

GCCF Judges Appointment Scheme Review Group Minutes

Of May 9th 2021 @ 1.00pm via ZOOM

Chair: Kate Kaye

Present:

Hilary Dean, Sarndra Deveraux, Claire Lewis, Peter Collin, Steve Parkin

Present by invitation: Sean Farrell

Item 1: Apologies for absence :

- Sue Dalton-Hobbs

Item 2: Chair's opening remarks:

- Welcome and thanks for giving up a Sunday afternoon.
- Request for permission to record meetings now and in the future was granted by all present.

Item 3: minutes of the last meeting - 11th April 2021

- Agreed as a true record

Item 4: Matters arising

- none
- A matter of misinformation was brought to the group's attention concerning a supposed proposal from the JASRG surrounding the removal of the requirement to submit written reports by judges on exhibits encountered during judging engagements.
- The secretary of the Judges Guild confirmed to the members of the JASRG that the document in question had originated from the Judges Guild. She confirmed that it was purely a discussion document distributed to judges for comment.
- After considerable discussion, although disappointment was expressed at the manner in which the misinformation had been perpetuated within the greater cat fancy, it was felt that everything possible had been done to ensure that the correct source and purpose of the document in question was highlighted to the greater cat fancy and especially to the publisher of the original misleading and harmful statement.

Item 5: minor re-wording of the TOR

- considerable discussion took place over whether or not there should be specific mention of the ability of the group to invite Guest input. It was generally agreed that wider engagement with all elements of the Cat Fancy was to be actively encouraged

but it would be more efficient to have any submissions from either individual's, clubs or any other interested parties in writing either via snail mail, email, or video.

Item 6: further rewording prior to submission of item 14 AJS.

The notice for a change to clause 14 (Process) of AJS as requested by the Board (December 2020). It was agreed that the current wording of this clause would be supplemented with the inclusion of the wording in red text and that it and the rationale would be sent to the Board for prior to going to Council for approval:

- 14) Judge a minimum of 3 certificate classes **from either, their book or that of the tutor judge**, containing the breed with accompanying tutorials on those classes with full judges of the breed and demonstrate learning by written submission of learning points covered- on the relevant forms provided. Further tutorials with exhibits not in title classes is acceptable and welcome but not mandatory.

Rationale:

- To ensure clarity to all concerned from where exhibits used for tutorials at shows may be selected (as requested by the Board)

Action: CMK to submit to JL for Board attention prior to going to Council.

Resubmission of proposed wording to clause 9.

"No minimum time requirement before applying to have Full Judge status confirmed"

There had been a suggestion that the following sentence could be added to clause 14 - **All FJ(P)s must provide evidence that they have judged an adequate spread of cats of the appropriate breed prior to applying for promotion** - however after discussion it was decided that it would be more efficient to look at a rewording with especial emphasis on the what or who determines "adequate" or is there a better way of phrasing this? It was also felt that this would be better to treat the issue as an entity in its own right.

Rationale:

- To ensure that a BAC could feel that any FJ(P) applying for promotion to FJ status has had sufficient experience prior to applying but no change should allow a BAC being able to unjustifiably "hold back" a judge.

Action: HD/CMK to redraft for discussion at next scheduled meeting

Item 7: reaching out to the Cat Fancy

- GCCF website

SF has no objection to being copied in (for information) on any request for paperwork - minutes etc. from the group, to be published on the GCCF website.

It was confirmed that items such as agenda/minutes are purely the responsibility of the group however a proposal for change would need to go via the Board and/or an affiliated group or club of GCCF to Council. Unaffiliated groups such as SNAP/2110 do not have the ability to submit proposals to either the Board or Council.

It was felt that confirmation from the Board on the legitimacy of the JASRG would be appreciated.

- Facebook

The chair confirmed that the Facebook Group set up in 2014 was still in existence but after much discussion it was decided not to pursue reopening it at this point in time due to its limitations as a means of communication as not all interested parties used Facebook.

- Guest input via invitation

This had been discussed at length under the discussions on the TOR.

Item 8: Consideration of what had been discussed previously and what next.

Training via Grand groups

It was agreed that this was the way forward however they would need an excellent chair and secretary to deal with the resultant work which would be key in such an approach.

It needed to be borne in mind that all BACs had two major roles - the training and overseeing of all judges and the breed specifics such as SOP and breeding and registration policies. Therefore, BACs would continue to function as is but then there would be an over reaching group - a super BAC - that one representative from each BAC would attend to discuss the candidates.

Prior to Covid, Peter and Hilary were working on looking to undertake a trial with one of "her" BAC's using this type of approach. Hilary has a blue-plan of this trial idea that she will distribute to the members. Given the advent of ZOOM these meetings should be a lot easier to arrange and manage.

SP raised the issue of those breeds that are rarely seen that could be used to hold back a PJ however it was pointed out that a precedent in such a case had already been set with the AJS and therefore this approach could also be used when looking at PJ's. Seminars could be of great importance in these cases and attendance should be more formalised.

There was considerable discussion on the interpretation on the format and expectations of tutorials by individuals. This conversation led on to the discussion as

to the need to sort out what constitutes the processes a candidate has to go through to become a Full judge before the discussion closes down on the minutiae of how that process takes place.

There was a general consensus of opinion that BAC's had to be far more proactive and responsible for ensuring that they supply the relevant breed specific information and guidance through judging/breed guides that PJ's could access and Tutor judges use in the discussions with PJ's.

There is currently a perceived conception that personalities often have considerable influence in determining the success a candidate so any changed system of training needs to address this. One way of overcoming much of this could be via a multichoice, on line test wherein a certain pass percentage is set and could be taken more than once if required. The BACs could be integral in developing any questions concerning their breed SOP/registration or breeding policies and elements such as genetics/health issues could be included. It was also felt that other forms of multimedia, such as virtual seminars could also be useful tools for training.

Action: all members to think through what they perceive as the "process" for discussion at the next meeting.

Item 9: consideration of:

There was some confusion on exactly what the query was. All first time PJ's initially apply to one list and they can not apply to another list until they become FJ on that original list. However, these days people tend to be involved in more than one breed - so should this be reconsidered?

It was thought that it would be worth considering the "Grand BAC Footprint" within the stewarding scheme as a way to improve and link a steward's move towards becoming a PJ.

There was then some discussion on further changes to the stewarding scheme to improve the move to becoming a PJ. One idea had been previously discussed was that the GCCF steward qualification was still important but that once a steward had got their qualification, they could apply directly to a BAC for PJ status if they wished to go down that route.

Action: HD to circulate the current documentation relevant to the stewarding scheme as is presently.

Item 10: AOB

- SF express thanks for his inclusion today which has really enlightened him to the work of the group.
- None

Item 11: Date of next meeting

Chair suggested that we work on a number of short (2hrs max) maybe fortnightly?

Dates suggested - all to start @ 1.00pm.

- May 23rd
- June 6th
- June 20th