2010-2011 REGIONAL BAND FESTIVAL RESULTS



The status of member school bands are listed below as to whether they attended Regional Band Festivals. The Festival Plan requires member schools (high schools, Middle School/9th Grade schools) to participate in the festival in their region within the guidelines of the Festival Plan. Section 127-5-5 of the WVSSAC Rules and Regulations Handbook states, "In order to qualify for approved participation in activities outside the home county and counties contiguous to the home county (including out-of-state), bands of member schools must have participated within the quidelines of the WVSSAC Band Festival Plan in the most recently conducted regional band festival."

HIGH SCHOOLS

School Name	Grade Level Rating	School Name	Grade Level Rating	School Name	Grade Level Rating
Berkeley Springs	2, 5 2	John Marshall	5 1	Ripley	4, 5 1
Bluefield	5, 6 1	Keyser	4, 6 1	Riverside	3 3
Braxton County	2 2	Lewis County	5 1	Ritchie County	5, 4 1
Bridgeport		Liberty (H)	4, 4 1	Roane County	3, 4 2
Concert	3, 4 1	Liberty (R)	2, 1 CO	Robert C. Byrd	
Symphonic	5, 5 1	Lincoln	4, 4 2	Symphonic	5, 5 2
Brooke	4 1	Lincoln County	1	St. Albans	
Buckhannon-Upshur	4, 6 1	Logan	1		4 1
Buffalo (P)	3, 4 1	Magnolia	4, 4 2		4, 5 1
Burch	Did Not Participate	Man MS/HS	2, 3 2	St. Marys	4, 5 1
Cabell Midland		Martinsburg	5, 6 1	Scott	4, 4 2
Wind	5 1	Matewan MS/HS	Did Not Participate	Shady Spring	5, 4 2
Concert	3 1	Meadow Bridge	2, 2 2	Sherman	Did Not Participate
Calhoun County MS/HS	2, 2 3	•	2, 2 CO	Sissonville	4 1
Cameron Jr/Sr	2, 3 2	Montcalm	2 2	South Charleston	3, 4 2
Capital			2, 2 3		3, 4 2
9th	4 1	Morgantown	,	Spring Valley	,
10th-12th	5 1	· ·	6, 6 1		4 1
Chapmanville	1, 1 2		5, 6 1	Symphonic	3 1
•	2, 2 2	• •	1	, ,	4 1
Clay County	4, 4 2		Did Not Participate		3, 4 2
•	2, 3 3		Did Not Participate	•	2 2
East Fairmont	•		5, 6 1		3, 3 <i></i> 2
East Hardy	•		4, 5 2	•	2 2
Elkins	•	•	2	•	2, 1 3
Fairmont Sr			2	,	3, 5 3
Fayetteville	2, 2 2		2, 3 CO	, ,	1
Frankfort	4, 42		4 2	University	-,
George Washington	5 1	Oak Hill	1	•	3, 4 1
Gilbert	3, 3 2		2		6, 6 1
Gilmer County	2, 2 2	,	2		Did Not Participate
•	4, 4 2	Parkersburg South	-,	• • •	3, 4 1
Greenbrier East	4, 5 1	•	5, 5 1	, , ,	Did Not Participate
Greenbrier West	3, 2 2		3, 3 1		2, 3 CO
Hampshire			2, 2 2		5, 4 2
Hannan Jr/Sr	•		2, 2 3	-	3, 4 1
Harman	,	•	3, 4 3	•	2, 3 3
Hedgesville	•	ŭ	6 1	•	3 2
Herbert Hoover		· ·	2, 3 2		Did Not Participate
Hundred/Long Drain			4 2		Did Not Participate
Huntington			2, 3 2	· ·	5 1
Hurricane		•	3, 3 2	-	Did Not Participate
Independence			4, 5 2		5, 4 1
James Monroe					5, 6 1
Jefferson			4, 4 2		3, 4 3
	3, 5 1		3, 3 1		5, 4 1
	5, 6 1	Monwood Wo/Ho	J, J		



