

GCCF Judges Appointment Scheme Review Group

Minutes

July 10th 2022 @ 10.30pm via ZOOM

Item 1: Apologies for absence

- PC

Item 2: minutes of the last meeting - 16th April 2022

- Agreed as a true record

Item 3: Corrections

- None

Item 4: Matters arising.

- None

Item 5: Correspondence (that will not be addressed elsewhere on the agenda)

Item 6: Board Queries

- None

Item 7: Development of a basic blueprint for Judge training in the future (Generic Heading)

- The current draft was distributed prior to the meeting but due to the extent of the content it was agreed not to discuss today so that people could read and inwardly digest at their leisure so as to come back with comments at the next meeting. Meanwhile the chair and Mrs Devereux will continue to work towards having the first full draft of the "new" Philosophy and Principles of the new Judge Training Scheme ready for discussion at the next meeting.
- Discussions around - How do we determine what constitutes a rare breed? Follow up data gathered by SP to determine what we may consider a minority breed was discussed briefly but by considering just one breed the data confirmed that we had been correct in identifying it as a minority breed. The impact it could have within, not only the AJS but also for PJs as a whole, in recognising those breeds wherein the data confirms a breed as such needs to be highlighted and acted upon so that any training method is realistic in the expectations for qualification. It was agreed that as it is a very extensive document KK to send to the members to study at leisure.

Item 8: AJS

An FJP requested clarification on the roles of a "Mentor" rather than a "Preferred" judge within the scheme?

- It was accepted that the terms had very different connotations as clarified by dictionary explanations and that the AJS document appears to confuse the two.
- Therefore, the advice given was that an FJP may request a mentor to advise and guide as they progressed through the scheme plus be used once as one of the BACs preferred judges with whom to do a tutorial.
- Whereas a "preferred judge" is one chosen by a BAC as one an FJP should strive, if at all possible, to undertake tutorials with.

A BAC requested clarification over the use of tutor/preferred judges in the case of a minority breed. They had an FJP who has submitted the required number of tutorials but the BAC in question had requested that, as a minority breed, they expected all their candidates to use only judges from their preferred list. The FJP was challenging this as it not within the rules.

- It was reiterated to the BAC concerned, within the JASRG reply, that at no point in the scheme other than if an FJP is deemed to be failing, is there any expectation that an FJP should only solicit tutorials from the list of preferred judges as supplied by the BAC although it would be hoped that they would do so.

A further BAC queried if they could delay an FJP who has fulfilled all the criteria but some members of the committee felt still did not consistently describe the subtleties of the coat.

- The JASRG advised that the BAC has to work within the rules as they stand.

After some discussion, given that the AJS has now been running for approximately 18 months, it was felt that we needed to revisit and update as and where we feel it is or may be required, especially given the number of enquires around clarification we have been asked to advise on.

Item 9: AOB

A short discussion took place over the possible impact the revised proposal from the Oriental Bicolour Group around an amendment in respect of awarding certificates by FJPs. Overall, it was felt that the proposal was insulting to FJPs who were all well respected and experienced judges and unrealistic to be actioned during shows given the increasing workload of all judges.

Date of next meeting

- Sunday 14th August 2022