

73rd FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 28-29 January 2023, MALMO SWEDEN

<i>Subject:</i>	Jury Composition	Annex #	22.1.4
<i>Author:</i>	Previously Jury Discussion Group, amended by G Bradley 2022		
<i>Date:</i>	30 November 2022	Total Pages	4

JURY COMPOSITION – A PROPOSAL

Background:

The Extended Bureau Meeting (“EBM”) in Moscow 2020 agreed that the high cost of Juries (~€30.000 PA) should be examined. The EBM further requested that an informal, volunteer group, the Jury Discussion Group (“JDG”) be commissioned to examine the selection and structure of Juries to remedy other perceived issues. The Moscow Plenary was informed of this investigative and reporting group.

In November 2020, the Extended Bureau agreed with the majority of solutions proposed by the JDG. At ISC Plenary 2021, a number of the proposals put forward by the JDG were implemented in our rules.

At ISC Plenary 2022 it was agreed to postpone further discussion about Jury composition until we could be face-to-face again. This report is a version of the previous submission, focussing on Jury composition. The JDG, as such, has disbanded but asked a Delegate to propose this structure again in 2023.

Proposer: Gail Bradley – ISC Delegate, Australia

1. The Problems

- Too many Jury Members compared with too few competitors causes events to be unprofitable.
- Too many officials including Jurors at smaller competitions leading to non-profitable events.
- ISC bears the full cost of Jury travel; other ASCs ask the Organiser to pay for them which at the end has to be covered by entry fees.
- Jury costs are increasing while participant numbers presently appear to be on the decline or, at best, remaining static. It is hard to project increases in the near future.
- Jury members not kept busy enough during small, stable, or more mature competitions.
- Jury members not properly trained, prepared, nor given feedback.

Cost is not the only issue. Other identified problems were attempted to be resolved in 2021, e.g. the Complaints Procedure, but is not yet commonly or correctly used.

2. A Solution

Solving the Jury Composition issue may save ISC up to €30.000 pa.

PROPOSAL	COMMENTS
Jury Member off-site	
The third member of the Jury will work offsite.	Remote Jury Members are already covered by the rules: <i>GS 5.4.2.5 and 5.4.2.6.1.</i>

<p>The FAI-C has paperwork to do, the Officials List and Annexe 4 – Finance, which take less than half an hour, meaning he/she will be available to assist with Records Processing, Protests, Complaints, and Jury Paperwork (usually a one-person job anyway).</p>	<p>It puts two experienced people into the Jury. A third is off-site to arbitrate and assist when needed. See “Jury Structure”.</p> <p>It saves a further third of ISC costs as the Organiser pays for the FAI-Controller.</p> <p>The FAI-Controller role does not exist in the <i>General Section</i>, so is easy to change in our rules and Handbooks.</p> <p>Once the “Big Three” take over, MD, CJ and JP, the Organiser’s rules adherence is already sufficiently managed. Most Organisers will welcome one fewer ISC Official.</p>
---	--

Final Jury Structure	Comments
<p>The Jury comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jury President: - FAI-Controller/Jury Member: - Jury Member - (Reserve Jury Member) <hr/> <p>Maintain geographic diversity.</p>	<p>Jury President to be selected as usual, i.e.: recommended by Bureau and relevant Committee Chairs from approved Jury list maintained by First VP. Appointed by the Plenary. SC5 4.7.1.6.(a)</p> <p>FAI-Controller to be selected as usual, i.e.: recommended by relevant Competition Committees, nominated by Bureau and approved by Plenary. SC5 4.1.1.1 (2) While selected in the year(s) before, this person automatically fills a Jury Member role. Once the competition is started, the FAI-Controller becomes available for both Jury duties when required and FAI-C duties (e.g. safety) when required.</p> <p>Works remotely unless exceptional conditions exist as described.</p> <p>In all cases, the Jury Members, FAI-Controllers and Chief Judges should be selected by the relevant Committees, and Bureau working <i>in consultation</i> to create a team working for the benefit of the competitors, given geographical considerations and costs. The opinion of the Jury President should be sought on all Jury Members.</p> <hr/> <p>It is in SC5, 4.7.1 (11b).</p> <p>It diversifies the Jury and adds experience to different countries.</p>

Jury Performance	Comments
<p>The Jury President is required to give a briefing to the Jury on his/her expectations for performance and behaviour especially to new Jury Members.</p>	<p>The Jury President must inform the Jury what is required of them up-front, not leave it to the Jury Handbook or expected knowledge.</p> <p>This briefing partially fills the Jury education need, although Jury tasks for already-experienced people, with competition backgrounds, are not considered so complex as to need formal training. It also includes working procedures and requirements to be available for the remote Jury Member (phone contact, timing to be online for Zoom, etc.)</p> <p>Handbook to be amended.</p>
<p>The JP will provide verbal feedback to the First VP on Jury Member performance.</p>	<p>The First VP requires feedback on Jury performance to be able to make recommendations about re-selection.</p>

Jury Training	Comments
<p>How do new Jury members work up into the system if they learned remotely?</p>	<p>The remote Juror is only for small/stable competitions. As ISC typically has 4-6 Juries per annum, bigger competitions will deliver opportunities for new Jury Members to learn on site.</p>
<p>Jury Training</p>	<p>A Webinar could be created.</p> <p>Or part of the ISC meeting, say Friday mornings, could spend an hour or two doing a "Round Table" from experienced Jurors, talking about Handbook, duties, preparation and previous decisions.</p>