

# SUB-COMMITTEE FOR THE ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE ABPA COMPETITION PACKAGE AND THE ABPA STRATEGIC PLAN

Concluded via SKYPE Meeting --19<sup>th</sup> September, 2016

Review Sub-Committee appointed by the ABPA Committee –  
ABPA Executive Members – Tom McIlveen (President), Hal Pritchard (Vice-President),  
Shelley Hansen (Treasurer) and Rhonda Tallnash (Secretary),  
ABPA Ordinary Committee Members – Robyn Sykes, Carol Reffold and John Peel  
ABPA Promotions Officer – Brenda-Joy Pritchard

The Review Sub-Committee had recorded and taken into account, all submissions made in writing to the ABPA Secretary. The relevant documents were recorded and filed against each item.

The following Record is a combination of

- A. the pre-meeting written comments and responses from the sub-committee members to the itemised agenda circulated during September via email, and
- B. the proceedings and findings of the SKYPE meeting of 19<sup>th</sup> September.
- C. the resultant resolutions and the actions required for their implementation.

## Written Competitions

### Item Numbers

1. **Feedback to Organisers/Entrants –**

#### **Judge's Jotter, Judge's Assessment Summary and Written Bush Poetry Competition Assessment Sheet**

Submission from Brenda Joy  
*Suggested Amendment to Written Guidelines  
and Suggested Judges' Assessment Docs.*

#### 1 A **Alteration to ABPA Guidelines**

#### MOTION

That the option be given to organisers of Written Bush Poetry Competitions, of accepting from judges a Judge's Assessment Summary (instead of individual Assessment Sheets) for the top 20 placings.

N.B. Individual assessment sheets would then only be required for competitors who had requested (and paid for) a judge's critique of a particular poem.

Action – That the ABPA Guidelines page 21 and 22 – be expanded to include this option.

#### 1 B **Alterations to Written Bush Poetry Competition Assessment Sheet**

MOTION

That the option be given to a judge of a written competition to either place ticks in the respective columns OR to give a score out of 100 for each of the six assessment categories (and divide the total by 6 to arrive at a final score).

Action -- The ABPA Written Bush Poetry Assessment Sheet be altered to accommodate this resolution.

2. **Names of Judges**

Submission from Terry Piggott  
*File – Written Competitions*

MOTION

That the following statement be added to the Sample Entry Form as an additional suggestion to organisers --

“Publication of judge/s’ names prior to the closing date of a competition is at the discretion of the organisers.”

Action -- That an appendix to the Sample Entry Form be compiled and included in the ABPA Competition Package.

That the above suggestion be added to the Additional Suggestions list.

3. **Post-Marked Entries**

Submission from Terry Piggott  
*File – Written Competitions*

MOTION

That the following be included as an additional suggestion for organisers --

“Considering the unreliability of the postal delivery service, it is recommended that the closing date be via postmark rather than by date of receipt. To accommodate this change you may find it necessary to adjust the closing date to allow for six-weeks-minimum between the postmark close off and the announcement of winners.”

Action -- That this be added to the Additional Suggestions list.

4. **Spread of Judging Pool**

Submission from Terry Piggott  
*File – Written Competitions*

**No Action Required.**

5. **Ranking Proposal**

Submitted separately by Robyn Sykes and Carol Heuchan

*Files – Ranking Proposal for Written Competitions*

*ABPA re Rank Order*

Rather than give a uniform ranking to all poems that didn't appear in a Judge's shortlist, it was thought best to leave these poems unranked.

**MOTION**

It was agreed that judges should only be required to rank the top twenty poems in a competition, however, if there were more than 100 entries then this could be extended to a maximum of 20% of the entries.

Action -- That the ABPA Guidelines be expanded to include this resolution.

It was agreed that where a huge discrepancy occurred between the scores of two judges as compared to a third judge, an organiser could approach the third judge. The following statement could go into Additional Suggestions for Organisers.

**MOTION**

Where a significant discrepancy in scores occurs, organisers may privately approach the dissenting judge seeking confirmation that this was that judge's intended result and that there have been no transcription errors.

Action – That the above suggestion be added to the Additional Suggestions list.

## Performance Competitions

### Item Numbers

6. **Proposed changes to Assessment Sheet – from WA Bush Poets Association**

Submission from Bill and Meg Gordon  
*File – Judging Sheet Proposal to ABPA*

It was decided that no change of form was required but that an adjustment could be made to the current form to obtain greater precision.

**MOTION**

That the Performance Bush Poetry Competition Assessment Sheet be adjusted to include an additional column for each score area with the relevant score range being vertically placed in the overall score section of each column.

