

Communication No. 2194

(Paragraph F) 1. and 2. revised on October 25, 2018 as highlighted in yellow)

Rules of Procedure for Officials Assessment Commission – Evaluation of Judging – Assessments for the Figure Skating Branch

This Communication replaces ISU Communication No. 2098 with immediate effect

(Changes compared to the previous version of ISU Communication No. 2194 are underlined and highlighted in yellow)

A) Appointment of the Officials Assessment Commission (OAC)

1. The Council shall establish an OAC Pool for each season, i.e. for the period from July 1 to the following June 30. The members of the OAC Pool are appointed by the Council based upon recommendation of the Vice President Figure Skating. If the Vice President Figure Skating does not propose any changes by May 31 of each year, the present OAC Pool members are automatically reappointed for the following season.
2. In order to be included in the OAC Pool, an Official must fulfill the following criteria:
 - a) be on the current ISU Officials list of ISU Referees, ISU Technical Controllers or ISU Judges for Single & Pair Skating, Ice Dance or Synchronized Skating;
 - b) have the following skills:
 - ability to analyze competition data;
 - ability to work quickly and in an organized manner;
 - good written English;
 - familiarity with report writing;
 - basic computer skills (in particular ability to work with Word and Excel files);
 - ability to remain objective in all officiating evaluation matters.
 - c) not have more than an “Assessment 1” according to Rules 440 and 930 for service in the three full years prior to their appointment. Members of the OAC Pool receiving an “Assessment 2” or higher, independent in which discipline and capacity, shall be deleted from the OAC Pool with immediate effect. After the expiry of the period of validity of the Assessment the Council shall decide on reinstatement into the OAC Pool upon a respective proposal of the Vice President Figure Skating;
 - d) be available to attend educational seminars as directed by the Council.

B) Assignment of OAC members for specific ISU Events

1. For the Single & Pair Skating and Ice Dance ISU Events, the ISU President shall assign at least two OAC Pool members for Single and Pair Skating and two OAC Pool members for Ice Dance. Each member can be assigned to more than one discipline of the same event.

2. If possible, at least one of the assigned OAC members for Single & Pair Skating and one of the assigned OAC members for Ice Dance should have acted as an OAC member before.
3. The ISU Secretariat and/or consultants will administratively assist the OAC as required.
4. For the Olympic Winter Games and the Winter Youth Olympic Games, the relevant procedures will be published before the start of the Olympic season.

C) OAC members rules of conduct / Reimbursement

1. The designated OAC members will perform their duty off site, from their home. It is limited to the examination of identified cases of evaluation (paragraph F – below) based on the evaluation materials (Paragraph D – below).
2. The OAC members must keep all data made available to them **strictly confidential** and may not make any comments or give any information related to their work at any time, except when specifically and formally requested by the respective Technical Committee, the Council, the Sport Director(s) Figure Skating or the Director General.
3. OAC Pool members must not act in any other capacity at the events for which they have been assigned to act as OAC member.
4. OAC Pool members may not accept any appointment to act as OAC member in any ISU event in which any Skater with whom or with whose Coach the OAC Pool member is working might participate.
5. Remuneration per event will be as follows:
 - CHF 400.- – ISU Junior Grand Prix, ISU Grand Prix, ISU World Team Trophy, ISU World Junior Synchronized Skating Championships, ISU World Synchronized Skating Championships
 - CHF 500.- – ISU European Figure Skating Championships, ISU Four Continent Figure Skating Championships, ISU World Junior Figure Skating Championships, ISU World Figure Skating Championships

D) Evaluation Procedure and Report

1. As soon as possible after the conclusion of the respective ISU Event the assigned OAC members will receive the following evaluation materials:
 - Printouts which the OAC members receive of the Grades of Execution (GOEs) of every element and the Program Component scores of all Judges, including the factored GOEs and Program Component scores of the Referee.
 - Printouts highlighting the cases of evaluation based on the criteria outlined under F below;
 - Excel sheets indicating cases of evaluation;
 - Video recording of the competition;
 - Other supplementary materials, as decided by the respective Technical Committee
2. The OAC members must review the evaluation materials, consult each other and prepare a joint report within two weeks after receipt of the evaluation material.
3. **The OAC members must review all scores identified as cases of evaluation as described in paragraph F) below, but shall also evaluate and indicate as errors, scores not highlighted by the computer which they consider the respective scores as unjustifiable.**
4. The OAC members shall also review the individual judges' scores and identify irregularities which reveal possible violations of the ISU Code of Ethics.

