FEI SPORTS FORUM

Dressage Judging Working Group
Dressage Judging Working Group

Update
Dressage Judging Working Group

Review of recent Rule Changes

JSP – review the job description of the JSP – Article 438

- A supporting panel to advise the DC regarding all judging issues and to oversee judging and evaluate it and the Judges. In addition, endorse the roles held until now by the Judge General.

- One of the members elected as Chairman and (partially) take the role of Judge General as well (to be determined) - At least one representative outside Europe; max 2/3 per stakeholder group.

- To avoid conflict of interest, members cannot judge CHs during their mandate (nor participate in/train others for CHs), nor be on the FEI DC.
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Review of recent Rule Changes

❖ 7 Judges – review article 437.2
The recommendation is to maintain the current use of 7-member Juries for specific higher-level Championships

❖ 6% difference – Article 438 – under revision

❖ Judges’ Huts warning button - New proposal for the Rules: Art. 429.6
Implemented in the 2018 rules for FEI CHs and Games on GP level. Optional for other events.
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Code of points and update of Handbook


Video Handbook

A Code of Points is needed before the Video Handbook can be created.

Judges dashboard

- The Dashboard is in place for Dressage Judges since July 2017
- Available to the Judges – overview of their own judging performance
- Promotions/demotions will be documented with a review/analysis produced form the dashboard
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Education System

Review of Education System and Course contents

Current Education Working Group (Katrina Wüst, Hans-Christian Matthiesen, Stephen Clarke and Maribel Alonso)

Improved Judging System

Exploring new Judging Systems solutions

Code of points
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Use of Modern Technology

Ideas:

• DoD system for public audience judging and for television use
• Introduce an E-scribe system to avoid paperwork test sheets. Voice recognition for scoring

Other sports:
Gymnastics Fujitsu introduction of using robots at Olympic Games 2020
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Selection and Remuneration of Judges

- Selection for Events/Championships of Judges
- Remuneration of Judges
Richard Davison
THE FIVE PILLARS

DJWG identified fundamental criteria needed to underpin a judging system for the sport of dressage;

1. Be EASY TO UNDERSTAND by all stakeholders
2. Be TRANSPARENT
3. Be FAIR (applied consistently & objectively to all competitors)
4. Be EASY TO USE by all levels of judges (expert & non expert) on a global scale
5. Be EASY TO REVIEW AND ADJUST (content of CoP and application routines)
Fairness = Consistency of judging process

• duty to provide equal judgement processes to each and all athletes, entering FEI competitions

• due to qualifying systems & world ranking points etc. judgements must be consistently applied throughout duration of each class; and from class to class & show to show on global basis?

• fairness – equal and same judging conditions, processes
Who / what is applying the judgements?

**COMPUTERS?**
- Eg FEI already uses DoD computer based judgement - advantage provides consistent & objective judgements
- No bias/objective
- unsubtle
- inflexible

**HUMANS?**
- flexible
- subtle
- but evidence proves high variability in consistency factor - why?
Factors which can result in variation in performance of sports Officials

- every Official strives to perform & officiate consistently
- is it just a matter of the Official reminding himself of the importance to perform consistently?
- or are some elements of judging tasks, imposed upon Officials, more or less likely to result in consistent decisions?

I wanted to learn what the human brain is being tasked with in dressage judging & what factors might increase/decrease the likelihood of consistency in judging performance
Research by Richard Davison

- Visiting Fellow to Nottingham Trent University
- Honorary Doctor of Science
- I AM NOT THE EXPERT!
- Access to psychology & sport research departments
- Access to experts in human brain & perception function
Judging the judges: Evaluating the performance of international gymnastics judges

Hugues Mercier* Christopher Klahn†

February 18, 2017

Abstract

Judging a gymnastics routine is a noisy process, and the performance of judges varies widely. The International Federation of Gymnastics (FIG), in collaboration with Longines and the Université de Neuchâtel, is designing and implementing an improved statistical engine to analyze the performance of gymnastics judges during and after major competitions like the Olympic Games and the World Championships. The engine, called the Judge Evaluation program (JEP), has three objectives: (1) provide constructive feedback to judges, executive committees and national federations; (2) assign the best judges to the most important competitions; and (3)
Summary of scoping research

- Reviewed research into human skills needed for consistent judge performance
- Reviewed research of factors leading to inconsistencies in judge performance
- Many research papers already available
- Applicable to dressage judging
Current system of multiple & overlapping cognitive processing requires high level of expertise, attention & high performance to sustain consistency.
3. Cognitive processing of specific information

