

JUDGES NEWS

Issue 70

Oct 2011

Dear Judges,

It has been a while since our last *Judges News*, but here is the third for 2011.

In the meantime, we have had a change in the Officials Committee and it is with excitement and also some trepidation, that I take on the role as Chairperson.

As you will see below, Susanne will be pursuing other life and career interests which will prevent her from devoting as much time and energy to the AA Officials Committee.

However, she has agreed to remain a Committee member and I would like to take this opportunity to thank her publicly for her enthusiastic work as an Official in our sport and especially, for raising the standard of judging in Australia.

Kind regards,

Karen O'Malley

About Susanne ...

Susanne Womersley has been a National Judge since 1986 (first in Austria, then since 1988, in Australia), and in that capacity she officiated at numerous State and National Championships.

Susanne was elected to the position of *National Officials Director* at the 1993 AGM in Perth, and was re-elected in 1997 and appointed to the re-named position of *Chair – Officials Committee* in 2001, 2005 and 2009 by the Archery Australia Board.

During her period as Chair - Officials Committee, Susanne was responsible for the development and implementation of the current AA national officiating program. She was instrumental (together with members of the AA Officials Committee and with assistance from the FITA Judges Committee) in upgrading the National Judges Manual three times, and the Examination Papers on a number of occasions.

Susanne also introduced the National Judges re-accreditation criteria, initiating the points system for officiating and responding to Judge Case Studies. On an annual basis, Susanne has produced and circulated the National Judges Newsletter, which has kept the 'Judge family' throughout Australia up to date with rule changes and news items, nationally and internationally.

In August of this year Susanne chose to resign as Chair – Officials Committee after a period of eighteen years, to concentrate on her commitments to the World Archery Executive Board; and to undertake further tertiary study to gain her Masters of Education qualification.

From the archery fraternity, but on behalf of the Officials in particular, I would like to express our appreciation for all she has done for our sport, and wish her every success in the future.

Contents

Susanne Womersley

New Continental Judge for Oceania

New AA Judge Candidates

Nationals 2012

Name Change

FITA Rulebook

You be the Judge – Answers

New Case Studies

New Continental Judge for Oceania

Congratulations to Helen Austin, who, following her attendance at the Continental Judge seminar in Bangkok, and passing of the exam with the Asian Archery Federation, has been accredited as an Oceania Continental Judge.

These are the requirements for *continued accreditation as a Continental Judge* in Oceania.

- Be accredited as a National Judge in your own country.
- Apply to officiate (and do so, if selected) for a minimum of two Oceania events during a four year period.
- Respond in writing to a satisfactory standard to a minimum of 24 case studies (minimum four per year) over four years. These are the same case studies as for AA National Judges.

New AA Judge Candidates

Following recent Training Courses held in NSW, and SQld, I am pleased to welcome the following people as National Judge Candidates:

NSW: Donald Chou, Peter Coghlan, Denise Deaves, Fiona Hyde, Jim Quilter, Noel Snazelle, Odette Snazelle.

SQld: Phillip Buhot, Brian Hagaman, Strafford Stark.

Congratulations to all these Judge Candidates, the first to be involved in our new process for National Judge Candidate accreditation, which provides prospective Judge candidates with a comprehensive Open Book examination a month before the seminar course date, and requires a pass mark of 80% be gained prior to their being invited to attend the two-day training seminar.

National Events in 2012

Please see the AA website for more detailed information regarding the 2012 Nationals events. The nomination form has been sent out prior to this *Judges News*. As the Youth Nationals is relatively soon, *please note the return date indicating your availability and preference for event, is NOVEMBER 13th*.

The Australian Open event nomination form will be sent out next year, when dates are finalised. The venue will be Sherbrook in Victoria.

Farewell FITA ... Hello World Archery (taken from World Archery News Aug 2011 & written by Morten Wilmann)

World Archery is now the name of our international federation, and it should be abbreviated **WA**. Immediately prior to the World Target Championships in Turin, a close to unanimous Congress voted in favour of the name change; the idea being to make our federation appear more modern – in line with the new, colourful logo.

We recommend that our judges use the new name in their conversations, even if FITA still will exist for some time when talking about rounds and awards.

Additionally, the rule book(s) will change completely. The (WA) Judges committee chairman is involved in work to make the rule book(s) more “accessible” to archers, coaches, media and organizers. That means the rules will be reorganized and hopefully simplified.

Book 1 - Constitution

Book 2 - Events (including all the venue rules)

Book 3 - Target Archery (archer’s equipment, shooting and scoring etc.)

Book 4 - Field Archery and 3D Archery

Book 5 - Miscellaneous (Flight, clout, run-archery, ski-archery etc.)

