

## Show, BAC and Judge Training Review Group

### Notes of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2017 at the Kennel Club, Clarges Street, London

**Present:**

Mrs Kate Kaye (Chairman)

Mrs Val Anderson

Mrs Jen Lacey

Mrs Jules Candler

Mrs Helen Marriott-Power

Dr Peter Collin

Mrs Heather McRae

Mrs Sue Dalton-Hobbs

Mrs Sally Rainbow-Ockwell

Mr Sean Farrell

Mrs Elaine Robinson

Mr John Hansson

Mrs Lisa Robinson-Talboys

Mrs Shelagh Heavens

Mr Peter Williams

Mrs Val Kilby

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

The Chairman welcomed those present shortly after midday and thanked them for attending. Those not known to each other were introduced and it was observed there was representation from across the sections; also a mix of judges, show management and BAC administrators.

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

Lynda Ashmore, Anna McEntee, Kate Ekanger, Steve Parkin.

A message was received from Hilary Dean that she was detained, but then unable to be present.

Andy Whittle had sent his resignation from the group with good wishes for the future.

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

A meeting of those members of the Show Structure Review Group and BAC Review Group able to attend had taken place at the end of April with KK in the chair. The decisions taken were the proposals drafted for the May Board meeting and subsequently put forward at June Council.

#### **3. Group Remits**

##### a) Show Structure Review Group

KC and PC reported that they considered the terms of reference for the SSRG were largely completed. The remit had included formulating proposals to restructure the show sections to give a more balanced entry and equality of competition. A survey of breeders and exhibitors had endorsed these aims, and the proposals put forward were believed to be the fairest viable means of implementing them, although acknowledged not to please all. However, alternatives had been examined during the three-year process, but rejected because they did not cover all criteria.

The completion of the process would be implementation, and this would be stated at October Council. The only reason now to make any change would be if any particular section or group was demonstrated not to be viable because of lack of balance, size or judges available.

##### b) BAC Review Group

The principle objectives of this group had been to streamline BACs and judge training procedures to deliver judges more efficiently and effectively to ensure GCCF would have a sufficient number of judges for all breeds and classes into the future. The current situation was that judges were retiring far more quickly than new ones were qualifying.

It had been agreed that it was no longer possible to train judges to each list of the multi-breed sections, and noted that the amalgamation of BACs to date had worked well. However, further decisions had not been made as it had been agreed that new BACs would be determined according to the show structure. An outline of how this could go forward had been provided with the SSRG proposals, but it was considered this would be flexible as detail was added.

#### **4. Consideration of whether these groups are now the right vehicles to carry forward the process of change through the next stages.**

PW lead a discussion to determine governance of the group for the future, as it was agreed that it could not function effectively with a membership of approximately twenty. It was decided there should be a split into three sub groups each with a specific purpose:

- Show structure implementation
- BAC amalgamation
- Judge training

It was agreed that there would be overlaps and inter-dependency, particularly between the second two. Good communication, particularly between the group Chairs, would be important.

SRO reported that the computer system could be adapted to cater for reallocation of the show sections. It would not be a problem for the GCCF Office to provide the relevant show paperwork with four months' notice. Refinements would be possible to Infusionsoft so that judges within a section could be selected for circulation, for example.

#### **Show Structure Implementation**

Chairman: Kate Kaye

Members: Heather McRae, Elaine Robinson ad Lisa Robinson-Talboys

Purpose: to develop an implementation plan to conclude the work of the SSRG  
to verify the content and take changes only if a sufficient rationale is provided  
inform stakeholders (show management, the GCCF Office & breeders and exhibitors of the detail and timescale.

It was expected that the work of this group would be finished fairly quickly and members could subsequently contribute relevant skills and knowledge to either of the others.

#### **BAC amalgamation**

Chairman: John Hansson

Members: Jules Candler, Jen Lacey, Sally Rainbow-Ockwell

Purpose: to streamline the procedures of all BACs  
to amalgamate BACs within the multi-breed sections by Grand Group, while respecting the need for individual breed groups to retain control of their SOPs, registration and breeding policies  
consider mechanisms for resolving conflict on judge progress  
consider BAC finances  
amend the relevant sections (particularly the BAC constitution) of the GCCF Judge Appointment Scheme  
ensure existing judges are not disadvantaged by amalgamation and that each section and group has a viable number of judges available (some overlap with JT group)  
consider seminar provision (content the responsibility of the JT group)

#### **Judge Training**

Chairman: Peter Collin

Members: Val Anderson, Sue Dalton-Hobbs, Shelagh Heavens, Val Kilby, Helen Marriott- Power, Peter Williams

Purpose: to review and revise the current judge training procedure to teach more effectively, ensure high standards and be user-friendly  
ensure it is based around the new section structure  
develop a system of mentoring  
amend the 'Rules of Procedure' of the GCCF Judge Appointment Scheme accordingly

- produce new forms/paperwork for the JAS requirements
- develop a transitional scheme for the groups formed by BAC amalgamation, ensuring no judges are disadvantaged (overlap Group 2) and enabling 'fast track' options for judges within a new group to extend their judging range if they so wish
- definition of 'specialist' (or new term)
- to revise the Stewarding Scheme, looking at its time frame and quality
- to review the monitoring of Full Judges, considering the possibility of licensing

It was agreed that Kate Kaye should retain Chairmanship for the BAC/JT Review Group overall.

## **5. Maintaining the momentum to take all issues forward**

The three groups met separately for over an hour during the afternoon to develop strategy for their areas of responsibility and goals. At 3.45pm progress reports were made on actions that had been discussed.

