



# Communiqué

Editor: Eileen Williams [eileenwilliams@seoa.co.uk](mailto:eileenwilliams@seoa.co.uk)

Spring 09

**Inside this issue:**

## Letter from the Chairman

The Conference in February was again a huge success. The revised format this year seemed to be very well received. If you missed out this year, put a note in your diary to go next year. We benefitted this year from sponsorship from England Athletics and they really seem to be committed to supporting Technical Officials. A big thank you should be given to all those that worked so hard to put the conference on, especially Ros Alterman who co-ordinated the whole thing. If there is something that you would like to see covered in future conferences, please do not hesitate to contact someone on the Committee.

Recruitment of new Officials is rising up the general Agenda, and some of you may have seen the article from me that was published in Athletics Weekly recently. If you have an attachment to a club where there is a shortfall of Officials, it would be helpful if you encouraged them to apply to

## UKA OR IAAF?

Scene in Final Call

Official – “Take those ear phones off please.”

Athlete – “You told me that at Lee Valley.”

Official – “Then you are aware.”

Athlete – “Looked in the Rule Books but can’t find the rule. Is it UKA or IAAF?”

Official – “It’s Health & Safety.”

Athlete – “Is that UKA or IAAF?”

Official – “I’m issuing you with a yellow card.”

Result – Every athlete took off their ear phones!!

their County Officials Secretary or directly to England Athletics to have Level 2 courses put on for them. This could be particularly useful for parents of young athletes so that we can boost the numbers of qualified Officials.

Just a reminder that the SEAOA is set up to help you, if you have any questions please contact your discipline Chairman or any other committee member, I am sure that they will be only too pleased to help. Have a good season.

## Stan Burton

### TRACK CHAT

Well, by the time you receive this you will no doubt have begun your outdoor season. If you also did some indoors then I hope you enjoyed the challenges of the 60 metres – certainly gets the eye in or something!

I hope all of you who needed to take the Level 3 course have now done so and if you need reports make sure you get them arranged as early as possible. It’s a good thing to let your Cofsec know of any arranged so that if they don’t arrive within the timescale then let them know so they can chase them up for you. It seems that arrangements for the changes within Level 2, despite Stan Burton’s efforts on our behalf, have not been finalised but we can but hope that the final details will be communicated to all shortly.

I hope you all have a good season especially our new Officials. Don’t forget if anyone has any problems then feel free to get in touch with me. Happy Track Judging.

Terry Williams (Chair Track sub-committee)

Conference Report 2

Minutes from January Meeting 2-3

Membership of International Officials Group 3

Keeping a Level 3 Log Book 4-6

Report Writing 7

Differences between UKA and IAAF Rules 8

Letter from America 10

**Why not have your Communiqué sent by email so that you can receive it in colour?**

**We are sure that a lot more Officials could do this. Please let the membership secretary know.**

**Also, please don’t forget to let the Membership Secretary know if you change your email address.**

**Membership Secretary**

**Chris Lamport**

**[chrislamport@seoa.co.uk](mailto:chrislamport@seoa.co.uk)**

On Sunday 1st February the SEAOA Conference '09 took place at Twickenham University College with over 150 officials attending. It was good to see so many 'new faces' this year. This was the first time the workshops were run as multi-disciplined to follow the new Levels format and seemed quite popular.

Our thanks go to Danny Crates, our guest speaker for giving his time to us.

His presentation was enjoyed by all. He has asked my to pass on his thanks to all officials. He said that it was good to see faces that he recognised from previous races. He was very grateful as he felt that officials had helped toward making his career possible.

The raffle raised £239. Many thanks to all those who generously donated prizes.

Grateful thanks must go to England Athletics for their generous financial support. It enabled us to subsidise the cost of lunch and give everyone a customised clipboard. Due to the changes in the regional set-up we were also donated the London region's stock of weatherwriters which were also given out to everyone. Thank you, also, to UK Athletics for financing the cost of bringing two workshop leaders down from the North.

The sub-committees will assess the de-brief forms and hopefully they will help provide the basis of the next conference.

Is there a particular subject you wish covered at next year's conference? If so, please let me know soon as planning for 2010 will begin in April.

Finally, many thanks to the committee for their hard work in preparation and to all those officials who helped on the day by running the workshops...

Ros Alterman (Chairman conference sub-committee)

Notes from some of the Conference Workshops are included in the following pages of this edition.

### Magician's Guide to Field Judging

Unfortunately there is no article available for this issue.