5. The report of the OAC shall be based exclusively on the evaluation materials as per paragraph D1. and its own observations. It may not take into account any other information and input of third parties.

The report of the OAC shall include:

- a) The opinion of the OAC members on whether the scores in identified cases of evaluation as per paragraph F) are:
 - (i) correct or at least acceptable or
 - (ii) errors according to Total Deviation Points in GOE's or Program Component scores, or
 - (iii) errors according to the Ranges of GOE's or the Ranges of Program Component scores, not forming part of a case of evaluation already qualified as an error as per subparagraph (ii) above.
 - (iv) In case error/s related to Competitors of the same ISU Member of the concerned Judge each error may be evaluated for possible bias by the Technical Committee and, if a bias is confirmed, will count as two errors.
- b) Observations of irregularities in the scores of individual judges which the OAC members consider to indicate violations of the ISU Code of Ethics, in particular bias, lack of impartiality, neutrality and honesty, manipulation of the competition by using unfair strategies
- c) Any critical observations regarding the Judges' behavior.
- d) The report may contain additional comments on other subjects, such as rule violations, misbehavior of the Referee etc.

E) Processing of OAC reports

1. OAC reports including the evaluation material shall be made available to the respective Technical Committee through the ISU Secretariat without delay.
2. The respective Technical Committee shall evaluate the OAC reports as soon as possible. Between their meetings, the Technical Committees shall communicate through e-mail and/or conference calls.
3. If the concerned Technical Committee disagrees on any determination of an error by the OAC, the OAC members must be consulted with the purpose of achieving a consensus. The Referee's opinion (if any), detailed in his/her report, will also be taken into consideration in order to come up with an appropriate decision. If the OAC and the Technical Committee still disagree on the determination of an error, the case will be finally decided by the Sport Director(s) Figure Skating.
4. After the evaluation process of the OAC and the review by the Technical Committee the errors, exceeding in number the maximum of acceptable errors, will be recorded by the respective Technical Committee in a dedicated database. The number of acceptable errors per segment is based on the number of Skaters/Couples/Teams per segment, as indicated:

Up to 8 Skaters/Couples/Teams:	1 error
From 9 to 16 Skaters/Couples/Teams:	2 errors
From 17 to 24 Skaters/Couples/Teams:	3 errors
From 25 to 32 Skaters/Couples/Teams:	4 errors
More than 32 Skaters/Couples/Teams:	5 errors

5. **When a Judge has accumulated 6 or more recorded errors, but less than 15 during the season, the Technical Committee will review for a possible Assessment. If the number of registered errors is 15 or more, an Assessment will be issued automatically.**
6. **If after having received an Assessment the same Judge accumulates 4 or more additional errors during the same season, the Technical Committee will review for a possible further Assessment.**

7. i) In cases of striking error(s) and/or bias, the Technical Committee may decide on an Assessment regardless of the total number of recorded error(s).
 ii) Apart from the OAC evaluation process and the Assessment procedure the respective Technical Committee may review the marking of Judges and if, in its opinion, it is warranted, issue Letters of Warning, Letters of Criticism or Letters of Advice with regard to the marking of an individual Judge/s, which may also result in an Assessment. In addition, the respective Technical Committee will submit cases which it considers to reveal violations of the ISU Code of Ethics to the ISU Disciplinary Commission.
8. When the Technical Committee decides that an Assessment is necessary, this decision must be supported by the respective Sports Director.
9. Should there be no agreement between the Technical Committee and Sports Director on the Assessment, the decision will be taken by the Vice President Figure Skating.
10. By May 25 of each year the Vice President Figure Skating shall receive the Reports of the Technical Committees of all Assessments issued during the season.