Some interesting pieces of Gear...

1. (Terry Gosschalk from NSW says ...)

My intention to make a barebow gauge for myself was always about halfway up the priority list until we judges met at this year's Nationals in Brisbane (2011). The difficulty, and cost, in obtaining one was raised by another judge. I commented that I was thinking of making one for myself. Immediately half a dozen hands went up requesting I make a few so I have done just that. The first production run is almost sold out.

There are two models. Model 2 checks arrow shaft diameter and arrow point diameter as well. Each one is individually checked for accuracy to tight dimensional tolerances before delivery, so a judge can be confident of the reliability of the gauge during tournament equipment inspection. I have always been involved in new product development – it's a hobby of mine. I cannot imagine a more obscure market for a product than archery judges, but now I have tooled up and have some in stock ready to go. You never know, maybe on a worldwide basis it may end up being worth my while. (For a detailed description and pictures go to Terry's website www.piricdesign.com.au)

2. (From the Pacific Games event in New Caledonia)

At the recent Pacific Games, I came across a novel way of fixing target faces to target butts. Now, we have all encountered the dreaded roofing/clout nails ... to make them more user-friendly, the field crew in Noumea had pushed each roofing nail through the middle of a drink bottle top, with the washer part flat with the bottle top. This allowed easy removal from the butt and made changing faces a much quicker job. Well worth trying; environmentally friendly and cheap.

3. (From Keith Manssen, SQld, via Brian Hagaman at the Grange Company of Archers)

The 'Come and Try' courses at The Grange use the rubber we probably all present to beginners. While I know this is a Judges Newsletter, many of you are also involved as coaches, and you may find this interesting to pass along to your clubs. They use the 'elastic string' recommended by AA, in an interesting way.

Attach a length of speargun-type rubber tubing to 2 pieces of cord, tied to the rubber at each end, and ending in a loop, to simulate a bowstring. String the recurve bow as normal and, additionally to the bow's string, loop the rubber-plus-cord arrangement over the bow's two string nocks. This allows the beginner to feel the bow in the hand and use only the rubber-plus-cord to pull back, instead of the more challenging bowstring, which just serves to keep the bow tensioned. It also allows for the feel of the bow, without using an arrow on the string to begin with. Very impressive and so simple. The club always uses them for the first session.

You be the Judge - Answers from Issue 69

The table below shows the number of Judges in each RGB and the replies received for Newsletter 69:

RGB	Judges	Replies	RGB	Judges	Replies
AACT	7	7	ASA	15	6
ASNSW	27	12	AV	19	4
AST	11	4	SQAS	11	0
ASWA	9	3	NQAA	4	0
<i>Oceania</i>	7	1	Total	110	37

Now, clearly it was too cold to shoot arrows all day, so it is disappointing that we did not reach a 50% reply rate, in spite of the usual reminder email!

Remember, our re-accreditation is due next year and you currently need 12 credit points from responses to Case Studies as part of re-accreditation as a National Judge. More about this, next issue.

Thank you to everybody who did reply to the Case Studies from Issue 69.

Once again, please make sure you look at and quote from the rules that pertain to the discipline of archery relevant to the question (i.e. quote 'field' rules for a field question, 'indoor' rules for an indoor question).

Case studies responses.

69.1 *During an indoor tournament, shooting on triple faces, one archer writes the scores, another one removes the arrows. The one removing the arrows removes the arrows before the other archer's arrows are scored. What to do? The arrow holes were not marked at all. No one knows exactly what the score would be and they call a Judge. What would you do?*

The relevant Indoor rules quoted are:

8.4.5 which says no arrows may be re-shot,

8.6.1.3 which requires the arrows to be scored and other archers to check the accuracy of the scores,

8.6.2.1 which requires no one touch the target face and arrows to remain in the target until they are scored and recorded,

8.6.2.5 which requires all arrow holes be marked,

8.6.4.1 which says each target will have 2 score cards.

It is not clear in the above scenario whether this was the first end or further into the competition and decisions from our Judges varied, depending on how the scenario had been interpreted by the respondent. However, this case gives us a clear reason why the *rules require archers to mark all arrow holes*. The Judges are there to safeguard the archers' scores, unless the rules tell us otherwise (see 8.8.2 *Losing the score of arrows*), and giving no unfair advantage. The archer did in fact shoot his arrows and deserves some score. But what?

