

2018 Judge's Committee Meeting
Atlanta, GA
Saturday, February 24, 2018

- I. The meeting was call to order at 0830, February 24
- II. Present were Sarah Ashton, Wayne Balsiger, Ric Crabbe, Matt Hill, Mike Kaspar, Joe Krolak, Bill Simon, and Rick Sullivan.

III. Manuals

a) *Judges' Manual (JM)*

Mary Savage has been working on correcting the current version. This Committee encourages her to continue her efforts and greatly appreciates her efforts. Much discussion ensued over the format and content of the manual. Hill stated that the manual still needs to assure that RRS references are accurate, and that misconduct section, technical committees, Safe Sport sections are added, and heavy copy editing is done. Education is taking over production of the manuals (not content). Krolak questions if we need all the appendices in back or simply include links instead? Could we request to use the World Sailing Manual and add our US Prescriptions, not this quad, but in the future? Krolak will discuss this with Jim Capron. Kaspar will work on simplifying *Chapter 12. Certification*. He will consider replacing it with a table like RO certification/recertification table. It was suggested that certification/recertification be a separate document outside to the JM as it basically is now. Hill will get an advance copy of the final edit to Ashton, Crabbe, Krolak and Martinson before publication. Hill also stressed that printed copies were still necessary. Krolak suggested that continuing education for judges and race officers e moved to stand-alone a "catalogue" of CEUs

b) *Judge Committee Manual (JCM)*

Sullivan stated the JCM has been under construction since the early 2000s. Ashton suggested that we start over to simplify the document to only include information needed by the RAJs, creating a similar document to the ARO Manual. Kaspar suggested going to wiki files for judges' documents. Balsiger suggested a core group work on this, not by committee. Krolak again stressed that it needs to be stripped down removing the commonality with the JM. Krolak emphasized that the JCM should be a what, a how to and where to find other stuff for the RAJs.

IV. Certification Levels

a) *Judge to Regional Judge Title Change*

Mike brought the name change up at a roundtable and there were no objections. Simon felt like it was a demotion. Ashton felt that this was a false perception, should be a step up and a positive change. The change would also align us the RO program. The motion was made and seconded and approved to use the term regional judge to replace judge and ask US Sailing to form a marketing plan to promote it. It will not be implemented until a plan is in place. Hill requests that the JC assist in the implementation of marketing the new title. He will look into coordinating this change with the Umpires' Committee also.

b) *Require Club Judge (JC) Certification before Judge Certification*

Krolak stated that there are those that can come in at the Judge level with all the necessary qualification and by-pass CJ. He thought this was in the qualifications that the JC could allow this. They would have to do all the qualifications and references. CJ was designed for the new comer and should not have to become a CJ before Judge.

Simon urged that there be prerequisites for participating in the Advance Judges Seminar (AJUS). Krolak strongly supports this. There is a disclaimer to the instructors that one can refund the money to or tell an unqualified attendee that he/she will not hold back the rest of the class. Krolak will work with Hill to

establish prerequisites for those registering for the AJUS. It was suggested that after one registers, he/she gets a reiteration of the prerequisites. The instructors should contact the RAJ to assist them in establishing the level of knowledge of the participants if they cannot glean this from SOARs or by other means. Krolak will work with Hill to establish a prerequisite check-list for registration. By-passing CJ would remain on a case by case basis as determined by the JC.

c) *International Judges (IJ) Mentoring*

Ashton had asked Rick Mallinson to pursue this. Mallinson submitted his proposal. Simon would like to see a clinic on certification qualifications from the judge level to the IJ. Ashton will ask Mallinson to pursue this. Krolak stated that US Sailing should use NJs wanting to move up to IJs in US Sailing-hosted international events.

V. Continuing Education Units (CEUs)

a) *One Day Judges Seminar*

Deferred to end of Meeting.

b) *Advanced Judges Seminar*

Krolak stated that they are in good shape, but there are having fewer seminars needed do to the Continuing Education Events (CEEs). What is the future of the AJUS? There is still needs to be the one-day entry level course. Clinics including protest day may be the replacement for the AJUS. He would like to see 3 different tests. CJ, Judge and add a written for NJ – finding facts, conclusions and decision. Krolak discussed the reason that qualifications for becoming an instructor was not published. Hill felt that there should be transparency as to the quals. so it does not appear as a closed system. Krolak felt that there should be a pathway which is not cut and dry. Matt noted that Instructor Trainers for Race Officials was in the works.

c) *CEU Values*

Krolak presented the CEE CUE Value Chart. This document should be a stand-alone document in the Judges Area, not within the JM. Other events to count as CEUs were discussed to include appeals, member of US Sailing Rules Committee and possibly mentoring once a system is in place. At some point, it is hoped that the CEUs will be aligned with the RO program.

d) *Round tables*

Krolak presented topics for round tables which he will email to the Committee. JC should add to the columns on the spreadsheet file to expand the A and B topics for the Round Table. Please forward them to him.

e) *Webinars*

Krolak stated that these are different from web-based training as there is no quiz associated with them. They could include taped round tables.

f) *Clinics*

Steve Wrigley sent his report.

g) *Protest Day*

Simon stated that the pilot Protest Day was a huge success. He forwarded the “instructors” comments and to the JC previously. Who were the attendees? There were 15 participants who were Judges in Training, CJs and Judges, no NJs. They self-evaluated themselves after the hearings. Krolak has developed guidelines for Protest Day. Simon recommends that participants get “hearing credit” for hearings. All were in agreement. Martinson and Krolak have made recommendations for this. In SOARS, the chair makes the event and participant goes in to say they attended. Krolak stated that if someone does not participate, the instructors should notify the RAJ and say so, so that the credit would not be given for the hearing. It was agreed that this should be retroactive. Hill recommends that the Coordinator should go in to roster to click on who did or did not attend after the Instructor adds the event to SOARs. Joe is planning the next one. Bill wants to roll this thing out and remove it from pilot status.

