

Agenda Item 10.2
CIVA JUDGING SUB-COMMITTEE
REPORT
2014

Prepared by John Gaillard

Judge selection 2014

The selection process was the same as in recent years as follows: -

1. Judges with an average ranking over the past three seasons of 5 or less are invited to indicate which contests they are available to participate in. Multiple contests may be applied for; this process ensures that the core of each judging line consists of experienced judges with a proven record.
2. When stage 1 is completed the balance of judges with RI data and then invited to indicate their availability and CIVA Delegates are also asked to nominate additional judges provided they are already on the International Judges list, which is updated at every CIVA meeting.
3. Any new applications without International RI data are asked to motivate their applications, preferably with data from a National Championship where the FPS system is utilised.
4. An extra factor for this year was that CIVA had decided that due to financial constraints, judging lines would be limited to seven CIVA supported Judges, linked to this only one Judge per NAC would be considered. For Yak52/Intermediate the judges would be limited to five supported judges.

Subsequently the JSC with CIVA Bureau approval allowed some additional judges to participate at their own cost; however the basic selection procedure still applied.

This process resulted in the following judging lines being fielded,

<u>WAAC</u>	-	<u>Slovakia</u>
Denton	-	USA
Auger	-	France
Gedminaite	-	Lithuania
Virtanen	-	Finland
Shpolyanskiy	-	Russia
Zelenina	-	Ukraine
Liszkay	-	RSA
Seibitz	-	Germany
<u>EAC</u>	-	<u>Hungary</u>
Auger	-	France
Liszkay	-	RSA
Bezdenzhnyh	-	Russia
Gedminaite	-	Lithuania
Bartholdi	-	Finland
Talabos	-	Hungary
Dovgalenko	-	Ukraine

YakWAC/Intermediate South Africa

Maxen	-	Denmark
Orlickas	-	Lithuania
Marengo	-	Italy
Duras	-	Czech
Hawthorne	-	RSA
Buckenham	-	UK

Gliding Combined Advanced & Unlimited - Poland

Hau	-	Germany
Dovgalenko	-	Ukraine
Ponizil	-	Czech
Bialek	-	Poland
Dugas	-	France
Allerhed	-	Sweden
Kanao	-	Japan

Comment

This year we ran with only one judge per NAC at each competition and a reduced judging line, this had little effect on the number of NACs who participated overall because of the elimination of a second judge per NAC.

This year we had a new experience of a judge being eliminated by the International Jury at a contest, of course if we had had the minimum number of judges being seven, instead of the eight who actually participated, this would have complicated the situation even further, we need to take this aspect into account in future years.

Certain Judges continue to have multiple scores eliminated high for their own countrymen; the overall effect however is probably minimal whilst we only have a single judge per NAC.

In general the standard of judging remains good, we sometimes tend to forget where we stand right now, the days of completely incompetent judges are now a thing of the past, admittedly some still display some bias, but the scoring system seems to cope with this quite well and eliminates those scores statistically out of limits.

Perhaps it is appropriate once again to look back, when the situation was clearly not very good.

Going back to the 1990s there was no pre-selection of judges at all, the organisers simply waited to see who would turn up. At Le Harve where there were more judges than the required ten maximum, judges drew lots to see who would be selected.

Two contests later at Oklahoma, which was the first time I was appointed Chief Judge at a WAC, fifteen judges arrived on site, many without any assistants at all who then staring recruiting from the IAC volunteers available.

At the three contests I had attended as a Judge, I had noticed what I considered to be a large difference in the quality of judges. In those days any difference in the score of zero (HZ was a long way from being invented) was simply resolved by conferencing by the Chief Judge and those judges in the minority simply changed their scores to an average or reserve mark. It became obvious that some judges consistently missed fairly obvious zeros. In Oklahoma in 1996 I decided to try and establish just how many of the judges who had offered their services were really competent, this was achieved by briefing one of the USA reserve pilots to fly the Known Compulsory with deliberate error (today an HZ) out of the sequence of fourteen figures, ten were to be flown with errors making the figure a zero, such as 1 ¼ roll instead of a ¾, a push humpty instead of a pull etc. However in all cases the figures ended in the right direction and maintained the basic shape. When the sequence was completed a de-briefing was held in a hangar with a full video review, the results were startling only two judges of the fifteen had identified all ten zeroes, there were two judges who had not identified any of the zeroes, and this was in effect the start of a more logical manner in the judge selection process.

Eighteen years later, we preselect all judges on the basis of performance, we also pay our judges travel expenses and we have come to expect judges to be absolutely competent. Our systems have also evolved with ACRO and FPS, we now having meaningful data that judges can use to improve their performance and identify problems.

Yet there is still criticism of the RI system for ranking judges, some say that judges are more interested in their RI and change their judging style accordingly, this really does not stand up to close examination. In order to get a good RI a judge has to get as close as possible to the final result in terms of the ranking, therefore scoring in a very narrow band for example will not really achieve this, I was pleased to see at WAAC that a judge who was being highly critical (as required in our Regulations) achieved the best RI for the contest.

Systems can always be improved and are constantly being developed, but if we look right now at the situation we are in compared with what we were doing in the past, it is a vast improvement.

One aspect which requires attention is the number of judges available for selection for gliders. Unlike power where we are getting a steady flow of new judges, we are not seeing this for gliders; the Gliding Sub-Committee should be giving this aspect some serious consideration.

The question has also been raised by the CIVA President of the role of the Judging Sub-Committee in training new judges, in the past proposals to hold seminars and training courses were rejected by CIVA in favour of holding extended briefings before contests, this is ineffective as we are "preaching to the converted". What needs to be considered is the role of CIVA and the Judging Sub-Committee in particular for the training of new judges, is this CIVA's role or does this form part of National Aero Club's duties, certainly the larger NACs all have their own training programmes, the results are apparent France, Russia and the USA all seem to have a large pool of judges.

Other NACs we know have good programmes and produce active judges, (these would include the UK, but for some reason we see little activity internationally other than from Nick Buckenham) others include Germany, South Africa & Finland, much beyond this is not that apparent. The CIVA plenary should perhaps give the JSC some guidance on this issue, especially as everything comes at a cost,

J L Gaillard