There are several issues in play in this case. While the archer who drew the arrows out is certainly at fault (8.6.2.1), so is the other archer who did not see what was going on (8.6.1.3). Additionally, *the judge should have noticed in routine checking of the targets he was allocated, that the arrow holes had not been marked, especially if this was well into the event. And why weren't both archers scoring (8.6.4.1) on 2 separate score sheets?*

All our Judges who answered in any detail agreed that the arrows could not be re-shot (8.4.5). Most Judges responded that if it was the first end, it would be easy to work out the scores because you would allocate a score based on the 3 single unmarked holes in the triple face belonging to the archer (as the archers were shooting on their own target, all the arrow holes would belong to the one person).

If you accept this philosophy, at any time during the shoot, depending on the state of the faces, it may be possible to reconstruct the score by looking at the arrows already scored in relation to the holes in the target. While this would

possibly hold up the shoot, it is not out of the question. The face could be changed and the score worked out by working backwards from the scoresheet. And this is what 40% of our respondents would do (including me), if it was possible. There would only be 10 holes per face, even at the end of the event.

Another 40% of responses would give the score of the 3 lowest unmarked holes, because there was no way of being sure which of the unmarked holes corresponded to the end just shot, then make a note of the event in the notebook in case of an appeal (though there is no score to appeal).

The minority of replies said MMM should be the score, using the same reasoning. However, we would not punish the archer who withdrew the arrows by disqualifying his scores, and giving him 3 'Ms' as well, as one person suggested!

Clearly, we as Judges need to prevent this sort of thing happening by reminding archers about marking arrow holes, regularly checking the state of the faces and here is another opportunity to discuss with the archers the protocol for scoring and that arrows cannot be removed until scored and the scores agreed among the archers. Certainly in our scenario, *all arrow holes should be marked on the faces before shooting could re-commence*. It could be timely for the DoS to remind all archers to do the same.

69.2 *At a State Target Championships there are three archers per target. On Target 1 there is archer A on the left, archer B in the middle and archer C on the right. After lunch the three archers approach the judge assigned to their target and tell him that archer A and archer B want to swap positions on the shooting line, because archer B has a rather large telescope that was in the way in the morning and there is more room at the end of the line. The judge does not allow this, saying they should have sorted out this issue before the start of the competition. Do you agree?*

The relevant rules are:

7.3.1.9.1 refers to the use of telescopes on the line,

7.5.1.3 covers there being disagreement between the 3 archers as to shooting position,

7.5.1.6 is a new rule which covers our scenario.

Simply put, *the Judge made the wrong decision*. Athletes may now change shooting positions as long as all archers on the target agree and that they inform a judge at the beginning of the distance (7.5.1.6). If they all do not agree, 7.5.1.3 applies, and they shoot according to their allocated ABC position.

69.3 *At a FITA Field tournament you come across a competitor wearing a wrist support made from rather stiff plastic and Velcro. She claims she will need to wear this support for another three weeks because of an injury. What is your response?*

The relevant references are:

9.3.10.1 about arm braces.

We also need to consider the issue under the interpretation from FITA (January 2011) which was outlined in our Judges News, No 69.

Clearly, we all read the last Judges News and all respondents got this one right!

At issue is whether or not the device assists the archer in a way that disadvantages other archers. Having a 'splinted' or rigid wrist would advantage the archer concerned as per the interpretation.

If our scenario, if the device falls within the FITA interpretation, the archer should be told that they cannot wear the device if they wish to have their scores count and be part of the competition. The decision to wear the device or not, whether to compete officially or not, is then the archer's.

But remember, if the archer were a Para archer then they may be allowed such a device according to their disability.

NEW CASE STUDIES

You be the Judge, No 70:

Here are the new case studies, and remember, reaccreditation is in 2012.

Please have your replies with RGB administrators by mid November, who in turn are asked to collate and forward replies by the end of November. Alternatively, judges can e-mail their answers directly to Karen at dragonladyofthelake@gmail.com by Nov 30, (but inform your RGB administrator you have done so).

Please remember to give reasons and quote appropriate rules for all your answers.

70.1

In a Target event, an arrow lands approximately one metre out from the shooting line but in front of an archer two positions away. The archer who shot the arrow asks you as the Judge, what to do. Describe your instructions.

70.2

i) In an Indoor event, what does an archer score if there is a) Centre 1 – 10 points; b) Centre 2 – 7 points; c) Centre 3 – (2 arrows) 9 points and 8 points?

ii) In an Indoor event, on a single face, what does an archer score if there are 4 arrows: 7, 9, 8, 10?

Explain the scoring, when the 2 archers have shot in the same colour zones.

70.3

In a Field event, Archers A and B take the peg. Archer A shoots more quickly than Archer B and Archer C immediately takes the shooting position before Archer B has shot the last arrow. Archer B complains to you, as the judge. When you approach Archer C to inquire, he says he 'took the shooting position as soon as it became available, as required by the Rules'. How do you respond, as that judge?

Until next time - Happy Judging!

Karen