

## Sail Canada

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Committee: Training &amp; Certification Committee</b> | <b>Attendees:</b> Warren Nethercote (Chair), Katie Nicoll, Eric Turner, Joe Jospe, Mike Turner, Samara Crothers<br><br><b>Regrets:</b> Lynne Beal<br><b>Observers:</b> | <b>Date:</b> 2018/07/09<br><b>Time:</b> 10AM EST<br><b>Location:</b> Conference Call / Webinar |
|--|--|--|

| No. | Agenda Item         | Discussion / Action description  | Motion / Action                                       |
|-----|---------------------|--|---|
| 1.0 | Call to Order       | Meeting opened at 1000 EDT.  |   |
| 2.0 | Approval of Minutes | Approval of the minutes of the meeting of 4 June was moved by K. Coleman Nicoll and seconded by E.V. Turner.<br><br>Motion carried without amendment.  |   |
| 3.0 | Matters Arising     | <p><b>3.1 Respect for Sport (S. Crothers):</b><br/>There had as yet been no response to the sponsorship application. Members asked if Sail Canada could make inquiries of its D&amp;O insurer to see if support might be available there.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> S. Crothers to ask S. Case to consider D&amp;O insurer as a possible sponsor.</p> <p><b>3.2 Rule 69 Advisory Panel (W. Nethercote):</b><br/>M. Turner, L. Reise, K. Dyer, R. Stewart, A.L. Beal, P. Healy, D. Pelling, W. Nethercote had accepted invitations to serve. There would be an announcement in the newsletter and a description and membership would be put on the website.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> S. Crothers/E.V. Turner to publish website details before release of Judges newsletter</p> <p><b>3.3 Budget Proposals (S. Crothers)</b><br/>Communications materials had been prepared and were included in the proposed Judges Newsletter.</p> | <p>S. Crothers</p> <p>S. Crothers<br/>E.V. Turner</p> |
| 4.0 | Work Plan           | <p><b>4.1 Communications:</b><br/>Copy for a Newsletter had been circulated by email and edited following feedback, prior to the meeting. The members approved release of the Newsletter, after publication of details of the Rule 69 Advisory Panel on the judges website page.</p> <p><b>4.2 Certification Standards (W. Nethercote):</b><br/>(a) <u>Definition of PD Activities:</u><br/>The Judges Program identifies professional development (PD)</p>  |   |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>activities as a future feature of the program. The JSC initiated development of PD standards, with initial reference to US, UK and Australian programs.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> K. Coleman Nicoll to review US Judging PD standards and suggest a derivative Canadian standard which would benefit from synergies/overlap with US activities. J. Jospe to investigate UK and Australian activities to see if opportunities existed there.</p> <p><u>(b) Request for Relief from Judging Standard:</u><br/>JSC had received a request from a Club Judge seeking appointment to Regional Judge level without a seminar. The applicant had been active judging, had taken and delivered a number of varied activities that in future would likely be awarded PD status, but had not taken an RJ/NJ seminar as none had been offered since 2014. The applicant requested that JSC make a one-year appointment to RJ that would require him to take a seminar within that year for certification to be extended to the usual four-year period.</p> <p>The JSC noted that the applicant to be considered at Agenda item 5.0 suffered the same deficiency of lack of a formal judge seminar.</p> <p>The consensus feeling of the JSC was one of discomfort. There was reluctance to support 'special cases' but also recognition and embarrassment that there was a seminar requirement for certification when no seminar had been offered since 2014. It was also recognized that JSC's delegated authorities did not extend to offering relief from standards.</p> <p>It was agreed that JSC should ask TCC to make restricted appointments outside of the standard for those judges whose applications indicated suitable experience in lieu of seminars, until such time as seminars became available again (See Agenda item 4.5).</p> <p><b>Action:</b> W. Nethercote to prepare a briefing note to TCC (see Annex A)</p> <p><b>4.3 Testing (K. Coleman Nicoll and J. Jospe):</b></p> <p>a. <u>Continuing Club Judge Test Experience:</u><br/>A sample Club Judge test is now available on the Sail Canada web site.</p> <p>b. <u>Interim RJ/NJ testing via US Sailing:</u><br/>To date, two judges have taken (and passed) the US Sailing test.</p> <p>c. <u>RJ/NJ Test Development for October 2018 RJ/NJ Seminar:</u><br/>The RJ/NJ test is nearing prototype testing. Wendt Loat had offered to be a test subject.</p> <p>The test format had evolved with largely new question with support</p> | <p><b>K. Coleman<br/>Nicoll<br/>J. Jospe</b></p> <p><b>W. Nethercote</b></p> |
|--|--|---|--|

