

INTERNATIONAL SKATING UNION

Communication No. 1893

This Communication replaces ISU Communication No. 1631 with immediate effect

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

Based on Article 22 of the ISU Constitution and the Rules 440 and 930 the Council determines as follows:

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 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 fashion;
 - good written English;
 - familiarity with report writing;
 - 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 events

- a) For the Singles & Pairs and Ice Dance competitions at ISU Championships and Olympic Winter Games the ISU President shall assign at least three OAC Pool members, two of whom must be available for Ice Dance and two for Single & Pair Skating. Each member can be assigned to more than one discipline of the same event.
- b) For the ISU Grand Prix Final of Figure Skating (Junior and Senior) individual events and final, the ISU World Team Trophy in Figure Skating, the ISU World Junior Synchronized Skating Championships and the ISU Synchronized Skating Junior World Challenge Cup, the ISU President assigns two OAC Pool members for each discipline.
- c) If possible at least one of the assigned OAC members per discipline should have acted as an OAC before.
- d) The ISU Secretariat and/or consultants will administratively assist the OAC as required.

C. OAC members rules of conduct

- a) 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.
- b) OAC Pool members must not act in any other capacity at the events for which they have been assigned to act as OAC member.
- c) 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.

D. Specific Rules of Procedure for the OAC at ISU Championships (except ISU World Junior Synchronized Championships) and Olympic Winter Games

- a) The designated OAC members perform their duty on site. They shall arrive on the day before the commencement of the first competition in which they will officiate. They **should, if possible, attend practice sessions but** for the purpose of identifying the competitors by name and appearance **only**.
- b) Whenever present in the ice rink OAC members must **remain apart** from participants, coaches and Officials, independent of the discipline they are assigned to serve. They may at no time sit with members of the Officials' Panels of the competition they are assessing.

- c) OAC members shall not attend the Initial Judges Meetings, Round Table Discussions, and shall not attempt to influence the discussion content of the Round Table Discussions by **making internal information concerning their work available** to the Referees..
- d) During the assigned competitions, the OAC members shall be seated together and as close as possible to the same **site** line as the judging panel or Technical Panel.
- e) The OAC members shall work separately from all other Officials. They **shall** take notes in the area of the GOEs **and Program Components**.
 - f) The OAC shall survey the Judges' behavior during the competition, especially with respect to whether they mark independently, without using previous results or unauthorized documents (see ISU Communication No. 1540) and their respect of the ISU Code of Ethics (currently ISU Communication No. 1717). Any critical observation in these regards must be submitted to the Referee immediately **or at earliest convenience, (e.g. during ice resurfacing)**, at latest upon conclusion of the competition.

E) Specific Rules of Procedure for OAC at the ISU Grand Prix of Figure Skating (Junior and Senior) individual events and Final, the ISU World Team Trophy in Figure Skating, the ISU World Junior Synchronized Skating Championships and the ISU Synchronized Skating Junior World Challenge Cup.

The designated OAC members perform their duty off site, from their home. It is limited to the examination of identified cases of evaluation (paragraph H below) based on the evaluation materials (paragraph F below).

F) Evaluation Procedure and Report

- a) After each Segment of a competition when the OAC works on site, or as soon as possible after the conclusion of the respective ISU Event in case the OAC works off site, the assigned OAC members will receive the following evaluation materials:
 - printouts of the Grades of Execution (GOEs) of every element and the Program Component marks of all Judges in random sequence without any reference to the Judges' names, but including the factored GOEs and Program Component marks of the Referee;
 - printouts highlighting the cases of evaluation based on the criteria outlined under H below;
 - DVDs of the competition.
- b) The OAC members must review the evaluation materials, consult each other and prepare a joint report within 24 hours of the conclusion of the last competition assigned to them if on site and **within two weeks after receipt of the evaluation material** when working off site from home.

- c) The OAC members shall review only GOE and Component marks identified as cases of evaluation as described in paragraph **H** below.
- d) The report of the OAC shall be based exclusively on the evaluation materials as per paragraph F a) above and the own observations of the OAC members. It may not take into account any other information and input of third **parties**.

The report of the OAC shall include:

1. **The opinion of the OAC members on whether the marks in identified cases of evaluation as per paragraph H are:**
 - (i) **acceptable** or
 - (ii) **errors according to Total Deviation Points in GOE's or Program Component Marks, or**
 - (iii) **errors according to the Ranges of GOE's or the Ranges of Program Component marks, not forming part of a case of evaluation already qualified as an error as per subparagraph (ii) above.**
2. Any critical observations regarding the Judges' behavior (see paragraph D) f) above).
3. The report may not contain any comments on other subjects, such as rule violations, criticism of the results of the competition, the general standard of skating and judging, individual skater ability, opinions on the direction of the sport discipline, etc.