- “Cognition is the process of acquiring knowledge through our thoughts, experiences, and senses”

- **A) Judgement**
  (information from visual search compared with FEI regs & Code of Points & previous experience)

- **B) Decision making**
  (conclusion of judgement followed by action e.g eliminate, award mark)

- **C) Verbalisation**
  (& interaction with scribe & computer operator)
Fundamental requirements for effective & consistent judging practice

1. Need standard reference (CoP)
2. Need standard visual search routines
3. Need realistic & sustainable cognitive processing demands
4. Need objective system for review judge performances & system

Consistent Judging
Judges manual
reference pages retained in memory

Education course content

Visual & memory recall of information from education courses, shadow judging, directives of FEI officials, official judge education days

Research shows officials use other sources of memory recall of e.g. scribing, demos, informal discussions, personal experience as a rider (motor skills), coach, media report & articles, being a spectator etc. IS VISUAL MEMORY RECALL FIRST RESPONSE/SHORT CUT IN JUDGING TASK?
If first memory recall is a visual source would a visual format of reference (CoP & education material) improve cognitive processing?
Is it possible to standardise visual search routines?

“a perceptual task requiring attention that typically involves an active scan....”

Where should the judge look for each specific movement? everywhere, randomly, varying from horse to horse?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Vision</th>
<th>Peripheral Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Priorities of specific movement ?</td>
<td>• General way of going ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Could both be reflected in Code of Points to enable ease of cognitive processing & provide transparency & consistency?
Proposal to improve consistency

If an individual judge always uses the same visual search pattern/routine, will this result in a more personal consistent & accurate judging performance?

If each member of the judging panel (with the same viewing position e.g. side/end judges) uses the same visual search pattern, will this result in greater consistency within the judging panel?
Cognitive demands in dressage judging

1. Visual Search activity & demands

2. Cognitive Processing of information (while continuing to visualise horse's on-going performance) including management of biases

3. Verbalising & interacting with scribe et al (while continuing to visualise horse's on-going performance)

4. Potential for sustainability eg repetition 30/40 horses X 7 minutes X 35 movements

Use evidence base guidance Judging cognitive demands & processes
CONCLUSION TO RESEARCH

- In dressage we search to improve horse welfare, performance, show organisation & promotion, wider media coverage, opportunities for youth but....

- Time to evaluate cognitive demands we make upon our judges?
  
  compare known factors causing cognitive variability (concentration levels, attention levels, memory recall efficiency, decision making levels, focus levels, manage bias etc.) against our judging system

  Research for: 40 horses per day, breaks, DoD, advice to judges?

- Result in improved judging performance
- Increase chance to deliver fairness to athletes
RESEARCH & TESTING

- Learn from other sports what is known about optimizing Official’s cognitive performance
- Much research already exists or is on-going
- Much research is transferable from commercial tasks to sport
- Not essential to do expensive trials, learn from what is already known, seek expert opinion
- Use of historical data, placebo affect
COPPSAG – Code of Points Pilot Study Advisory Group

A Group of Dressage technical experts, experienced in the allocation and use of points given by Dressage Judges for competition purposes.

Members of the Group:
- Stephen Clarke (IDOC and Judge General)
- Katrina Wüst (IDOC)
- Uwe Mechlem (JSP)
- Anky van Grunsven (Rider)
- Wayne Channon (IDRC)
- Linda Keenan (IDTC)
Code of Points – COPPSAG – Assignment

- Define a **scale starting from 10** for a specified series of movements from the Grand Prix test.

- Identify only **measurable observations** with are easily visible to each judge, and recommend wording that reflects every day language and refers to specific parts of the horse/rider.

- Recommend a prioritised **scale of deductions** which relate to the principle purpose of each movement.
## Code of Points – Example – Piaffe

### FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENTS: Collection – Height of steps - Regularity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piaffe</th>
<th>BASE SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>As above showing the prescribed # of steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>As above but slightly less height/energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>As above but clearly less height/energy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 7      | As above but front foot only reaching fetlock of supporting leg
        | hind foot reaching just above hoof of supporting leg |
| 6      | Clear steps but just coming from ground |
| 5      | Earthbound steps |
| 4      | Some clearly irregular steps |
| 3      | Irregular throughout/obvious resistance |
| 2      | |
| 1      | Only 1 or 2 steps |
| 0      | No piaffe steps |
Questions and Answers
THANK YOU