

BAC Review Group Meeting
Somerset Coffee House
Chalton Street, London



Minutes

(second meeting)

Present:

John Hansson (Chairman)	
Jules Candler	Hilary Dean
Kate Ekanger	Val Kilby
Jen Lacey	Sue Lorton-Hobbs
Helen Marriott-Power	Steve Parkin
Sally Rainbow-Ockwell	Peter Williams

1. Chairman's greeting

- 1.1 The meeting began shortly after 1pm. John Hansson thanked all present for attending.
- 1.2 He observed that since the last meeting he had worked with Hilary to delete from the Philosophy & Principles of the GCCF Judge Appointment (JAS) sections that were a repetition of what existed elsewhere, and highlight others that were questionable.
- 1.3 Copies had been circulated electronically for discussion and input, and Hilary provided print copies at the meeting that included the most recent revisions so that it was available for group discussion.
- 1.4 The aim was to reduce the length and complexity.

2. Apologies for absence: None, all were present.

3. Minutes of the meeting of 26 February 2015.

- 3.1 Inclusion of Hilary Dean at 3.4.
- 3.2 Deletion of final wording at 6.2.4
- 3.3 Amendments at 6.2.10 to note that the Selkirk Rex were also included in the Joint Rex BAC, and that the Sphynx BAC was a separate entity from the Joint Rex BAC.
- 3.4. The minutes were then approved.

4. Matters arising from the minutes (not otherwise covered by the agenda)

4.1 Agreed for Council by the Board:

- 6.2.13 Byelaw revision to enable judge appointments and promotions to be published weekly on the GCCF website, and be brought to Council only if an objection was received.

- 6.2.11 A rule change at 1:43e to ensure that judges for new breeds are already qualified to work in the section the breed has applied for.
 - 6.2.12 An addition to the website statement of eligibility to ensure that no Full Judge is disadvantaged by any future restructuring of sections, breed groups and/or the addition of new breeds. This was to be applied retrospectively to 1.6.2012 (the introduction of Olympian classes).
- 4.2 6.2.14 It had not been agreed by the Board that new PJs should be allowed to offer their services freely, as this was thought to advantage those with the most money, but it had been accepted that a change to the Code of Conduct could be proposed to Council to allow new PJs to let Show Managers know of their availability.

5. Discussion of the JAS.

- 5.1 Probationer had been changed to pupil throughout, as agreed at the last meeting and renumbering inserted where necessary after clause deletions.
- 5.2 The breed list at 2b would be deleted and maintained in the records at the GCCF Office.
- 5.3 The reference to no further specialist judges created would be deleted, as new specialists could occur during the transitional period of list amalgamations.
- 5.4 The final sentence of 4d) to be revisited as worded inappropriately. *
- 5.5 6f needed to tie in with the clauses on deferral and rejection. This procedure and the complaints process needed to be clarified. *
- 5.6 The maximum number of representatives per club on a BAC of two, three or four clubs was reduced to four.
- 5.7 It was agreed that under no circumstances should a representative have more than one vote as currently allowed for at 7c) iii) and 8h.
- 5.8 Single breed BACs would be required to have an independent chair.
- 5.9 Rewording was required at 12 i) to ensure clubs could not block or exclude one another from meetings. *
- 5.10 From discussion it was considered that the quarterly feed back proposed (min 6.2.2) should be optional rather than mandatory.
- 5.11 The GCCF Stewarding scheme did not need to be included.
- 5.12 Breeding and exhibiting experience would carry equal weight at 17k.
- 5.13 Candidates should not feel obliged to join multiple clubs for their training period. A form of associate membership was discussed. *
- 5.14 It was agreed that 19e) (**a new clause to introduce sample critiques at the end of the stewarding period** - see min 6.2.5) was an important addition and should carry input from BACs as the number would depend on the range of colour/pattern/coat type to be covered. However, there should be a maximum of 5 classes required.
- 5.15 It was thought unnecessary to have a section for judges belonging to other organisations as they now had eligibility to judge in GCCF even if resident in UK. All that was needed, if the circumstance did arise, was for the judge to follow the same process as a GCCF judge from another list coming into a new section.
- 5.16 At present few candidates are informed during the course of their training that they have not the aptitude to judge. There was a considerable amount of discussion on how and when to do this as soon as the BAC recognised it from failure to learn from both tuition and feedback and therefore to make meaningful progress.