Action – That the Performance Bush Poetry Competition Assessment Sheet be adjusted accordingly.

7. **Anomalies in Judging**

Submission from Rhonda Tallnash and Gary Fogarty  
*Files – Performance Judging – Review Material  
and ABPA Judging Review Submission*

It was agreed that, although anomalies occur, a set of guidelines for judges would not be popular. Issues relating to the concept of judges needing training/pre-judging guidance were carried over to Item 9.

**No Action Required.**

8. **Supplementary Judges and Hal Pritchard's Application**

Submission on behalf of Eric Beer, Dunedoo.  
*Files – Performance Judging – Supplementary Judges  
– Accredited Judges*

**8A Supplementary Judges**

The ABPA Committee has approved the concept of having a list of Supplementary Judges for remote area or low budgets performance competitions to be utilised in accord with the provisions stated on the application form.

**MOTION**

That an application form for a supplementary performance judge, be included in the ABPA Competition Package. This form could be used by applicants who did not conform to the criteria of having won three performances. Applicants would be considered on an individual basis to be given dispensation for approval as a supplementary judge. Supplementary judges could only be used where no ABPA Accredited judges were available due to non-availability, distance or financial prohibitions. Supplementary judges would not be allowed to judge at ABPA National Championships and only in ABPA State Championships or the Golden Damper Performance Competition under exceptional circumstances and if the prior consent of the ABPA Executive had been obtained.

That these provisions be included on the Supplementary Judges Application form.

Action -- That a Supplementary Judge's Application Form be formatted for inclusion in the ABPA Competition Package.

Action -- That a list of Supplementary Judges for Performance Competitions be included in the ABPA Competition Package.

Action – That the ABPA Performance Bush Poetry Guidelines (page 9) JUDGING PANELS (para 2) be adjusted to accommodate this.

8B **Application to be considered as a Supplementary Judge – Hal Pritchard**

Approval was given for Hal Pritchard to be an ABPA Supplementary Judge for Performance Competitions.

Action That Hal Pritchard be placed on the list of Supplementary Judges.

9. **Appointment of a 'Senior Judge'**

*File – Performance Judging – Appointment Senior Judge*

It was agreed that the concept of a nominated ‘Senior’ or ‘Head’ judge would be unacceptable to a large percentage of ABPA judges. However, the following was proposed --

**MOTION**

In order to ensure that all judges at a competition are aware of the competition requirements and that judges, not co-ordinators, determine the winners and place-getters in a competition, an experienced judge could be used to conduct a training session and/or to intervene in any issues relative to judging discrepancies or disputes.

Action – That the following be added to the ABPA Performance Bush Poetry Competition Guidelines (page 9)

**JUDGING PANELS**

paragraph 2

At the co-ordinating committee’s discretion, where there are non-ABPA judges or judges who have not judged under the current ABPA Guidelines and the Rank Order Tally system, a training session with an experienced judge to clarify procedures, is recommended.

paragraph 3

If judging concerns or discrepancies occur, these could be addressed to the experienced judge for consultation with the other judges to achieve a combined resolution.

**10. Handing in Sheets after each Performer**

Submission from Bill and Meg Gordon

*File – Performance Judging Notes*

**No Action Required.**

**11. Eligibility of Poems**

Submission from Rhonda Tallnash

*File –Towards Reviews of Guidelines*

**MOTION**

That, for this purpose, the Golden Dampier be considered to be equivalent to a State Championship and that the conditions relevant to the *Non-repetition of Poems* be adjusted to include this.

Action – That the ABPA Performance Competitions, Non-repetition of Poems, (page 9) be adjusted to include the Golden Dampier as follows --

N.B. It is desirable that poems which have won a first prize in an open performance category should no longer be used by the same poet in future performance competitions. An exception would be that a first-prize-winning

poem could be used in a following ABPA State Championship **or Golden Damper Competition** and then in an ABPA National Championship.

## 12. **Inclusion of criteria for ‘difficulty of poem’**

Submission from Rhonda Tallnash

**No Action Required.**

## 13. **Role of ‘pub poetry’**

*From the ABPA Committee*

It was accepted that organisers have the right to decide what is or is not acceptable. and that if they require further restrictions against offensive material or themes, this was their prerogative.

### MOTION

That a suggestion be put to organisers that they may restrict poetry that is unacceptable to their competition.

