonlight" (90 pts)

# WHAT COULD YOU LOSE SPECIFIC POINTS?

- Note while PRS is adjudicating Articles (Rules), MUS is also penalizing items in the Category Description
- This will be addressed in the next decade

BARBERSHOP HARMONY SOCIETY

RULE	Description	S 1	S 2
Article IX.A.1	Lack of Consonant Chords		
Article IX.A.1	Not Predominantly Homophonic		
Article IX.A.1	Melody Not Predominantly in the Lead		
Article IX.A.1	Excessive Passages Less Than 4 Parts		
Article IX.A.2	Instrumental Accompaniment		
Article IX.A.3	Chorus Singing Unit Not Brief or Appropriate		
Article V.A.2	Repeating Substantial Portions of a Song		
MUS CD II.A	Melodic Alterations		
MUS CD II.B	Lyrics		
MUS CD II.C.2	Chord Vocabulary		
MUS CD II.C.3	Harmony (33%)		
MUS CD II.C.6	Circle of Fifths/Secondary Dominants		
MUS CD II.E	Extremely Complicated Rhythms		
MUS CD II.F	Construction and Form		
MUS CD II.G	Degree of Embellishment		

To record forfeiture, enter a zero in the net song score box and a zero (or an X) in applicable rule box.

**MUSIC**

Song 1 Score

Song 2 Score

Check box if reduction (penalty) applied for one or both songs. ☐

CJ-26 02/01/09

RULE	Description	S 1	S 2
Article IX.D.1	Taste Within a Song		
Article IX.D.1	Patriotic Issues		
Article IX.D.1	Religious Issues		
Article X	Electronic Amplification or Use of Recordings		
Article XI.A.1	Non-Members Performing on Stage		
Article XI.A.2	Taste Regarding Gestures, Staging, etc.		
Article XII	Excessive Speaking (Before, In Between, After)		

To record forfeiture, enter a zero in the net song score box and a zero (or an X) in applicable rule box.

**PRESENTATION**

Song 1 Score

Song 2 Score

Check box if reduction (penalty) applied for one or both songs. ☐



**SINGING**

Song 1 Score

Song 2 Score

## 2007 – OTHER UNIQUE PERFORMANCES

- Wheelhouse – Finals of International
  - Excessive Talking
- Southern Gateway – Fall District - South Pacific
  - Perceived in performance as a single song
- Technology allowing us to all view performances day after the event and discussing what really happened



## END OF THE DECADE MISCELLANEOUS

- In 2008 Contest Administrators are made “Judges”
- Moving minor stylistic issues into the back of the MUS CD
- Conferencing is witnessed as “Good, they heard what I heard”
- Evaluations ala carte idea introduced in 2008
  - Wasn’t fully realized until 2018-2019

Policy adopted by the Society Board (at its July 1, 2008 meeting): The Society Contest & Judging Committee shall follow and establish processes and procedures, including statements of policy and category descriptions that are entirely consistent with the definition of the barbershop style as approved by the Society Board. Any change in the definition of the barbershop style, whether proposed from within or without the Society Contest and Judging Committee, will not be considered by the Society Board without prior consultation with the Society Contest and Judging Committee. Any proposal must be presented at a board meeting, then published in at least one issue of *The Harmonizer* and otherwise broadly advertised by the then available means of communication to the Society membership to advise them of the possible change to the definition, before action may be taken at a subsequent meeting. Changes in judging procedures and/or category descriptions or policy that may be at variance with the Board-approved definition of the barbershop style require prior approval by the Society Board.





# END OF THE DECADE MISCELLANEOUS

- Elimination of 33% barbershop sevenths in 2009
- Sound into the Int'l pit in 2009
- Consideration of reducing the number of judges 2009

With the change to the 33% criterion, it was decided to publish the proposed change initially in *The Harmonizer*; and then entertain discussion of the change on the Society blog site before the final approvals were made. This process follows the steps associated with a change to the definition of the barbershop style (although it technically was not).

There were several lessons learned in that process.

1. Regardless of whether people agreed with the proposed change or not, transparency and communication was truly appreciated by all.
2. Open communication of change likely diffused turmoil among factions of the membership.
3. A large portion of our membership is much more liberal and progressive than we believed.

To point #3, I fully expected a hailstorm of protest in response to the proposal. What we got was mainly either mixed emotions or actual support. Very few people who responded in some form were against the change and, with some private dialogue, they were much more accepting of the change.

Keller, New  
Directions,  
Dec 2009

# SCORING LEVELS AT INTERNATIONAL

- By the end of the decade, PRS is having more influence by using more of the scale between 90-100
  - MUS is starting to use some additional scores between 90-100 but not to the same extent
  - SNG is hitting a glass ceiling of 90 for quartets
    - SNG is having less weight in the higher level placements



# CHORUS DISQUALIFICATIONS AND OTHER CHORUS MEMBERSHIP ISSUES (ARTICLE I.B.4)

- Westminster (2002)
- Big Apple (2003)
- “Merger” of Mason City, IA & Minneapolis Commodores (2006)
- At the Fall 2007 SCJC meeting, new MUS CS Kevin Keller suggests a rule change
  - Elimination of Article I.B.4
  - Approved in 2008 by the SBOD

## 4. Contest Cycle and Dual/Transfer Membership

*a. Contest Cycle Defined:* In each district, a contest cycle begins with the first contest, in a given calendar year that is part of the process of selecting the district's representative to the international chorus contest.

*b. Membership Prior to Cycle Commencement:* To be eligible to compete with a given chapter as a transfer or dual (including reinstated dual) member, a member must have established his transfer or dual membership status in the chapter prior to the commencement of the contest cycle in the district.

(1) *Membership Established:* A membership transfer or dual membership will be established upon receipt at the Society office of the necessary request for transfer or dual membership, and all necessary approvals thereof.

(2) *Change of Residence:* This eligibility requirement will not apply to a member who, after the commencement of the contest cycle, changes his place of residence and solely as a consequence of such change, transfers his membership to the chapter with whose chorus he thereafter competes.

*c. Multiple Choruses:* A dual or transfer member may participate, either as director or singer, with more than one chorus in any contest.

## 4. Competing in Multiple Choruses

A member may participate, either as director or singer, with more than one chorus in any contest.

## NEXT TIME

- In our next episode, we will
  - Discuss the events and actions of 2010-2015
  - How did C&J manage the predicted change in categories of every generation?
- Video Series is “free”
  - Donations in the name of this series are gladly accepted to <https://give.barbershop.org/preserve>
- Any new information you may have, please contact me at [kkburi@charter.net](mailto:kkburi@charter.net)