The Magician will be back in the next Issue.

However, for those of you who were unable to attend Conference, the notes from three of the workshops are included.

### REPORTS FROM SUB-COMMITTEES:-

- a) Timekeepers – Chair has accepted the role and meeting to be arranged.
- b) Track – Meeting to be held after Conference to deal with reporting in the main.
- c) Field – Met on 9<sup>th</sup> December to discuss Conference
- d) Photofinish – No report

NAOF Web Site - [www.NAOF.co.uk](http://www.NAOF.co.uk). This had been discussed after the March meeting and Stan Burton was asked to set this up. This he had done through the South web site at a cost of £5.00 and it was linked to other association web sites.

Paula Gowing had stated that changes to the Education structure would be circulated soon. Stan Burton had been to a Technical Committee meeting to put a view forward, that many officials had supported, concerning the lowering of the number of Levels proposed for the future. He expressed the concern that with the reduction to three levels Level 2 would have officials of differing abilities within this group. The committee accepted this and although they were unhappy with Stan for taking it upon himself to obtain the views of officials they would look into changes by splitting this group into three sub-groups to divide the Level 2 officials.

Endurance Update is being prepared and would be circulated to all those officials.

CRB - Athletics Welfare are without CRB checks on some Officials, which appears to be a large number. County Officials Secretaries had received lists of the officials in their areas according to the UKA database and found that information did not agree with that held by them. We were asked if we knew when the database would be up and running, who would have access and how. All officials had, in March 2008, been asked to fill in a form checking their details and the county and tri-region they wished to be affiliated with. The subject of Log Books was raised, the different interpretation being put on the questions asked, which are not easily understood by the inexperienced trainee and the doubt on uniformity of assessing them. There is also the problem for some Level 3/4/5 officials who require EDM reports and do not have the innate ability to handle this type of task.

There were still problems with Officials opting for a different Region and also the selection policies. The question of appeals after removal from IOG were discussed in general particularly the £100 deposit. The Peer Groups are meeting this weekend and should be finalising the lists which have been removed from the website.

**ELSE** – JC had circulated the Notes from the Group meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> November.

(i) Form 10s – ELSE suggested that discipline sub-committees produce guidelines on how these should be done as there is great variation.

There is already one on the website for track in the Level 2 booklet. SB said that as soon as these were produced he would place on the website.

(ii) It has been suggested that the present members of ELSE remain for 2 years and then be replaced on a 3 yearly rotational basis.

(iii) Future funding for meetings unsure.

(iv) ELSE to make nominations for Peer Groups in due course.

(v) ELSE keen to establish a list of those seeking L3 status. TW said that under the old system the Cofsecs would notify John Neale of anyone they considered worthy of consideration for SEAA meetings and he would try to give them the opportunity and that this could be carried on. SB suggested this be done through Alan Vincent.

**OFFICIALS STRATEGY** – Long discussion took place as SB is meeting with EA on 13<sup>th</sup> and UKA on 14<sup>th</sup> with others (as the PM would say). Summarising points raised as follows.

a) Little agreement between EA & UKA as with Level 2 & 3 UKA decide what is to occur and EA administer provided funding is agreed. It is hoped to define the structure tomorrow and it was agreed that we should recommend keeping the old structure. Important a uniform structure throughout the Regions.

b) Log Books are a problem as they are time consuming for Official and Referee/Chief and difficult if there are a number at one meeting. Also there is a big time lapse between assessment and Official receiving their UKA Pass/Licence, sometimes well over 3 months, which does not encourage Official to proceed. Mentoring should be done on the day by qualified Officials present and that leaves the personal mentor to deal with any other problems.

c) Each discipline has differences and the Timekeepers feel that some sort of practical assessment should occur.

d) Discussion took place as to the benefits or not of the old exams but with no real outcome.

e) Reporting – Quality of reports poor as a number are doing reports having not attended L3 Course and not questioning IAAF knowledge. Officials need experience in report writing which they could gain by doing intermediate reports at Level 3 and 4. Should be guidelines issued. Recommended that to go from L2 (Club) to County should require one satisfactory report and to L2(Region) 3 satisfactory reports to establish some quality control. Considered that promotion to L2 (County) could be done by Cofsecs and Region by recommendation from County to Region as with the old grade 3 to 2.

