

Show, BAC and Judge Training Review Group

Notes of the meeting held on 6th December 2017 at the Conway Hall, Holborn, London

Present:

Mrs Kate Kaye (Chairman)	
Mrs Jules Candler	Mrs Jen Lacey
Dr Peter Collin	Mrs Heather McRae
Mrs Hilary Dean	Mr Steve Parkin
Mrs Kate Ekanger	Mrs Sally Rainbow-Ockwell
Mr John Hansson	Mrs Elaine Robinson
Mrs Shelagh Heavens	Mrs Lisa Robinson-Talboys
Mrs Val Kilby	

1. Meeting introduction

Shortly after midday the Chairman thanked those present for attending.

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of:

Lynda Ashmore, Val Anderson, Sue Dalton-Hobbs, Sean Farrell, Helen Marriott-Power, Anna McEntee, and Peter Williams.

2. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes had been circulated and were agreed without amendment.

Matters arising

Group membership of those who weren't present at the August meeting.

HD had opted to be a member of the Judge Training RG and had attended its October meeting.

KE and SP both became members of the BAC Review Group.

KK confirmed AE had been contacted, but at present could not join any of the groups because of difficulty attending meetings due to work commitments.

3. Examination of the current status and issues to resolve within:

a) Show Structure Review Group

Objections to the new groups had been received from Birman exhibitors in the form of a petition with 191 signatures, and the Suffolk Breeder Group, who had made representation in Council and contacted JL when submitting their application for championship status with information that was circulated. There was discussion on the points made by each.

It was understood that the Birman exhibitors did not want to lose a solo grand class that they had gained because of the numbers on the bench after the SLH section was formed. However, the statistics gathered by KK, verified by the GCCF Office records, and considered by the SSRV, showed numbers present now were low, as with the two Persian grands that were to be amalgamated to one. No data had been submitted with the petition.

The Suffolk had been allocated to the Foreign Section by the Board when given breed status, as it was a condition of recognition that it was different from Orientals, and most judges (less than a third) appointed to its list, and familiar with it in its assessment and foreign miscellaneous classes, did not currently work in the Oriental section, therefore it would be predominately judges with little previous experience of the breed judging it for higher certificates.

There was a proposal that the SUF should be allocated to the AOV class of section 5. However, the vote taken was on maintaining the status of the status quo to cover both the Birman and Suffolk requests for change, and the majority were in favour of no change.

Protocol for future change

It was agreed that these decisions could be subject to change, after a twelve-month period post introduction of the new structure, on the presentation of factual evidence, as was the right for all breeds who wanted class splits or section change. The Birman clubs would need to submit data to indicate numbers shown merited a separate grand, and the Suffolk breeder group show record of judge problems or disadvantage in Section 6.

Section numbering

The sections were originally listed in hair type/body shape order, with the British as the second, but after discussion on whether to hold to this rationale it was considered it would cause less confusion for exhibitors and schedule drafters if the section list was standardised to follow the current pattern.

Thus:

1. Persian and Exotic
2. Semi-Longhair (all breeds currently within the section, including NEB at assessment level)
3. British SH, Manx, Selkirk SH/LH, Chartreux, British LH
4. Breeds currently in the Foreign section except Australian Mist, Tonkinese, Asians and Suffolk
5. Burmese, Australian Mist, Tonkinese and Asians
6. Orientals, Suffolk, Siamese and Balinese.

Date of implementation

It was acknowledged that the structural changes had to be made ahead of the new judge training programme (as this would be dependent on the new grand classes) and the interlinked BAC revision. There was some consideration given to them all commencing in June 2019 which would give time for plenty of preparation, and allowed for a greater degree of familiarity with the show changes, but the consensus was that it was probably better to get on with the section re-organisations so that the inevitable glitches could be dealt with, ahead of further change.

It was confirmed that judges would be doing the same breed classes they were qualified for at present and there would no change for Imperial and Olympian eligibility. It would be necessary to have lists to show who was eligible for the reorganised grands in each section, based on the principles of a 50% of the breeds in each grand group qualifying a judge for grand, but that there should be no loss of current eligibility.

(Note: post meeting query re eligibility for grands with only two breed lists, particularly the ORI & SUF if the SUF should be promoted to championship status in February).

It was noted that shows had already booked judges for June 2018 onwards, and had prepared an allocation of classes although schedules would not have been printed. However, it was decided that judge changes would be manageable. Some judges would not be needed (only one Imperial for section 6 and 7 and one grand rather than two in the Persian section), and grands would be added in sections 2 and 5.

The conclusion was the re-structure should be presented in Council in February to go ahead from 1 June 2018.