|            |                        |  |   |
|------------|------------------------|--|---|
|            |                        | <p>from diagrams wherever possible. Numbers of questions in parts A and B had been reduced to allow a one-hour test duration.</p> <p><b>4.4 Training Materials:</b></p> <p>a. <u>Ongoing Experience with Club Judge Seminar Presentation (Mike Turner/Lynne Beal):</u><br/>(Defer to future meeting)</p> <p>b. <u>RJ/NJ Seminar Presentations:</u><br/>W. Nethercote had circulated version 5 of the presentation and observed that he had added discussion on conflict-of-interest after distribution. There was agreement that the R2/R69 section was too detailed, but that the full detail would make a good on-line or round-table resource.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> W. Nethercote to prepare v6.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> The testing group would be supplying scenarios for the seminar, as well as example test questions.</p> <p><b>4.5 Potential RJ/NJ Seminars:</b><br/>The new RJ/NJ seminar was first scheduled for the October 2018 APC, with presentations to follow in GTA and Nova Scotia.</p> | <p><b>W. Nethercote</b></p> <p><b>A.L. Beal</b></p> |
| <b>5.0</b> | <b>Certifications</b>  | <p>One RJ application received: John Farquharson</p> <p>The application was discussed and response awaits TCC approval or otherwise of extended delegation. (See Annex A)</p>  | .   |
| <b>6.0</b> | <b>AOB:</b>            |  |   |
| <b>7.0</b> | <b>Future Meetings</b> | First or second week of August, based on a Doodle poll.  |   |
| <b>8.0</b> | <b>Adjourn</b>         | Following a motion by K. Coleman Nicoll the JSC meeting adjourned at 1103 EDT.   |   |

## **Annex A**

### **JSC Briefing Note to TCC: Request for Relief from Standards/Special Appointments**

#### **Issue:**

The Judges Sub-Committee (JSC) has not offered judging seminars for Regional or National Judges since 2014, but such seminars are a requirement for certification. A small cadre of judging candidates are unable to certify as a result and JSC is recommending special measures be taken.

#### **Background:**

The JSC has not offered judging seminars for Regional or National Judges since 2014, but such seminars are a requirement for certification. Regional or National judges certified since 2014 have had to satisfy the seminar requirement by travelling abroad to attend US Sailing Seminars.

The JSC is developing a new RJ/NJ Seminar with first delivery scheduled at the 2018 APC (Vancouver), followed by delivery in Toronto and Nova Scotia, subject to demand.

Some NJ/RJ candidates were unable to travel to the US for scheduled US Sailing seminars, *nor should they have to do so*. The JSC has received two applications from RJ candidates who the JSC recognize as being due for appointment, but who lack the formal seminar requirement. Appointment opportunities for these judges are now being limited by organizing authorities' reluctance to appoint club judges to major events or to chief judge roles. There may be other future candidates in the same position, but expected numbers would be small, if any.

The JSC recognizes that it is the reason for unavailability of seminars, and that simple rejection of these recent applications would result in a year's loss of advancement, as well as a reduced pool of qualified judging candidates for organizing authorities. The JSC also recognizes that its delegated authorities from TCC do not extend to offering variances from standards. Indeed, JSC is somewhat uncomfortable with special cases, based on perceptions of fairness.

#### **Discussion**

The JSC's operations are in a transitional phase. We have a new judging standard and are bringing training and testing materials in line with that standard. Revised Club Judge seminar materials and testing materials are operational. Development of Regional and National Judge seminar and testing materials is well underway, but first deployment of them will not occur until after completion of the summer 2018 sailing season, largely due to resource limitations.

We cannot fall back on earlier RJ/NJ materials for two reasons. First, the 2014 seminar and test have not been updated to reflect current rules, and second, evaluation of the 2014 test has determined that it was seriously deficient from a testing practice perspective. This was no surprise given failure rates in excess of 75 percent.

Our inability to certify current RJ applicants is a direct consequence of unavailability of a seminar. We can rationalize the gap, but no justification can offset a year's lost development for these judges due to a year's delay in appointment to the next level.

The JSC consensus is that TCC should enable an interim, short-term variance from standard to allow judges such as these to be certified, with restrictions.

## **Recommendation**

The JSC recommends that TCC approve one of the following options.

### Option A:

JSC has examined RJ applications for two candidates, and obtained references, and is comfortable that they are performing at the RJ level. They do not meet the RJ seminar requirement, but the Canadian RJ seminar will not be available until autumn.

The TCC would appoint these two judges to the Regional Judge level, effective immediately, until December 31, 2018. Should these judges attend a seminar approved by JSC before December 31, 2018 their appointments will be extended to December 31, 2021.

*This approach is simple, and satisfies a goal of perceived fairness to these two candidates, but not to other potential candidates who did not choose to submit an application which showed a seminar deficiency. This approach would also demand a further submission to TCC in the event of new applications.*

### Option B:

JSC has examined RJ applications for two judges, and obtained references, and is comfortable that they are performing at the RJ level. They do not meet the RJ seminar requirement, but the Canadian RJ seminar will not be available until autumn.

The TCC would authorize the JSC to make RJ and NJ appointments in variance from the Judges program for candidates clearly performing at requested level, but otherwise lacking the seminar requirement. Appointments would expire December 31, 2018, unless the judge attended an approved seminar by that date, in which case the appointment would be extended to December 31, 2021. This special delegation expires as of the 2018 Sail Canada APC.

*This approach delegates authority for variance from the program so that further reference to TCC is not required. It satisfies the goal of perceived fairness particularly for candidates who have not submitted applications lacking only the seminar requirement. The JSC would communicate this special delegation to the judges community so that other, eligible judges might take advantage of it.*

### Option C:

TCC do nothing.

*This will result in refusal of applications and possible loss of judges, should they be unwilling to wait 'a season' for promotion to RJ. The seminar unavailability issue is a cause of dissatisfaction within the judging community so this option hurts the reputation of Sail Canada.*

Option B is preferred and is recommended by JSC. It is the best option administratively and offers the greatest fairness for all judges, not only the two who have filed applications. Early response (perhaps secretarial action) would be appreciated.

Prepared by W. Nethercote, Chair JSC, July 10, 2018