A two year review was proposed and there was agreement that it was sensible to

include this in the JAS as it was unfair to allow candidates to continue for a further two years if failure was inevitable.*

- 5.17 Yes/no would be substituted for 'accept/not/accept'.
5.18 It was decided not to include miscellaneous classes as mandatory prior to kitten breed classes.
5.19 Wording was included to allow for use of a new style of form to cover tuition.
5.20 It was noted that the section that covered the way in which assessments were carried out needed clarification, and could need a complete review if BACs were working as groups and candidates were learning simultaneously multiple types/patterns/colours and/or coat types . *
5.21 It was agreed that there should be one section to deal with the complaints/appeals procedure. (see 5.5) *

Actions: changes to be made to the JAS to include the wording that was agreed during the document's review.

This to be circulated to the group members prior to publication.

Items marked * to be noted for further discussion

HD

HD

JH

6. Public circulation of the amended JAS.

- 6.1 It was agreed that this should be done as soon as it had been agreed by the BACRV.
6.2 Comments would be invited and suggestions put forward discussed at the next meeting.

7.The new tuition certificate

- 7.1 It was agreed that this type of certificate that put the onus on the candidate to demonstrate the knowledge gained was what was required.
7.2 It needed to carry a number as this would indicate to the tutor judge that candidate's level of experience.
7.3 It was considered unnecessary to include reference to judging 'techniques, and inappropriate to ask for comment on the SOP, although the candidate could be asked if the SOP had been understood in respect of the exhibit judged.
7.4 There could be discussion on placings if more than exhibit had been entered in the class, but if only one the focus had to be on the reason for awarding or withholding placement.
7.5 It had to be clear to PJs that the certificates were worthless unless accompanied by critiques of the cats discussed.

Action: the certificate to be revised following the discussion and circulated to the BACRG PW.

8. Additional tutor judge role

- 8.1 The BAC would need to take comment from the tutor judges on the ability and competence of the PJ, taking account of how far advanced they were in the scheme. (7.2)
8.2 Feedback from tutors would be used to assess progress for the mid-term review. (5.16)

9. Training by section

9.1 It was agreed this should be the target for GCCF judge training. However, as some of the in depth breed knowledge that GCCF judges were currently respected for could be lost, and amalgamation was already underway to form group BACs in two sections, it was thought to proceed at a slower pace had merit.

9.2 A proposal had been put forward to make a single list for Cornish & Devon Rex, LaPerms and Sphynx, combining the Joint Rex and Sphynx BACs, as the breeds formed a single group based around grand classes in the Foreign Section. The Board had approved the rationale.

Action: the Joint Rex and Sphynx BACs to be informed and asked to formulate transitional arrangements based on those being used by the Persian LH and Oriental BACs. **JL**

9.3 Feedback from the BACs would have to come to the BACRV as the JAS could need further amendment to adapt to particular training requirements for a group of breeds.

9.4 It was agreed that if the amalgamation of this group proved successful in the same way that the LH Persian BAC then the scheme should be rolled out across the multi-breed sections. It would be ideal if any restructuring proposed by the Show Review Group (or an amended format, as agreed) had taken place so that groups were stable for the foreseeable future.

10. BACs

10.1 There was comment during the course of the meeting on the suitability of those who were representatives on BACs, and agreed that this needed qualification.

10.2 Long experience with a breed had to count as well as current breeding and exhibiting.

10.3 It was proposed that no one person should Chair and/or be Secretary to more than two BACs. This excluded people who would be willing to work in these capacities.

Action: this proposal to be put to the Board at its May meeting. **JL**

11. Chair's conclusion:

A number of items will require further attention & once the Philosophy & Principles have been tidied up with the agreed changes, it will be necessary to review the document to ensure as far as is practicably possible that it is a workable document.

This document in its current format will be presented to Show Review Group if the BAC Review Group agree for additional input if possible & check for compatibility between the two groups. Due its size & complexity it may require further input at a later date. Some items will be on the agenda for the next Council meeting, with the required rule changes to implement these proposed changes.