F) Criteria for the identification of cases of evaluation in the Judges' GOEs and Program Components scores

1. Method of Calculating Deviation Points in Grades of Execution (GOE)

- a) For each element performed the computer calculates the average GOE of all the Judges. The GOE's awarded by the Referee are NOT used in this calculation.
- b) The computer then calculates the difference between the "calculated average" and each Judges GOE's which results in so called "Deviation Points".
- c) The Deviation Points for each Judge will be added to give a Deviation Total for that Judge (+ and - Deviation Points do not compensate each other).
- d) The Deviation Total must not exceed the Total Number of Elements performed **multiplied by 1.5**.

* In the case of elements receiving NO VALUE the Deviation Total still remains with the number of elements performed; the Deviation Points for this element for all Judges will be 0.

Example	Average GOE	GOEs of Judge A	Deviation Points
Element 1	1.8	1.0	- 0.8
Element 2	-1.4	-4.0	- 2.6
Element 3	0.0	-2.0	- 2.0
Element 4	0.8	1.0	+ 0.2
Element 5	-1.0	0.0	+ 1.0
Element 6	0.4	2.0	+ 1.6
Element 7	2.2	0.0	- 2.2
	Minus Deviation Points		- 7.6
	Plus Deviation Points		+2.8
	Total Deviation Points		10.4

7 Elements performed: $7 \times 1.5 = 10.5$ Deviation Points Acceptable

Total Deviation Points: 10.4 points - points are added regardless of negative or positive values

Result: No Reason for Evaluation

2. Method of Calculating Range of Grade of Execution (GOE)

- a) For each element performed the computer calculates the average GOE of all the Judges. The GOE's awarded by the Referee are NOT used in this calculation.
- b) The computer then calculates the difference between the "calculated average" and each

Judge's GOE's which results in so called "Deviation Points".

- c) Acceptable range of scores in GOE is stated as **less than "+ or -" 2.5 Deviation Points**.
- d) If the Deviation Points of an element for a Judge equals 2.5 points or more, the GOEs of that Judge for that element will constitute a case of evaluation*.

The respective deviation points will be indicated on the Judges protocol sheets provided to the OAC for evaluation.

In the example above the GOE of Judge A for the element 2 has to be evaluated.

3. Method of Calculating Deviation Points in Program Component scores

- a) For each Program Component, the computer calculates the average scores of all the Judges. The Program Components scores awarded by the Referee are NOT used in this calculation.
- b) The computer then calculates the difference between the "calculated average" and the Judges Program Components scores which results in "Deviation Points".
- c) The Total Deviation points for each Judge will be added to provide a Total Net Deviation Points (+ and - Deviation Points compensate each other).
- d) Total Net Deviation Points must not exceed 7.5.

Example

	Average Component scores	Component scores of Judge A	Deviation Points
Component 1	5.75	4.00	-1.75
Component 2	5.85	4.00	-1.85
Component 3	5.45	6.25	+ 0.80
Component 4	6.00	7.75	+ 1.75
Component 5	5.55	7.00	+ 1.45
	Deviation Points in Minuses		-3.60
	Deviation Points in Pluses		+4.00
	Total Net Deviation Points		+0.40

5 Components performed: 7.5 Total Net Deviations acceptable.

Total Net Deviation Points: +0.4 - points in the minuses offset points in the pluses.

Result: No Reason for Evaluation

4. Method of Calculating the Range of Program Components scores

- (i) For each Program Component, the computer calculates the average scores of all of the Judges. The Program Components scores awarded by the Referee are NOT used in this calculation.
- (ii) The computer then calculates the difference between the "calculated average" and the Judges Program Components scores which results in "Deviation Points".
- (iii) Acceptable range of scores in Program Components is stated as less than "+ or -" 1.5 Deviation Points.
- (iv) If the Deviation Points of a component for a Judge equals 1.5 points or more, the scores of that Judge for that component will constitute a case of evaluation*.