G) Processing of OAC reports

- a) OAC reports including the evaluation material shall be made available to the respective Technical Committee through the ISU Secretariat without delay.
- b) The respective Technical Committee shall evaluate OAC reports and submit its findings to the ISU Secretariat as soon as possible. Between their meetings, the Technical Committees shall communicate through e-mail and/or conference calls.
- c) If the 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. If this is not possible and a disagreement persists, the case will be finally decided by the Sport Director(s) Figure Skating, who may seek assistance from additional experts of their choice.
- d) If an error has been determined by the joint opinion of the OAC and the Technical Committee or by the final decision of the Sports Director(s), the Technical Committee shall immediately undertake the following actions:

- for all errors related to the Deviations Points in GOEs and Program Component marks (paragraph H below): issue one Assessment;
 - for all errors related to the Ranges of GOEs and Program Component marks (paragraph H below) which do not at the same time lead to an Assessment as above: issue one Letter of Warning.
- e) Not more than one Assessment or Letter of Warning will be issued to any Judge for the same Competition and all its Segments, even if the Judge concerned has committed several errors.
 - f) For each two Letters of Warning for errors related to the ranges of GOEs and Program Component marks imposed during the same season, the Technical Committee shall issue one Assessment.
 - g) Assessments and Letters of Warning are considered separately for each discipline, i.e. Single and Pair Skating, Ice Dance and Synchronized Skating (see also Rule 440, Paragraph 9).
 - h) Letters of Warning and Assessments are taken into consideration in the evaluation of service as per Rule 411, paragraph 4. For detailed rules regarding Assessments and their consequences, reference is made to Rule 440.
 - i) A report of all Assessments issued shall be forwarded by the respective Technical Committee to the Vice President Figure Skating and Sports Director(s) Figure Skating **at least once per year**.

H) Criteria for the identification of cases of evaluation in the Judges' GOEs and Program Components marks

a) Deviation Points in Grades of Execution (GOE)

- (i) For each element performed, the computer calculates the average of the GOEs of **all** Judges **and** the Referee. The result is called "Average Evaluation Score". The GOE of the Referee will be factored with 2.0 to give the Referee's opinion a major weight, if the panel consists of seven (7) Judges or more. For panels of less than seven (7) Judges, the weight of the Referee's input is 1.5.
- (ii) For each Judge the computer program calculates the difference between his/her GOE and the Average Evaluation Score which results in so called "Deviation Points".
- (iii) The Deviation Points of each Judge for all elements of a skating program will be added, which leads to the Total Deviation Points for each Judge.
- (iiii) The GOE's of each Judge may differ from the Average Evaluation Score by one Deviation Point per element in the average. If the Total Deviation Points of any Judge exceed the number of performed elements, there is a case for evaluation.

(iv) Example: Short Program

	Average Evaluation Scores of GOEs	GOEs of Judge A	Deviation Points
Element 1	1.2	1.0	- 0.2
Element 2	-1.4	-2.0	- 0.6
Element 3	0.0	-1.0	- 1.0
Element 4	0.8	1.0	+ 0.2
Element 5	-1.8	0.0	+ 1.8
Element 6	0.2	2.0	+ 1.8
Element 7	2.2	1.0	- 1.2
	Minus Deviation Points		-3.0
	Plus Deviation Points		+3.8
	Total Deviation Points		+6.8

Allowed: maximum 7.0 Deviation Points

Result: no case for evaluation

b) Ranges of Grades of Execution (GOE) of elements

- (i) For each element performed, the computer calculates the difference between the highest GOE and the lowest GOE of **all** Judges of the panel **and** the Referee. The result is called “Range of GOEs” for the respective element.
- (ii) **If the Range of GOEs of an element equals 3.0 points or more, the GOEs of the Judges for that element will constitute cases of evaluation.**

c) Deviation Points in Program Component Marks

- (i) **For each Program Component, the computer program calculates the average mark of all Judges and the Referee. The result is called “Average Evaluation Score”. The mark of the Referee will be factored with 2.0 to give the Referee’s opinion a major weight, if the panel of Judges consists of seven (7) Judges or more. For panels of less than seven (7) Judges, the weight of the Referee’s input is 1.5.**
- (ii) **For each Program Component mark given by each Judge, the computer program calculates the deviation from the Average Evaluation Score, which results in “Deviation Points”. Deviation Points in pluses and Deviation Points in minuses are combined and the result is “Net Total Deviation Points”.**
- (iii) The Program Component marks of each Judge may differ by 1.5 Deviation Points per Component in the average, i.e. by 7.50 Total Net Deviation Points. If the Total Net Deviation Points of any Judge exceed 7.50, there is a case for evaluation.

(iv) Example

	Average Component Scores	Component marks 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

Allowed : maximum 7.5 Net Deviation Points

Result : no case for evaluation

d) Ranges of Program Component Marks

- (i) **For each Program Component, the computer calculates the difference between the highest mark and the lowest mark amongst all Judges of the panel, and the Referee. The result is called the “Range of Marks” for the respective Program Component.**
- (ii) **If the Range of Marks of any Program Component equals 2.50 or more points, the marks of the Judges for that Program Component will constitute cases of evaluation.**

I Cases of Evaluation of Judges Behavior

The respective Technical Committee shall further examine any reported critical observation of the Judges’ behavior (paragraph D f) above). **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 Claim.

K 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 marks 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 marks. **For the purpose of establishing what constitutes serious errors, the Referee should use the criteria for the identification of cases of evaluation (para H above) as approximate guidelines** Respective reports must be based on the “Judges details 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 Letters of Advice to the concerned Judges through the ISU Secretariat, with copy to their Member federation. Letter of Advice shall point out striking errors or multiple serious errors with the purpose of giving guidance for the respective Judges' future activities.

Letters of Advice are taken into consideration in the evaluation of service as per Rule 411, paragraph 4.

L. Evaluation of the decisions of the Technical Panel and of the decisions of/conduct of competition by the Referee at ISU Events, the Olympic Winter Games, Youth Olympic Games and Olympic Qualifying Figure Skating Competitions

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 (formerly Rule 440, paragraph 2 in the 2012 Regulations) and Special Regulations Synchronized Skating, Rule 930, paragraph 3 (formerly Rule 825, paragraph 2 in the 2012 Regulations).

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

Milano,
August 13, 2014
Lausanne,

Ottavio Cinquanta, President

Fredi Schmid, Director General