MIDDLE SCHOOL/9TH GRADE SCHOOL

School Name	Grade Level Rating	School Name	Grade Level Rating	School Name	Grade Level Rating
Andrew Jackson	2 2	Hamlin	Did Not Participate	Rivesville	Did Not Participate
Ansted	1, 2 4	Harpers Ferry	2, 2 1	Robert L. Bland	2, 3 2
Athens	2 2	Harts	1, 1 2	Romney	1, 1 2
Barboursville	2 2	Hayes	2 1	Rowlesburg	Did Not Participate
Barrackville/Fairview	1, 2 2	Hedgesville	2, 2 1	Saint Francis	Did Not Participate
Beckley-Stratton	1, 1 1	Horace Man	2, 3 1	Shady Spring	Did Not Participate
Belington	2 1	Huntington	1 2	Shepherdstown	3, 3 1
Beverly Hills	2 2	Hurricane	2, 4 2	Sherman	Did Not Participate
Blennerhassett		Independence	1, 2 2	Sherrard	2, 3 2
Bluefield	1 1	Jackson	2, 2 3	Short Line	
Braxton	Did Not Participate	John Adams	2 1	6th	1, 2 2
Bridgeport	2, 2 1	Kasson	2 2	7th/8th	2, 3 2
Bridge Street	2 1	Kermit	Did Not Participate	Sissonville	2 2
Bruceton	Did Not Participate	Keyser		South	
Buckhannon-Upshur		Lashmeet/Matooka		South Charleston	1, 2 1
Capon Bridge			1, 1 2	South Harrison	-
Cedar Grove			2, 2 2	South Preston	1, 2 2
Central Preston		Lumberport	_,	Spanishburg	-
	1. 1 1	•	1, 2 1	Spencer	•
	3, 3 2		2, 2 1	Spring Mills	
Ceredo-Kenova	,	Madison		Stonewall Jackson	
Chapmanville		Man		Summersville	•
Charles Town	Dia Noti antioipato	Mannington/Monongah -		Suncrest	•
	3, 2 1	Marlinton	.,	Taylor County	
	2, 2 1		1 2	Terra Alta East Preston	
Cheat Lake			2, 3 2	Trap Hill	•
Clay County		•	2, 2 2	Triadelphia	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Collins		Martinsburg South	Σ, ΣΣ	Trinity	•
Crum		<u> </u>	1, 1 1	Tucker Valley	
Davis Thomas			1, 1 2	Tyler Consolidated	1, 2
Doddridge County		McKinley	*		1 1
Dunbar		Milton			2 1
DuPont			1, 1 2	VanDevender	
Duval K-8		Moundsville		Vinson/Buffalo	
East Bank		Mountaineer	2	Walton	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
East Fairmont MS	•		2, 2 1	Warm Springs	
East Hardy	•		2, 3 1	Warwood	
East Preston	•	Musselman	*	Washington Irving	
Eastern Greenbrier	· ·	New Martinsville	The state of the s		2, NR No Rating
Edison		Nuttall	*		3, 4 2
	3, 3	Oak Glen	*	Wayne	•
Elkins	2.2			Weir	
	2, 3 2	Oakvale		Wellsburg	
Elkview	-	Park		West Fairmont	•
Enslow	,		2, 2 2		
Fairmont Catholic MS	'	Peterstown	•	West Preston	3, 3 2
Follansbee	•	Philippi		Western Greenbrier	
Fort Gay		Pleasants County	•	Westwood	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Frankfort		Poca		Wheeling	
George Washington		Point Pleasant		Wildwood	•
Glenwood		Princeton		Williamson	
Green Bank		Ravenswood		Williamstown	•
Guyan Valley	· ·	Ripley	The state of the s	Winfield	
Hamilton	3, 4 1	Ritchie County	1, 1 2	Wirt County	2, 2 3

THE WEST VIRGINIA PLAN OF ADJUDICATION

Rating I (Division I)

This division represents the finest conceivable performance for the event and the class of participants being judged; worthy of the distinction of being recognized as among the very best.

Rating II (Division II)

This rating reflects an unusual performance in many respects but not one worthy of the highest rating due to minor defects. Yet it is a performance of distinctive quality.

Rating III (Division III)

This rating is awarded for a good performance but one that is not outstanding. The performance shows accomplishment and marked promise but is lacking in one or more essential qualities.

Rating IV (Division IV)

This rating describes a performance that shows some obvious weaknesses. These may reflect handicaps in the way of instrumentation or lack of rehearsal time.

Rating V (Division V)

This rating indicates a performance which reveals much room for improvement. The director should check his methods, instrumentation, etc., with those of more mature organizations.

*Comments Only

A band director may choose to not receive a rating - just comments. This is to encourage bands to attend their Regional Festival even though they lack numbers or instrumentation.