SB mentioned that he had seen reports being done on Chiefs/ Referees. Suggested that ELSE were assessing whether the Official was satisfactory to Referee at senior level. Also felt that those writing reports on L3 as Referee should have reached the old Grade 1 (R/C). Comment made that the forms for L3 Referee stated that they were able to act in this position at National/ International level. TW had spoken to Dave Vidler who had the forms changed.

f) Considered important that we know the person at HQ dealing with Officials as all will be centralised – face to a name!

Question raised as to how the Technical Committee is 're-elected' and SB is taking this up over the next two days

**CONFERENCE** - Since our last meeting you must be aware that we have managed to reduce the cost of meals for the conference. Our grateful thanks go to England Athletics for their very generous financial backing. We also wish to minute our thanks to UK Athletics for their support in funding two of our workshop leaders to travel down from the North. Everything is under control. The only concern being the low numbers registered so far.

## Membership of the International Officials Group

On the UKA website John Pickles writes

The 2008 season was much more of a success regards the number of reports and assessments carried out and returned by Chiefs and Referees. For many meetings I had assessments for all the officials at the event.

The information provides the Peer Groups/Technical Committee with evidence which is used when making appointments, reviewing the IOG/ICOG and the L5 active list. They also identify officials below L5 who show potential and may be considered for further exposure at major events.

For ongoing information got to:-

<http://www.uka.org.uk/competitions/officials/reportingandassessment-forms/>

If you have any questions relating to the Assessment process please get in touch – baldnbeautiful@btinternet.com

## TRACK TIPS

Steeplechase – inside water jump – first barrier is diagonally opposite the start.

# KEEPING A LEVEL 3 LOGBOOK – WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF DOING SO?

by Moira Gallagher for her Officials Conference Presentation

## Introduction

The title suggests to me that some people think that there is no purpose in completing the logbook so it is obviously my job to convince you that it is an important part of the process!

I think that it is important to set the keeping of the logbook in context so I will start with some of the information given in the Guidelines for assessing Level 3 which were sent to Tri Regional Officials Groups, Peer Groups and candidates last year and was also on the UKA website. These guidelines are currently being updated and should be available within the next month or so. It is essential that candidates for Level 3 access these guidelines and also obtain the required application form in good time.

We need to consider the following question posed in the Guidelines.

### **What do we mean by Level 3?**

- a) An official who becomes level 3 will go onto the national list and will be eligible for consideration for major meetings which may include televised meetings.
  - b) There is often considerable pressure when officiating at the higher level meetings and it is essential that any official being designated Level 3 is sufficiently experienced to be able to work confidently at that level. To put forward an official too early could put them in a position where they are totally overwhelmed and perform badly.
  - c) All officials at those meetings are assessed against published criteria and it is essential that candidates and their assessors are fully conversant with those criteria, both Generic and Discipline Specific.
- All concerned need to be realistic about those candidates who are being considered, including the candidates themselves.

### **Responsibility for submitting paperwork.**

Tri Regional/Celtic Country Officials' Groups are responsible for collating all the required reports and annual worksheets for candidates and then considering them to decide on the suitability of the candidate to become Level 3.

Questions that need to be asked:-

**Annual worksheets** – do these show at least 30 meetings over 2 years and are the meetings at a range of levels including the equivalent of Territorial level? If the meetings are all local ones the candidate is unlikely to have the experience to move straight to National level and if they have not travelled out of their local area are they likely to be prepared to travel nationally? Has the candidate carried out the full range of duties relevant to their discipline? All candidates need to be asked to include some detail on this form so that it is clear which duties they have carried out. This provides a quick summary to look at which will be supplemented by more detail in the logbook where this is required.

**Reports** – Reports from 2007, 2008 and 2009 are valid this year. A minimum of 6 specified reports is required but for some aspects it may be helpful to provide an additional report to strengthen the information provided in an earlier report. You need to check that all reports are from different Level 5 officials and whether they provide adequate information overall about the candidate? Do they include some from meetings at the equivalent of Territorial level?

**Do the team member (minimum of 2 ) reports** show the ability to work at higher level meetings. Bear in mind that reporters do not always tick the correct statement to fit the information they give and that some of them will not have fully grasped how the new system works. Does the information on the reports indicate readiness for the national list? If an official becomes level 3 the expectation will be that they have the competence and confidence to work in a team of officials at a National/International level meeting

**Out of Region report** – this is most likely to be as a team member but could cover one of the other areas for reports. It should show that the candidate can work with officials that they do not know as well as their local ones and is a chance for someone further afield to be involved in their assessment. Sometimes we see our local officials through rose tinted spectacles!