Actions:

1. List of classes to be produced in the Office for circulation to show managers by 15 December. **SRO**
2. Lists of judges of judges per section to be revised to take account of recent decisions and updates, and then to be circulated to judges and BAC secretaries by 11 December. **JL**
Amendments to be made and the list to go to SMs on 15 December **JL**
3. IT changes to be made to the computer system to allow for the difference in show data provided after the date change.
4. The restructure plan showing the section and classes to be provided on the website in written & diagrammatic form. **CK/SRO**
5. A link to this to go out to all on the system via 'infusionsoft'. **SRO**

6. Presentation to be given in Council with appropriate statistics (particularly the Birman data) represented, but the website presentation needed well before delegate circulation. **CK**

b) BAC Review Group

JH explained that the BAC RG had not yet met as it needed finalisation of the restructuring, which was now done, and clarification of what would be covered by the Judge Training Group, as defined by its October meeting. With implementation of the restructure to go ahead in June a meeting was now a matter of priority to allow for consultation with the BACs as most met infrequently.

It was agreed that the notes of this meeting would be sent out to all BAC secretaries. **JH/JL**

The BAC and JAG administration would need to be in place ahead of the accelerator scheme being put into operation to allow judges awarding grand certificates in the multi-breed sections to become full on other lists within the group, if they so wished, after specified tuition and parallel judging.

It was agreed that the Judge Appointment Groups (JAGs) of the multi-breed sections would not deal with breed registration policies and SOPs. These would remain the remit of the existing BACs. It was necessary to work out with the BACs how this would be put into operation when two or more clubs were current BAC members. The probability would be for the allowance of most business to be carried out electronically.

Finance would also need discussion. The possibility of a scaled rate of fees for candidates on multi-breed lists would be considered. It was observed that fees had not risen for many years.

It was anticipated that only one from each BAC would need to represent the breed on a BAC, and bring comment from the BAC on a candidate's judging progress with the breed.

It was thought essential that those attending JAGs should be well experienced, and representative qualification would also need to be discussed with current BACs and then agreed.

The issue was raised of a candidate progressing with most breeds in a multi-grand group, but failing with one. It was agreed this should be the remit of the Judge Training RG.

However, it was observed that it would be possible for a candidate to go through the training without encountering each breed (if a minority breed) or each colour/pattern of larger breeds. It would be unrealistic that this should be a requirement, and the precedent was already established with Manx.

c) Judge Training Review Group

The Judge Training RG had met in October and circulated minutes of their discussions. There was also feedback from some judges after they had received the notes, which was mostly positive, but also highlighted some problem areas.

They had determined too main areas to plan for:

- A revision of the Judge Appointment Scheme that all new candidates would work through.
- The accelerated scheme that would be a transitional stage between the current scheme and the new one.
- It was also planned to revise the stewarding scheme.

Features of the new scheme

It was intended that the new scheme should be education based and emphasise the placing of the cats in classes and the reasons for the order.

Tutorials would be based on core topics to be defined by BACs. They could be given to individual PJs or to a group.

It was queried whether 'open book' exams had been considered, particularly for the early stage of the transition from steward to judge. These were not a test to demonstrate memory, but a method of encouraging reading for understanding and research, and could assist with acquiring knowledge of one or more SOPs. They could be delivered in an electronic tick box format and be an option for a multi-breed JAG.

It was observed that exams of any type were not wanted, but it was possible use could be made of electronic work sheets for the reading and research elements.

Mentoring was used successfully by some BACs currently. It was intended that it should be an option rather mandatory.

Assessments would be replaced by parallel judging. The outcome of assessments sometimes depended upon the relationship between the Full Judge and the candidate.

It was proposed that full critiques should be written only for the cats in breed classes. For other classes pointers, plus reasons for placing, would be used.

The move between being a steward to a judge was thought too sudden. A transitional period where the steward worked with the BAC/JAG for the final five certificates and received some guidance on report writing and the interpretation of the SOP(s) would be required.

However, Full Judges commencing training on a new list would not be asked to steward.

Acceleration during the transitional period between the existing and new schemes

This would be optional for judges already eligible to judge the Grand Class in one of the multi-breed sections, but not full on all lists. They could become PJs on the other lists in the groups and apply for promotion following three tutorials and one parallel judging exercise.

If not eligible to do the grand they would be able to go onto to the other lists as a PJ and progress through the scheme.

(If a judge remained as a specialist and did not wish to take on other breeds s/he would not be eligible to award CCs/PCs to the other breeds in the Grand group – as at present).

Other issues

It was thought those judges already judging would be assisted to cover more quickly if they wished, but more had to be done to address the problem of attracting new people. If new judges could do more they would be more useful to SMs, and that was the purpose of training judges by group or section, but it had been identified that some were reluctant to cross the line between exhibitor and judge for social reasons.

Seminars were considered useful, but were expensive to run and it was difficult to obtain cats. It would be useful to have some GCCF arranged training sessions in conjunction with shows. These could be breed related or cover handling, including BIS handling.

4. Actions to implement for maintain momentum and timelines.

The show structure action was planned in detail for the first stage. It would be important that the information was shared and queries responded to promptly.

The Judge Training and BAC revisions were planned for implementation in 2019.

5. Date & time of next meeting

It was agreed this should be set after the next meetings of the sub-committees.

AOB None.

The meeting finished at 3.00pm