Action -- That the following to go into the ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS TO ASSIST ORGANISERS –  
“The ABPA Performance Assessment Form includes the category -- CHOICE OF POEM “*Is it appropriate family entertainment? (Offensive material or themes to be penalised.)*” This places the onus onto the performer. However, should you have further concerns regarding offensive material or themes, these should be stated on your Entry Form.”

## 14. **Deciding Places in Tied Situations**

*Files – Deciding Places in Tied Situations  
Notes re Ties on Judging Sheets (Brenda Joy)  
ABPA re Rank Order (Carol Heuchan)*

With respect to the Performance Rank Order Tally Sheets  
In the section ‘Ties’, the first paragraph was found to be acceptable.  
However, it was considered that the second paragraph left too much up to the scrutineers and personal opinions. It was therefore proposed --

### MOTION

That the method for deciding a winner in a tied situation be revised by changing the current wording on the Rank Order Tally sheets as follows:-

That the penultimate paragraph, “*If a tie still exists then...until separation is found.*” be removed and that the last paragraph should be expanded as follows –  
“If a tie still exists **then the scrutineers should refer back to the judges and their** majority decision will determine the Place in question.”

Action -- That the ABPA Performance Rank Order Tally Sheet and the ABPA Performance Overall Rank Order Tally Sheet, be altered as above.

15. Various Concerns (some of which have been incorporated in items above as relevant)  
*File – ABPA Judging Review Submission (Gary Fogarty)*

**15.A Judge’s Lists**

*File – ABPA Judging Review Submission (Gary Fogarty)*  
(refer to para 5 page 1)

**No Action Required.**

**15.B Inclusion of Academics and Radio Announcers, etc. as approved judges.**

*File – ABPA Judging Review Submission (Gary Fogarty)*  
(refer to last para page 1)

**No Action Required.**

**15.C Single Score for Performance**

*File – ABPA Judging Review Submission (Gary Fogarty)*

**No Action Required.**

**15.D Emphasis on Comedy**

*File – ABPA Judging Review Submission (Gary Fogarty)*  
(page 3, para 4)

**No Action Required.**

**16. Judging Methods**

*File – ABPA Rank Order (Carol Heuchan)*

Carol Heuchan’s letter relates to Item 5 ‘Ranking Proposal’ and Item 14 ‘Deciding on ties in a competition’ and has been included for the discussions relevant to those items. Additional points from Carol Heuchan.

**16. A – Memory Loss**

*File – ABPA Rank Order (Carol Heuchan)*  
(page 2, para 1)

It was considered that, unless a judge was familiar with a particular poem, it was hard to assess if it was performed without error. However, it was felt that the requirements of the MEMORISATION/READING Performance Assessment category could include a reference to this and to Total Memory Loss.

**MOTION**

That the definition of MEMORISATION/READING be expanded as follows –

***Is there an uninterrupted flow of the original words of the author? If a poem is performed without error or awkwardness, then that poem could be considered for a 100% ranking. Total Memory Loss should be significantly marked down.***

***(Reading is not permitted in an Open or Intermediate class and should be appropriately penalised in a Novice class where other performers are reciting.)***

Action -- That the notes relevant to the Category MEMORISATION/READING on the Performance Bush Poetry Competition Assessment Sheet be adjusted as above.

## 16.B – Judge’s Critiques

*File – ABPA Rank Order (Carol Heuchan)*  
(page 2, para 3)

**No Action Required.**

## 17 Reworking of Written Assessment Sheet

MOTION

**That the words “*but without unintentional ambiguities*” be removed from the GRAMMAR, PUNCTUATION, SPELLING category of the current Written Bush Poetry Competition Sheet.**

**Action –** That the Written Bush Poetry Competition Assessment Sheet be adjusted accordingly.

## **FOLLOW UP ACTION REQUIRED**

It was agreed that:-

- . a general notice go to the Website and into the Magazine via the President’s October/November Report) stating that the review has been carried out.
- . a general thank you email go to Terry Piggott, Graeme Johnson, Meg and Bill Gordon, Eric Beer, Gary Fogarty and Carol Heuchan for their input to the review.
- . all resolutions be presented to the ABPA Committee for ratification.
- . following the ABPA Committee’s ratification, the necessary alterations and additions be made to the ABPA Competition Package to come into effect at the beginning of November.
- . following the implementation of the changes, a further notice be circulated through the Website, the Magazine, the ABPA Facebook Page and the ABPA Forum advising that, for the sake of uniformity in competitions Australia wide, all concerned with the organisation of, judging of or participation in competitions, be urged to re-familiarise themselves with all the relevant documents and helpful information in the current ABPA Competition package.