* The respective deviation points will be indicated on the Judges protocol sheets provided to the OAC for evaluation.

In the example above the scores of Judge A for the components 1, 2, 4 have to be evaluated.

G) Referee's Report

Section 8 of the Referee's report is dedicated to a Referee's comments regarding if he/she supports a Judge's scores even if they are significantly higher/lower than the scores of other Judges.

With the goal that the comments will be used by the Technical Committee, it's recommended that the

Referee's Report reaches the ISU Secretariat as soon as possible.

H) Cases of Evaluation of Judges Behavior

The respective Technical Committee shall further examine any reported critical observation of the Judges' behavior. **If the respective Technical Committee finds a reported critical behavior to constitute a violation of the duties of Judges, it shall issue a Letter of Criticism.**

If the respective behavior at the same time indicates any violation of the Code of Ethics, the respective Technical Committee shall further refer the case to the ISU Disciplinary Commission by way of Statement of Complaint.

I) Evaluation of judging at International Competitions not covered by the OAC

In International Competitions not covered by the OAC no systematical evaluation of Judges GOEs and Program Components scores takes place.

However, the Referee of such International Competitions shall include in his report the attached Form for Judges who, in his/her opinion made serious errors in GOEs and Program Component scores. For the purpose of establishing what constitutes serious errors, the Referee should use the criteria for the identification of cases of evaluation (para F) above) as approximate guidelines. Respective reports must be based on the "Judges detail sheets", which are published at the end of each segment of a competition and must be attached to the Form. The respective ISU Technical Committee shall evaluate reports on striking or multiple serious errors and, as the case may be, **with approval of the respective Sports Director, issue a Letter of Observation** to the Judges concerned through the ISU Secretariat, with copy to their ISU Members.

J) Evaluation of the decisions of the Technical Panel and of the decisions of/conduct of competition by the Referee at ISU Events

The evaluation of the above-mentioned decisions relating to the Technical Panel and Referee are regulated in the Special Regulations Single & Pair Skating/Ice Dance, Rule 440, paragraph 3 and Special Regulations Synchronized Skating, Rule 930, paragraph 3.

Based on the experience being gained, the Council will proceed with an evaluation for possible adjustments to be applied.

Tubbergen,

October 25, 2018

Lausanne,

Jan Dijkema, President

Fredi Schmid, Director General

**ATTACHMENT TO THE REFEREE'S REPORT
SINGLE & PAIR SKATING, ICE DANCE and SYNCHRONIZED SKATING
INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIONS**

EVALUATION FORM FOR JUDGES HAVING MADE (IN THE OPINION OF THE REFEREE) STRIKING/SERIOUS ERRORS IN THE AREA OF THE GRADE OF EXECUTION (GOE) OR PROGRAM COMPONENTS

This Form is NOT applicable for competitions for which the evaluation of Judges is covered by the Official Assessment Commission, i.e. the Olympic Winter Games, ISU Championships, ISU Senior & Junior Grand Prix of Figure Skating Events and Final, ISU Synchronized Skating Junior World Challenge Cup and the ISU World Team Trophy in Figure Skating (see ISU Communication [.]). The Referee should use this Form only for the Judges who (in the opinion of the Referee) have striking errors or many cases of serious errors. The relevant Judges detail Sheets must be attached to this Form.

Competition:					
Place:			Date:		
Category (Ladies, Men, Pair Skating, Ice Dance, Synchronized Skating):			Junior/Senior/Novice		
Referee:			ISU Member:		
Judge's name:			ISU Member:		
Segment	SP <input type="checkbox"/>	FS <input type="checkbox"/>	PD <input type="checkbox"/>	RD <input type="checkbox"/>	FD <input type="checkbox"/>

GOEs of elements or Program Components scores wrong in the opinion of the Referee (please indicate wrong GOEs/scores):

Skater's/Team's name	ISU Member	Element /Program Component with wrong GOE/score	Judge's GOE/score	Panel's trimmed mean	Referees GOE/score

Date:

Referee's Signature: