

## Communication No. 2423

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

**This Communication replaces ISU Communication No. 2369 with immediate effect**  
(Changes compared to the previous version of ISU Communication No. 2369 are underlined)

### **A) Appointment of the Officials Assessment Commission (OAC)**

1. For each season, i.e. for the period from July 1 to the following June 30, an OAC Pool shall be established by the Council. 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, Ice Dance and Synchronized Skating ISU Events, the ISU President shall assign at least two OAC Pool members for Single and Pair Skating, two OAC Pool members for Ice Dance and two OAC Pool members for Synchronized Skating. 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, one of the OAC members for Ice Dance and one of the OAC members for Synchronized Skating should have acted as an OAC member before.
3. The ISU Secretariat and/or consultants will administratively assist the OAC as required.

### C) OAC members rules of conduct / Reimbursement

1. The designated OAC members will perform their duty off site, from their home.
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 Technical 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 an 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:

Men, Women, Pair Skating Ice Dance, & Synchronized Skating will be considered separately for reimbursement. Remuneration per OAC member, per discipline will be as follows:

- CHF 175
  - ISU Senior Grand Prix
  - Winter Youth Olympic Games
- CHF 200
  - ISU Junior Grand Prix
- CHF 350
  - ISU European Figure Skating Championships
  - ISU Four Continent Figure Skating Championships
  - ISU World Junior Figure Skating Championships
  - ISU World Figure Skating Championships
  - ISU World Junior Synchronized Skating Championships
  - ISU World Synchronized Skating Championships
  - Olympic Winter Games

### 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:
  - Electronic files of the Grades of Execution (GOEs) of every element and the Program Component scores of all Judges.
  - Electronic files highlighting the cases of evaluation based on the criteria outlined under paragraph F) below;
  - Excel sheets indicating cases of evaluation;
  - Electronic files of statistical grids highlighting cases of possible (national) bias which are based on a mathematical calculation of the percentage difference between / each Judge's total score

for one Competitor (Single Skater, Pair, Ice Dance Couple, Synchronized Skating Team) and his total scores for the two Competitors who, in the official result of the respective segment, are placed immediately above and for the two Competitors placed immediately below that Competitor.

- 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 14 days after receipt of the evaluation materials.
  3. The OAC members must review all scores identified as cases of evaluation as described in paragraph F) below and/or as cases of possible (national) bias and/or undue favouritism, but shall also evaluate and indicate as errors, scores not highlighted on the printouts which they consider 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, in particular any bias, but also any type of undue favouritism.
  5. The report of the OAC shall be based exclusively on the evaluation materials as per paragraph D 1. 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 correct or at least acceptable.
- b) GOE or Program Component scores which the OAC considers to be errors despite not being identified as cases of evaluation according to paragraph F.
- c) The opinion of the OAC members on whether highlighted cases of possible (national) bias actually do reflect (national) bias.
- d) Observations of irregularities in the scores of individual Judges which the OAC members consider indicating violations of the ISU Code of Ethics, in particular bias, lack of impartiality, neutrality and honesty, manipulation of the competition by using unfair strategies or undue favouritism.
- e) 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 by the appointed OAC members to the respective Technical Committee through the ISU Secretariat without delay, but latest 14 days after the end of the concerned competition.
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, conference calls or video conferences. In case of disagreement between the OAC and the respective Technical Committee on the determination of certain errors, the Vice President Figure Skating shall take the final decision.
3. If the respective Technical Committee identifies anomalies in Judges scores which the OAC members have not evaluated, it shall inform the respective Sports Technical Director who shall decide whether these anomalies are to be considered as determined errors and/or (national) bias.
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 registered by the respective

Technical Committee in a dedicated database. The number of acceptable errors per segment is based on the number of Competitors (Single Skaters/Pairs, Ice Dance Couples/Synchronized Skating Teams) per segment, as follows:

|                            |          |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Up to 8 Competitors:       | 1 error  |
| From 9 to 16 Competitors:  | 2 errors |
| From 17 to 24 Competitors: | 3 errors |
| From 25 to 32 Competitors: | 4 errors |
| More than 32 Competitors:  | 5 errors |

5. When a Judge has accumulated 6 or more registered 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 without delay. The range of errors allows the Technical Committees to take into consideration all circumstances, including but not limited to the following:
  - The number of segments in which the errors were accumulated
  - The number of errors accumulated in each segment
  - The severity of the errors.
6. If after having received an Assessment the same Judge accumulates 15 or more additional errors during the term of validity of the respective Assessment, the Technical Committee will review for a possible additional Assessment. The additional errors will be evaluated in the same manner as stated in paragraph 4.
7. In cases of striking error(s), the Technical Committee may decide on an Assessment regardless of the total number of registered error(s).
8. All Letters of Assessment are subject to a review and approval of the ISU Vice President of Figure Skating. Letters of Assessment shall be submitted to the ISU Director General for signature and be sent to the concerned official with a copy to his/her ISU Member as well as the ISU Vice President Figure Skating.
9. Cases identified as (national) bias or indication of (national) bias shall be handled in accordance with Rule 440 Para 2e.
10. By May 25 of each year the Vice President Figure Skating and the respective Sports Director 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 the Range of Grade of Execution (GOE)**

- a) For each element performed the computer calculates the average GOE of all the Judges. The GOEs 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 GOEs which results in so called "Deviation Points".
- c) If the Deviation Points of an element for a Judge is more than 2.0 points, 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 below, the GOE of Judge A for the element 7 has to be evaluated.

| <b>Example</b> | <b>Average<br/>GOE</b> | <b>GOEs of<br/>Judge A</b> | <b>Deviation<br/>Points</b> |
|----------------|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Element 1      | 1.8                    | 1.0                        | 0.8                         |
| Element 2      | -2.1                   | -4.0                       | 1.9                         |
| 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                         |

## 2. Method of Calculating the Range of Program Components scores

- For each Program Component, the computer program calculates the average scores of all of the Judges. The Program Components scores awarded by the Referee are NOT used in this calculation.
- The computer program then calculates the difference between the “calculated average” and the Judges Program Components scores which results in “Deviation Points”.
- If the Deviation Points of a component for a Judge is **more than 1.5 points**, 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 below the scores of Judge A for the components 1, 2, 4 have to be evaluated.

| <b>Example</b> | <b>Average<br/>Component<br/>scores</b> | <b>Component<br/>scores of<br/>Judge A</b> | <b>Deviation<br/>Points</b> |
|----------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| 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                        |

## G) Referee's Report

Section 6 (SP),9 (ID) 8(SyS) of the Referee's report is dedicated to comments of the Referee in case he/she supports a Judge's scores even if they are significantly higher/lower than the scores of the other Judges.

## H) Cases of Evaluation of Judges Behavior

The respective Technical Committee shall further examine any reported critical observation of the Judges' behavior which indicates a disciplinary/ethical violation. If the respective Technical Committee finds a reported critical behavior to constitute a serious disciplinary/ethical violation or in case of repeated disciplinary/ethical violations it shall submit the case to the ISU Disciplinary Commission and, in case of a less serious disciplinary/ethical violation, issue a Letter of Warning.

## **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, if in his opinion, a Judge has made serious errors in GOEs and/or Program Component scores. For the purpose of establishing what constitutes serious errors, the Referee shall 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, issue a Letter of Attention to the Judges concerned through the ISU Secretariat and to be signed by the ISU Director General, with copy to their ISU Members and the Vice President Figure Skating.

## **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 the 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.

Tubbergen,  
August 16, 2021  
Lausanne,

**Jan Dijkema**, President

**Fredi Schmid**, Director