

## BAC Review Group

### Notes of the meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2018 at the Somers Town Coffee House, London

**Present:** Mr John Hansson (Chairman)

Mrs Jules Candler	Mrs Catherine Kaye
Mrs Jen Lacey	Mr Steve Parkin
Mrs Sally Rainbow-Ockwell	

#### **1. Meeting introduction**

The Chairman welcomed those present shortly after midday and thanked them for attending. The purpose of the meeting is to put together proposals for the administration of the delivery of judge training in its new format. This should cover structure constitutional revision, funding and a complaints/appeals system

#### **Apologies for absence were received on behalf of:**

Dr Peter Collin, Mrs Kate Ekanger, Mrs Heather McRae.

#### **2. Minutes of the previous meeting**

Previous discussion had taken place at a meeting with Show Structure Review Group & Judge Training Review Group on 6 December. Notes had been circulated to the Board, Council delegates and to BACs. They were not discussed further.

#### **3. BAC/JAG Structure post June 2019**

A table was presented based on GCCF records from the system. It was amended according to what was known of current club participation in BACs, and noted that the computer records should be updated. Once finalised this table would replace the list of the JAS at 2b, be on the GCCF website and updated when necessary. (table attached).

It was noted that if the Suffolk gained championship status in June its breed club would become a single club BAC. It would not be amalgamated in any way with the OJBAC, though an ORI/SUF JAG would need to be formed.

There was discussion on the definition of a breed club. A list of these had been approved by the Board and the category was confirmed when were accepted for membership. All Breed club were entitled to be BAC constituent/associate membership regardless of whether they catered for one breed (eg. ABY CA) or several (eg. SHCS & Rex, Colourpoint & AOV). However, there were multi-breed specialist clubs that were not also BAC eligible. It was agreed that as these were now being linked by the computer system to BACs there should be Board clarification, but that at present it was the original definition that counted, though any club could make an application to the Board for a change of status. New breeds needed a club, but most existing breeds were well catered for.

It was agreed by all that any meeting of a JAG or multi club BAC needed an **independent Chairman**, whose function was to run the meeting and review the minutes.

**Definition:** not a breeder or exhibitor of any of the breeds concerned nor a club committee member of any of the clubs involved.

One person should be a Chairman for a maximum of 2 JAGs.

S/he could also Chair no more than two BACs, but neither of these should be in a JAG that was chaired by that same person.

It was thought that an independent secretary could be the choice of the JAG or BAC as long as the Chair was involved in monitoring minutes and correspondence.

#### **4. Membership of JAGs**

This was the major debate of the meeting and eventually it was agreed to present BACs and clubs with two options and invite comments on preference.

##### **A) Every breed club to have a single representative on the JAG.**

This would take BACs out of the loop completely as far as judge training was concerned. The JAG secretary would feed all information from meetings and candidates directly to all constituent club secretaries. Constituent clubs would be those who paid the agreed levy to the GCCF account held for this purpose.

Club committees would discuss candidates' progress and the elected representative would put these to the JAG meetings, which would be held twice a year.

##### **Pros:**

- Simple to define membership, and fair in that each breed club had the same representation.
- The cheaper option. BACs would be looking after SOPs, registration and breeding policies and occasionally progressing new colours & patterns. They would need to hold face to face meetings very infrequently, with most business done electronically if there was no contentious issue to discuss. Therefore, very little funding would be required.
- Better involvement for breed clubs within the system giving them purpose and new committee members could learn from the more experienced.

##### **Cons:**

- It would lead to very large Judge Appointment Groups for some breeds, and it was preferable to keep these to 7-11 for ease of discussion and resolution.
- Some breeds by virtue of the number of clubs would be able to dominate the JAG and their breed's needs and preferences would probably take priority. Candidates would work to please them.
- Possibly there could be club proliferation in an attempt to gain greater JAG influence and this could be divisive.

##### **B) The BACs in each group to elect members to a JAG of an agreed size**

Each BAC within the group would elect a suitable number of members to make up the JAG that could be kept to a suitable working size. Where there were more clubs than representatives required it would be a matter of drawing lots annually, and giving those missing out one year the priority for the next. The JAG Secretary would provide relevant information to the BAC secretaries whose responsibility it would be to pass it on to the clubs. The BACs would be the forum for discussion on breed matters and judge training with their reps attending the two annual JAG meetings.

##### **Pros:**

- Each JAG would be of a manageable size and consist of well experienced representatives with substitutes readily available.
- Each breed would have an equality of input into the training of candidates with their grand group so less domination from and priority given to larger breeds in the groups, or those who happened to have a greater number of breed clubs.

##### **Cons:**

- Some clubs would feel disenfranchised for periods when they do not have direct JAG representation.
- A greater cost as the BACs would want more frequent face to face meeting to discuss candidate progress. This could lead to higher club levies, a cost that some clubs might find difficult to meet.

No decisions would be taken to define membership and fitting procedures within the constitution until BACs and clubs had indicated a preference for one of these options. BAC involvement in judge training after June 2019 could then be determined.

### **Associate membership**

Suggested: no annual subscription, but participation at BAC level only, with a contribution to be paid towards the expenses of any actual meeting held. BAC input required.

### **JAG/BAC Meetings**

It was agreed that it was preferable that the JAG meetings that considered candidate applications should be face to face with voting taken by paper ballot. However, no JAG should hold more than two such per year, though there was no reason why there should not be conference calls between meetings, particularly if there were issues with candidate progress evidenced from information received.

**Provision in the constitution should be made for emergency situations using electronic means with a clear method of meeting procedure and secure voting agreed in advance.**

**If A** was chosen then it was thought there would be infrequent need for BAC meetings, and therefore little cost. An independent Chair would only be necessary if clubs were divided along club lines on a registration or SOP issues. Any of the clubs could refer the matter to the Monitoring & Review Group to provide a way forward if there was deadlock.

**If B** was chosen the same practice would be used to resolve issues. It would be possible actual meetings would be wanted to determine the breed comment re candidate progress the elected reps should take to the JAGs. An annual electoral meeting would be a necessity – one other to be centrally funded or electronic meeting only unless at club expense?

## **5. BAC constitution appraisal**

1. **The system** – minor rewording
2. **The Appointment of judges** – less wording for most clauses, with reference made to the table, and rules as appropriate. Emeritus & retired status considered later g & h.
3. **Definition & purpose** – to be finalised after BAC input on membership
4. **Full Judges** – short statement only needed to refer to relevant Judge Training Section
5. **Stewards** – as above
6. **Complaints** – a-d general but needed to ensure disciplinary action can be taken if necessary  
Once finalised the use of the Monitoring & Review Group as the body to deal with complaints & arbitration would be written in here
7. **General** - to be completed after BAC input
8. **Membership** – as above
9. **Objectives** – to be divided to give clear JAG & BAC responsibility, once BAC input has been determined
10. **Officers** – points here as agreed at 3 (page 1).
11. **Finance** – see Finance proposals
12. **Meetings** - as discussed above with JAG & BAC procedure separate & distinct
13. **Circulation of documents** – GCCF printed & despatched from the Office to JAG officers & reps for the two meetings. All other circulation electronic or paid for by the clubs
14. **Training & monitoring** – summary, mostly JAG responsibility, but to include BACs if agreed

## **6. JAG Finance**

The shared pot, a radical approach to remove disparity in income and avoid the need for bank accounts and treasurers.

Some current problems:

- Difficulty in opening new bank accounts and handing these on to new personnel with a change of officer(s).
- Finding people with the time and capability to act as efficient treasurer and make GCCF returns
- BACs with a large number of clubs have built up funds which are dormant, while BACs with fewer clubs & candidates struggle to make ends meet.

### **Proposal**

1. Open a single JAG/BAC GCCF account operated by the GCCF computer system
2. Payments are made to this from candidates and from constituent clubs via an annual levy which is reviewed periodically. Payment taken via bank transfer, Pay-pal, phone etc. The candidate fee for a multi-breed Grand Group JAG to be set at £50
3. Payments for JAG meeting room hire, paper circulation & officer expenses for two meetings per annum are made from this, by invoicing the office, either directly or for funds to the Chairman or secretary in advance to meet any cash-on-the-day payment required.
4. All existing BAC accounts close.
5. Half the funds to go the GCCF (JAG) account & half to be returned to share amongst the constituent clubs. This would give the GCCF fund a 'pot' to operate JAGs
6. This shared fund would probably allow for one GCCF JAG based seminar annually alternating between northern and southern venues (if thought necessary by the Judge Training Group), provide sponsorship for small breed shows that are combined with a training event, or any other teaching/training event proposed.

*(When this was discussed by the Finance Committee it was thought that BACs should consider the possibility of all funds going into the central pot, as it could be difficult to determine which constituent clubs were eligible for a share. Also, the possibility of some going to the CWT in the case of large amounts was thought worth consideration).*

### **7. A Review Group or Panel to monitor & scrutinise and deal with complaints and arbitrate disputes**

#### **Eligibility – who and how selected?**

It was agreed that no one could participate in any type of monitoring or complaint solution if involved with the JAG concerned as an officer or member, and/or a committee member of constituent club. They could be judges of the breed concerned, but must not have participated in the training (by tutorials and/or assessments) of any candidate concerned.

This would mean as many would have to recuse themselves from a case, there would need to be a large number of people involved. If a list was kept in the Office people could be selected randomly to act on a case.

It was agreed that there should be a Bye-Law change to remove reference to the Committee of Judges and establish the Monitoring and Review (M&R) Panel. Delegates could put forward annually the names of those suitable (at least 25 suggested). Criteria for suitability would be:

- Experienced judges
- Experienced BAC representatives or administrators

(both to include GCCF Officers and Board Members, but not anyone who was an officer or committee member or SM of another cat organisation covering registration and shows).

## Functions

As well as hearing complaints and sorting out difficulties (sections 6, 23j k and h & l of the current JAS) the M&R would have a monitoring role. The paperwork of all deferrals and rejections to be scrutinised before any referral to Council, and a selection of promotions to be considered as 'quality control'.

This would be done by five members via two meetings annually, electronically or face to face if the Chair, elected by those selected for the session, considered an actual meeting was required because of the complexity or level of contention of any complaint. In the event of a split decision the Chair would have a casting vote.

## 8. Emeritus/Retired Judge Status

It had been agreed by the Board that there should be clarification before June for judges on the Emeritus List. The following points were to be put forward:

- 'Retired' was the equivalent of list removal for judges who knew that they would not undertake any further engagements. This was unchanged.
- If judges wished to be Emeritus this would cover all lists. A working definition was: it could be temporary or permanent, accepting few or no engagements, not being added to new breed lists nor gaining additional higher classes unless opting for Full Status once again.  
2g) A Judge may apply to be placed upon the Emeritus List for ~~any or~~ all of the Breed Lists of which they are a Full Judge. This shall be taken as an indication that, although not generally available to judge that Breed List, they may accept engagements for occasional shows, ~~or that they are unable to accept engagements in the immediate future.~~ However, they will not be added to new breed lists and/or may not take on new certificate classes.
- It was also proposed that taking a refresher course after 5 years absence from judging should no longer be discretionary.  
2i) It is the responsibility of JAGs to monitor Full Judges and report to the MR Group if they have not accepted judging engagement in the previous five years. It will request they must either take a refresher period as a PJ or retire.
- It was thought it would help it would clarify if the Office ascertained the intentions of some present judges who had not made contact for over five years.

## 9. Date of next meeting

After an opportunity for input from BACs and clubs.

## 10. AOB

There was discussion of a letter from a judge re **eligibility in Grand Group 5**. It was agreed that in the cases of those not eligible to judge two Grands in the section Burmese judges had to retain their entitlement to do an Imperial, but those coming from the Foreign Section kept any entitlements to higher classes in section 4 and did not have a right to an additional Imperial if qualified for the non-Burmese Grand only. Most cats in Section 5 were expected to be Burmese. Each judge would still retain the number of higher certificate classes they had in advance of the re-structure, but these could be spread across two sections instead of one.

It was agreed there should be the **establishment of an archive**. Copies of applications, veterinary defect training, assessments and minutes to be kept on file on the GCCF system.

The meeting finished at 4.30pm.