



NATIONAL JUDGES NEWSLETTER

Issue 42

December 2003

Dear Judges,



The festive season is again upon us, I wish all of you and your families a

*Merry Christmas
and a Happy New Year*

Warm regards to you all

Susanne E Womersley



Open National Championships 2004

The Open Nationals are held in Brisbane again – haven't you always fancied a trip to sunny Queensland? Well, here is your chance!

The nomination form is attached. Please consider and reply by the due date.



International Appointments 2004

I am pleased to inform you that Holger Blum and John Womersley both have been appointed by FITA to officiate at the World Field Championships in Croatia; and I have been selected to judge at the Olympic Games in Athens.



Team Work (excerpt from the FITA Judges Newsletter)

It is important to remember that the judge commission at any tournament needs to work as a team around the chairman, especially in dealing with the Organising Committee. Any problems or issues should always be discussed within the judge commission; and it is part of the role of the chairman to handle communication with the organisers. It does not show a good image of the commission and the coordinating role of the chairman, when individual judges without previous reference to the commission tell the Organising Committee to make changes to the field, etc.



New National Judge Candidates

SQAS and ASNSW recently run judges courses, which resulted in five new National Judge Candidates being accredited:

Alison Hagaman and Helen Austin (SQAS)

Tim Castle, Stephen Jankovic and Andrew Henderson (ASNSW)

Welcome to the team!



You be the Judge - Answers from Issue 41

Before I give you responses to the current case studies, I need to back track to issues 39 and 40, as the FITA Judge Committee Newsletter has arrived – so I can add to earlier comments:

39/1: Judges have overall responsibility regarding the conduct of the scoring – the judge was correct in his actions.

39/2: The sight pin is illegal – more than 2cm; irrelevant of direction.

39/3: Shooting positions need to be marked – does not take that long.

40/1: The bouncer will get the value 5 – three lowest scoring arrows 9 – 7 – 5.

40/2: a) 9 – 8 – M; b) 8 – 6 – M; c) 9 – 8 – M

40/3: Score the arrow according to its witnessed impact.

The table on the following page gives an indication of the number of Judges in each society and the number of replies received for issue 41:

Society	Judges	Replies	Society	Judges	Replies
AACT	4	nil	ASA	14	8
ASNSW	12	2	AV	20	7
AST	7	nil	SQAS	8	4
ASWA	9	2	NQAA	6	1

Total: Judges: 80 Replies: 24 Proportion: 30%

Please keep in mind that answering at least twelve case studies is a requirement for reaccreditation in July 2004.

41/1: At a major field tournament the following incident happened. At a very steep down hill target approx 45 m long a Judge had stopped half way up the hill catching his breath at the same time as the archers were doing their scoring. One of the archers called the Judge by name and asked him to come down and correct the scorecard as he had managed to fill in the wrong arrow value on the scorecard. The Judge answered that the archers could correct the scorecard themselves and continued climbing the hill.

From your understanding of the rules, would you have done likewise – or would you have acted differently?

We all agree that the archers could have done the correction themselves, but as the majority of judges stated, as a matter of courtesy and diplomacy the judge needs to go to the target, make the correction and explain the rules to the archers. We are there to serve the archers – just walking away is bad form

41/2: Two of the archers shooting at target 34 inform a Judge that the arrows of the third archer on their target are penetrating into the butt more than it is normal for the kind of material the butts are made of. They believe his compound bow is beyond the weight limit of 60 pounds.

What action would you take if you were the judge here?

All judges would have weighed the bow, but only half would have watched first to see for themselves how far the arrows penetrate. It is important not to act too quickly; after all it could be a ploy of the complainants to put the other competitor off. Two judges suggested to weigh all three bows on the target, as not to discriminate – not a bad idea.

41/3: This could happen at a National Championships: Teams A and B are shooting a quarterfinal match. After the 27 arrows are shot, both teams show the same score: 242 points. They go to a shoot off, and each team shoots 9, 9, 9. A second shoot-off end is shot and each team scores 10, 9, 8. The judges

change the target faces for the third end to be able to measure from a brand new centre. Team A shoots 10, 9, 7; while team B shoots 9, 9, 9.

Which of the two teams won the match? Why?

The majority of judges responded correctly that Team B with the higher score wins; closest to the centre arrow only counts when scores are tied after the third shoot-off.



You be the Judge (Case studies)

Please have your answers with society administrators by the end of February, who in turn are asked to collate and forward replies by mid March. Alternatively, judges can e-mail me their answers directly (but inform your society administrator, you have done so).

42/1: At a State championships while scoring the first end of a distance the three archers shooting on a target find that one of them is missing an arrow and duly record the arrow as a miss.

They search for the arrow on the ground but cannot find it. They do not report the lost arrow to a judge and return to shoot the next end.

After scoring the next end they again search for the missing arrow with no success and still do not report it.

After scoring the third end they search again, and one of them spots the arrow protruding from the rear of the target butt obscured by the target stand.

The archers call a judge who checks the score sheet and ascertains that there was only one miss recorded. A second judge is called to assist in watching the arrow as it is pushed carefully back through the butt to ascertain its value. The arrow exits the target face touching the centre + and it is the arrow that was missing (same shaft, nock, fletching and initials).

The judge amends the scoresheets to change the value from M to X.

Was the judge correct in doing so? What would you have done?

42/2: At a tournament, just after a target face has been changed at 50 m distance, an absent-minded archer pulls his arrows before the scores are taken down on the scorecard. However, there are only three unmarked holes in the target; 10-9-9.

What will you - as the judge - do in this case?

42/3: During shooting you discover an archer with glasses - one of the glasses seems completely black.

What is your action - if any?

