

# INTERNATIONAL SKATING UNION

## Communication No. 1962

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

**This Communication replaces ISU Communication No. 1893 with immediate effect. The basic changes, in particular but not limited to Paragraph F), are underlined**

Based on Article 22 of the ISU Constitution and the Special Regulations Single & Pair Skating, Ice Dance, Rule 440 and the Special Regulations Synchronized Skating, Rule 930, the Council determined the following:

#### **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 & Pair Skating and Ice Dance competitions at ISU Championships and the 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 Synchronized Skating Championships, 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 member 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, independently 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 evaluating.
- 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 score 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 the 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) Considering the requirement of the previous procedure (see ISU Communication No. 1893, paragraphs F), G) & H)) for Judges scores to remain within the "corridor" and the experience gained, it was decided that as of the season 2015/16 not to impose such "corridor" conformity and consequently not to impose Assessments for errors in the Judges scores.  
The methods of evaluation relating to Judges scores outlined in this Communication will be reviewed at the end of the 2015/16 season to determine if the removal of the corridor as well as the abolition of Assessments has had an impact on the pattern of judging. Depending on the outcome of the review, decisions and recommendations will be made on how to proceed for the subsequent seasons.
- b) 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 scores of all Judges in random sequence without any reference to the Judges' names, but including the factored GOEs and Program Component scores of the Referee;
  - printouts highlighting the cases of evaluation based on the criteria outlined under H below;
  - DVDs of the competition.
- c) 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.
- d) The OAC members shall review only GOE and Program Component scores identified as cases of evaluation as described in paragraph **H)** below.
- e) 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 scores in identified cases of evaluation as per paragraph H) 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.**
2. Any critical observations regarding the Judges' behavior (see paragraph D) f) above).
3. The report may contain additional comments on other subjects, such as rule violations, misbehavior of the Referee etc.

#### **G) Processing of OAC reports – Letters of Observation**

- 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 the 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 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.
- 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 Ranges of GOEs and Program Component scores (paragraph H.) below): issue one **“Letter of Observation”**;
  - **until further notice there will be no accumulation of Letters of Observation into Assessments;**
  - **until further notice all errors related to Deviation Points in GOEs and Program Components scores (paragraph H) below) will not result in Assessments and will be used for statistical purposes only;**
- e) Letters of Observation are considered separately for each discipline, i.e. Single and Pair Skating, Ice Dance and Synchronized Skating.
- f) A report of all Letters of Observation issued shall be forwarded by the respective Technical

Committee to the Vice President Figure Skating and Sports Director(s) Figure Skating **at the end of the season.**

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

**a) Method of Calculating Deviation Points in Grades of Execution (GOE)**

- (i) 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.**
- (ii) The computer then calculates the difference between the "calculated average" and each Judges GOE's which results in so called "Deviation Points".
- (iii) 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).
- (iv) The Deviation Total must not exceed the Total Number of Elements performed\*.

\* 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	1.2	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		- 3.0
	Deviation Points		
	Plus Deviation Points	+3.8	
	Total Deviation Points	+6.8	

7 Elements performed: 7 Deviation Points Acceptable

Total Deviation Points: 6.8 points - points are added together regardless of negative or positive values

Result: No Reason for Evaluation

**b) Method of Calculating Range of Grade of Execution (GOE):**

- (i) 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.

(ii) The computer then calculates the difference between the “calculated average” and each Judge’s GOE’s which results in so called “Deviation Points”.

(iii) Acceptable range of scores in GOE is stated as **less than “+ or –“ 1.5 Deviation Points.**

(iv) If for a Judge the Deviation Points of an element equals 1.5 points or more, the GOEs of that Judge for that element will constitute a case of evaluation\*.

\* Reasons for a “Range Evaluation” will appear as a **Gray Bar** in the Judges protocol sheets provided to the OAC for evaluation.

In the example above the GOEs of Judge A for the elements 5 and 6 should be evaluated.

**c) Method of Calculating Deviation Points in Program Component scores**

(i) 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.**

(ii) The computer then calculates the difference between the “calculated average” and the Judges Program Components scores which results in “Deviation Points”.

(iii) The Total Deviation points for each Judge will be added to provide a Total Net Deviation Points (+ and – Deviation Points compensate each other).

(iv) Total Net Deviation Points must not exceed 7.5\*.

\* The accepted Total Net Deviation Points is derived from the number of PC’s which is equal to 5:  $5 \times 1.5 = 7.5$

**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

**d) Method of Calculating Range of Program Components scores**

- (i) 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.**
  - (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 for a Judge the Deviation Points of an element equals 1.5 points or more, the scores of that Judge for that component will constitute a case of evaluation\*.
- \* Reasons for a “Range Evaluation” will appear as a **Gray Bar** in 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 should be evaluate

**D) Referee’s Report**

There will be a new chapter in the Referee’s Report in which the Referee should include the comment if he/she supports a Judge’s scores even if they are significantly higher/lower than the scores of other Judges.

With the goal of the chapter to be used by the OAC and the Technical Committee, it’s recommended that the Referee’s Report reaches the ISU Secretariat as soon as possible.

**J) 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 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 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 Observation to the concerned Judges through the ISU Secretariat, with copy to their Member Federation. Letter of Observation shall point out striking errors or multiple serious errors with the purpose of giving guidance for the respective Judges’ future activities. Letters of Observation are taken in 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 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.

Milano,  
August 31, 2015  
Lausanne,

**Ottavio Cinquanta**, President

**Fredi Schmid**, Director General



