

GCCF Judges Appointment Scheme Review Group Minutes

On June 6th 2021 @ 1.00pm via ZOOM

Chair: Kate Kaye (KK)

Present:

Hilary Dean, (HD) Sarndra Deveraux, (SD) Claire Lewis, (CL) Peter Collin, (PC) Steve Parkin, (SP) Sue Dalton-Hobbs (SDH)

Present by invitation: Sean Farrell, (SF)

Item 1: Apologies for absence:

- None
- PC/SDH have given prior notice that they would be late in joining.

Item 2: Chair's opening remarks:

- Welcome and thanks for giving up a Sunday afternoon.

Item 3: minutes of the last meeting - 9th May 2021

- Correction: item 7 - "SF requested that he be copied in on any request for paperwork" now "SF has no objection to being copied in (for information) on any request for paperwork"
- Agreed as a true record with the caveat that PC (who had not joined at the time) had no comments to make.

Item 4: Matters arising

- none
- It was queried if the matter of misinformation was brought up at the Board, KK answered in the affirmative.

Item 5: Query from the Board re: publication of the JAS updates?

- HD confirmed that the most up to date version of the JAS document is available on the Judges Guild website and had been distributed to the BAC secretaries and the Board was informed at the time (supporting evidence available). It was felt that some thought could be put into ways in which any future changes are highlighted to all interested parties.
- Considerable discussion took place on the issue of some viewing certain elements of the JAS document as separate entities. The members of the group wished to stress to the wider community that the whole content of the JAS document is central to all Judges and Judge training and therefore its every aspect comes within the brief of

this group and it becomes very confusing when others (uninvolved in the JASRG) make/or propose changes to the JAS without consultation with the JASRG.

Item 6: Byelaws/appeals as they relate to FJ/PJ's and BAC's

- On examining the wording around the complaint's procedure; it was important to consider how the Byelaws etc. linked in. On investigation it was pointed out that there seems to be some confusion as, in places, they don't appear to make sense and are contradictory.
- The references to arbitration are a point in case - both parties have to agree to go to arbitration however as the byelaws presently stand, should one party refuse, the case remains unresolved!
- It was also pointed out that there are no guidelines available that informs committees, such as the Judges panel, what powers they have.
- After considerable discussion it was agreed that this was a matter that needed sorting. It was felt that as this issue concerns all BAC's, it was the opinion of the group that it could consider proposing a way forward to the Board.

Item 7: Processes to becoming a GCCF Judge

- Stewarding is the starting point but it was queried if they really need to do table work etc. However, it was agreed that all stewards and judges needed to know how shows work as, whatever the role, each is totally interlinked to ensure that shows run as expected.
- It was agreed there is a need to understand the rules etc. that govern GCCF/shows etc and moving away from a tick box mentality, which often holds candidates back, at all levels of training.

Item 8: Development of a basic blueprint for future judge training.

- Training by Grand Groups/Section.

The group reflected on decisions the group has already made around training within Grand Groups, which had garnered general agreement as a way forward plus the possibility of instigating a trial meeting with a willing Grand Group of BAC's, during Dr Collins tenure as Chair. It was agreed that this approach was still very valid and will be going forward to be trialled. It was felt that the basic principle could also be applied to training by section.

HD circulated a document that she had prepared during pre-covid discussions which clearly explains a process of working within a Grand BAC Group.

[SDH/PC joined the meeting during this conversation.](#)

There was considerable discussion over how we deal with those PJ's who may struggle with one or more breeds in any given Grand and concern was expressed that the BAC's could create a "hold up" in the process over a PJ they are not in favour of, however it

was felt that it was the responsibility of the BAC's to have guided and trained PJ's so as to avoid this situation arising. A number of questions were raised surrounding how PJ's promotion would be affected should there be a breed or breeds they just don't "get" and the rarely seen breeds. It was stressed that there should not be an acceptance that a PJ who is poor on a specific breed getting a "free card" within any grand group. It was pointed out that currently a judge only needs to qualify on 50% of breeds in any one grand and queried if this could be used in such cases but, overall, it was agreed that the aim is to move away from this.

Item 9: Fast tracking for stewards

- Consideration to be given to stewards being able to apply directly to the BAC as a PJ once their training is completed but this would need to be considered when the group looks at the minutiae of the process of training.
- HD to circulate a number of comments sent to the Judges Guild over the progress of stewards.

PC left the meeting

Item 10: AOB

- Consideration of letter from the Board to the Singapura BAC regarding its decision to suspend its activities. One important issue for this group is that there are 4 judges listed as FJ(P)'s for Singapura's - S Heavens, K Kaye, M Pearman and E Stark - who will all need guidance on the breed.

CL/SDH left the meeting as it was felt that this may become an issue for the IC/DC

There was a feeling that as they have actually suspended the BAC and have refunded the monies to the constituent clubs it is likely they could be in breach of the Rules. However, it was felt that at present this is an issue for the Board to resolve and it was suggested that our response should be that this issue could be dealt with other BAC's that have encountered similar issues.

HD left the meeting.

Action: KK to write to the Board suggesting that they offer help similar to that extended recently to another BAC that was in a similar situation and querying if they have actually breached the rules by suspending the BAC.

Item 11: Date of next meeting

- 19th June 2021

Dates suggested - all to start @ 1.00pm.

- 11th July
- 25th July