### **Show Structure Implementation**

- October Council Statement – summary of completion of SRG work
- Possibility of change by Board application, but caution urged)
- General publicity as widely as possible
- Invitation of feedback using SRG site (Anna McEntee to be contacted)
- Liaison with show management
- Liaison with GCCF Office

### **BAC amalgamation**

- Contact with all BACs to give them the detail of their groups (where relevant) and make a check of the draft judge analysis
- Data now available to indicate which judges have not taken an engagement for five years, confirmation with BACs and discussion on options so that these can be indicated for SMs
- BACs to continue as a forum for discussion where more than one club breed club exists, and Judge Appointment Groups to cover group judging with BAC or Breed club representation
- 'Panel' to determine outcome of split decisions
- Seminars no longer mandatory as a separate event can be held at breed shows
- Fee to JAGs covering a several breeds to be £50 for appointment & promotion
- An examination of BAC funds and consideration of financial viability
- Time limit for BAC response to be given as the end of October, but not necessary to have a formal meeting unless already planned as discussion and feedback can be electronic.

### **Judge Training**

Members of the group had been allocated areas of specific responsibility:

- The Training Scheme for new judges
- Mentoring
- Tutorials and assessments
- Full Judges
- Transition and training with the Grand groups

## **6. Consultation with interested parties**

The key stakeholders had been identified during the course of group discussion and each would make and maintain contact.

PC had sent a questionnaire to judges. Responses had indicated some concerns, but not hostility. It was thought stewards and older YES members should also be asked for input.

## 7. Comprehensive plan of action

As devised by each group (see item 5).

## 8. Date of next meeting

Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> December, venue to be arranged.

## 9. AOB

It was agreed that those unable to present should be invited to select a group.

The concluding observation was that it had been a useful and productive meeting.

The meeting finished at 4.30pm.

Please scrutinise carefully the judge list for your section. It's based on judge eligibility at the beginning of this month, and doesn't take account of some promotions and appointments that may be in the pipeline, but it does need checking carefully for errors of the sort where someone may have been included as a FJ when only a PJ, and to ensure no judge to your knowledge has been disadvantaged.

**Has a judge who was previously judging your breed at Imperial or Grand level been missed, or is there any other reason why you think someone should be included as eligible to do a certificate should be listed? The judges will also be asked, but it's important to look at this from as many perspectives as possible.**

There is a second issue concerning judge eligibility. According to the Philosophy and Principles of the Judge Appointment Scheme (2i) and the Rules of procedure (25) judges who have neither judged nor attended breed seminars during the previous five-year period may be required to undertake a refresher period as a Pupil Judge.

The GCCF Office has been able to compile a list of these judges as BACs can usually make an estimate, but won't necessarily be in a position to be sure of this. **Would you like to contact your judges (as listed below) and find out whether they have plans to take engagements in the future, or want to be considered as 'retired'? It's your right to do this, but if you prefer it they can be contacted directly from the Office.** What is important is to be sure going forward that all show managers know who is happy to take an engagement, and also who could be interested in extending their current range of lists.

### Future plans for BACs

In the multi-breed sections BACs will continue to exist where there is more than one breed club to represent the breed. They will have particular responsibility the breed's registration and breeding policy and Standard of Points and be responsible for proposing changes to these to Council. In the case of a single breed club this responsibility will devolve to the club's committee which will no longer double as a single breed BAC with the need for separate administration and accounts. It cuts the number by almost half and should reduce the need to create more.

It is not envisaged that BACs will need to hold frequent meetings. Amendments to registration policies and SOPs are regular occurrences and discussion can take place electronically. An actual meeting would only be required to reach and confirm agreement on major changes required to go to the Board and on to Council.

It is planned that judge appointment, monitoring and training will be the responsibility of a Judge Appointment Group (JAG). In some cases, such as the Persian, British Shorthair and Burmese the BAC will also have JAG status, but there will be nine new JAGs, each taking responsibility for overseeing the training and monitoring of judges in each of the Grand Groups of the fourteen lists.

Representatives to JAGs would attend from the breed clubs and/or BACs and it is expected that they give feedback on judge performance relating to their breed. This will be considered by the JAG together with how judges are placing cats in mixed classes together with their knowledge of individual breed their ability to assess and differentiate the qualities of each.

A group has been appointed to review and completely re-write the procedure for training both judges and stewards, as there's a need to improve the quality of teaching and assessing in addition to appointing judges to multiple breed lists. There will be a transition period between the old and new systems and it's expected that there will be some 'fast track' schemes for existing judges which will arrange them to extend their number of lists and be eligible for more certificate classes if they so choose. Detail of this will be announced when drafted.

It was agreed at the first meeting that seminars in the present form will no longer be mandatory. Some very successful ones have been held and can be repeated, but breed shows (after the morning's judging also provide a useful opportunity for breeders, exhibitors and judges to come together, discuss and learn.

It is recognised that financing the future scheme will have to be considered in depth. It is expected that if existing funds are held by BACs that will be redundant they will go into the new JAG account, as was done with BAC amalgamations for Persians and Orientals. Also, it was thought that judges going onto multiple lists would pay more for appointment and promotion than on a single to cover the more complex administration.

It should be appreciated that all of the above are first thoughts in what will be a fairly lengthy process. New constitutions will have to be written for BACs and JAGs. If you would like to pass give feedback please do so by the end of October. It is thought that a number of BACs will have autumn meetings, but please circulate and discuss by email if this doesn't apply to your BAC.

So, your contribution will be welcome, and don't forget to give the judge information requested in the first part of the letter.