VI. Testing policies

Crabbe reported that the tests are in good shape. The down time was for a very short time this year. Keep two years of tests in data base for the analytical data. Please send him any good scenarios you may have with TSS diagrams as the data base constantly needs to expand. Sullivan would like to see data on how many went to a seminar and took the test. After some discussion a motion to extend the time limit to 75 minutes for both tests was seconded and approved. It was agreed that for a CJ, the passing score is 80% on either test.

The question again arose to debrief for only those that fail or extend it to all. The cons were; lots of extra work for the RAJs and instructors, some will ask for a debrief just to argue and question their answers. The consensus is to only debrief those that have failed. Better preamble about how to take the test – i.e. the scenarios, was suggested.

The following motion was made, seconded and passed: the test for recertification must be taken within 18 months of recertification. Exception, if your recertification is in the first year of the quadrennial rules you must take the test in that year. Balsiger will reword this for publication.

Hill discussed the 30-day waiting period to retake the test after a failure. Could it be 15 days? Retake the test before after debriefing and 30 days. Do we need the thirty days? Should it be 15 days? After some discussion the motion was made, seconded and approved stating that after failing a test, and obtaining a debrief from instructor, RAJ or other qualified person, a person may retake the test after 15 days. A third test is by RAJ approval.

Krolak stated that IJ tests do not show up in SOARs, but the test is acceptable for both judge and national judge.

VII. RRS 64.4 Discrepancy Resolution

Balsiger presented *Guidelines for Conducting a Hearing Involving a Support Person for US Sailing Judges*. This will be included in the JM under Misconduct. Ashton will also forward it to the Race Administration Committee as requested.

VIII. Safe Sport (SS)

Hill stated that the US Sailing Board of Directors is meeting to approve those that have to take it. By the end of 2018 all recertified race officials will have to take and pass the Safe Sport Online Course. It is located under the Safety tab on US Sailing website. There is a manual that explains the program. One should take it through US Sailing site that eventually the certification will go directly into SOARS. Briefly it teaches one how to recognize and identify the possibility of abuse within the sports. If there is any suggestion of sexual abuse against a minor the official is required to make a report to local authority. Any accusation of child sexual and physical misconduct goes to local officials. Any notice of sexual misconduct toward a minor must go to US Sailing and SS Center.

Krolak concluded that the judges need to know the policies and procedures with SS and Misconduct hearings. The judges need to be educated as to this. Does SS policies constitute rules, US prescriptions, etc. We need to ask the rules committee and others to give guidance on how does this mesh with the RRS and our prescriptions. This needs to be clearly delineated to include should SS go into the NORs and Sis? By prescription? We also need to know our liability. What are the Issues with the implementation of these? Hill also stated that there will be background checks down the road and person will pay for it. Much discussion ensued. Simon commented that we strive to make it easier for those to volunteer to serve the sport, but now 2 more roadblocks – SS and background checks. Krolak suggested that completion of the SS course would allow 15 CEUs.

IX. Seminar Materials

It has been noted that US Sailing no longer providing Participants Notebooks, model boats and Protest Hearing Procedures sheet by postal service, but on line only. Hill stated that when all the information, notebooks, boats etc. were mailed out it was not only expensive but very unreliable. Others added that it was thrown away immediately after the seminars. Now the registrants get a link to all necessary material. As a follow-up, they are sent via mail the boats, the speed and protest card, SOARS primer, test taking info and other swag. However, what it fails to do is does not make sure all that is needed – protest committee boat, scenarios, protest forms – for the instructors. A packet will now contain the scenarios, protest forms. This would go to instructors in advance. Joe, Bruce and Matt will produce what needs to go out to the instructors and participants. Sullivan pointed out that Martinson does send a packet to the instructors with scripts and protest forms printed out, etc.

Walk-ins still accepted because the materials now electronic, so one can get it that day.

Krolak suggested that for the AJUS, providing editable forms are provided that participants can use their computers to fill out at the seminar.

Hill was asked “What do they get for \$30.00?” Answer - A day of education. There will now be a stipend to the instructors.

X. Opportunities for judges and Umpires.

Hill described an upcoming program at US Sailing - a match-maker site/forum. On one side an Organizing Authority (OA) will post the needs for the event. The other side would be the race officer who would post his/her resume. OA could then offer an invitation. Simon suggested some form of push notification to alert those that have signed up that there is an offer out there.

XI. Club Judge Program

Bruce Martinson and Edith Collins joined us via phone. Martinson previously submitted his report. He stated that there have been quite a few seminars this year. But there is too much material for the time frame. He has taken out *Around the Race Course* and suggests that it be presented the evening before to the Club hosting the seminar. *Around the Race Course* is on line and available for anyone’s use. It was suggested that it be protected do that it cannot be changed. Not everyone at the One Day Seminar wants to become certified, but the instructors should inquire to such so that a mentor can be assigned to that person.

XII. Next Meeting

Ashton stated that the committee members for Annapolis have made a generous offer to house the Committee members and host the meeting at the Annapolis YC next year. Kaspar suggested that there have already been 2 meetings on the East Coast and he would like to see it move the West. He will consider prices to/from and in Las Vegas. It was also suggested that we pick a weekend around the Laser event.

XIII. Fleet Racing Umpiring

Kaspar questioned where the document came from that is on the US Sailing judges sight. Simon will share the guideline that modifies Appendix Q developed for Oakcliff. They are using it for events for high purse, using National and IJs.

XIV. The meeting was adjourned at 1701.