### Technology report

**Track Judges and Timekeepers** simply require a report to say that they can work in a photo finish team and read the results. They are not required to be able to set up the equipment.

**Field Judges** are not required to be able to operate EDM equipment at the speed required at an International event. They do not need to be able to set up the equipment although that should be encouraged. They should be able to operate consistently, accurately and confidently. Bearing in mind that opportunities to use EDM are limited and often only cover the long throws it is acceptable for reports to be presented from long throws only but they must cover several events, possibly at more than one meeting. The ideal would be for the report to cover a range of events including both long throws and shorter events.

**Starters/Marksmen** are all required to be able to support the installation and movement of FSE and to be able to identify basic malfunctions (eg. no sound coming from the speakers at the blocks). They also need to be able to interpret the printer data. In addition starters are expected to be able to respond to a signal from the equipment and also act appropriately when there is no signal and they think that an infringement has taken place.

**Referee/Chief report** – This needs to show that the candidate can organise a group of officials, has a good knowledge of rules and procedures and can relate to officials/athletes/coaches/ team managers/parents as required. It can be from a County Championship or League meeting. Where possible a duty sheet should be attached but there may be situations where that has not been done. It is acceptable to ask a candidate to produce a duty sheet for a meeting retrospectively in order to demonstrate that they are capable of planning at that level. They are not being looked at in the way Grade 1 officials were looked at for Referee under the old system.

**Clerk of Course** – There is not an expectation that an official immediately upon appointment to level 3 could handle Clerk of Course duties at a major meeting. They should be able to cover this duty at County or area level.

### **Logbooks**

Those candidates who have come through the new system from Level 2 will have continued to complete their logbooks with self evaluation of each meeting. Those who were Level 3 by transfer should have begun logbook sheets following their Level 3 course (on the disk given to attendees). Candidates should show in their logbooks that they recognise what they need to learn and are making progress in doing this. The logbooks should be assessed by the Tri Regional and Celtic Countries Officials' Groups and do not need to be sent in with the reports and worksheets for consideration by the Peer Groups. The summary comments about the logbook will form part of the application form for Level 3 and should be submitted with the other documentation. In borderline cases the Peer Group may ask for the completed logbook to be submitted to help in their decision making. Last year I arranged to have all the logbooks available at the Peer Group meetings to save any delay and will continue to do that as it was beneficial.

**FINALLY** – ask yourself – ***IF SELECTED FOR A MAJOR ASSESSED MEETING WILL THIS CANDIDATE COME OUT WITH AT LEAST THE BASELINE GRADE OF C?***

If the answer is Yes then proceed with the application, if the answer is No then think again! That is how the guidelines end.

### **More about Logbooks**

The Tri-regional Officials Groups and Peer Groups are looking for evidence that the candidate can be given a YES to the above question and the logbook is a very useful way of providing that evidence.

The questions to be answered by the Tri-regional Officials Group on the application form are as follows and I will relate each one to the logbook sheet (level 3 competition experience sheet as given on the candidate disk).

Remember that it is actually a minority of people who are filling in logbooks and these are the less experienced officials who are aiming to progress. It includes new Level 2 officials and those who were transfer Level 3. The transfer Level 4 officials who have more experience have not been asked to do this. However there is nothing to prevent the Level 4s from doing this if they want a chance to be pro-active and sell themselves! As I have mentioned at other meetings it would actually be good if all officials spent a little time analysing their performance – we all need to think about what we are doing and why. I have been officiating since 1970 and plan to retire when I stop learning which, hopefully, will be some years in the future!

To return to the questions about the logbook to be answered by the Tri Regional Officials Group and recorded on the application form.

#### **1) Has the logbook been completed conscientiously?**

*The logbook is a chance for the candidate to show that they are a potential Level 3 official. Not all good officials are literary experts and there will be a great range of logbook entries. With the pressures of life and the busyness of most officials some events may be written up in much greater detail than others. We all officiate at events where there is not a great deal to comment on and a very brief entry will suffice for such a meeting. However during a season it would be expected that everyone would work at meetings at which incidents did occur and they did learn something. Some of the comments about how the referee/chief handled incidents can be quite enlightening and I suspect is one of the reasons why some such people don't like the idea of logbooks!!*

*In the same folder in which you file the competition experience sheets you can include any duty sheets or briefing notes that you are given. This will provide you with a good basis from which to prepare duty sheets as needed in the future. Some people have found that there is insufficient space on the forms so have included additional sheets for those meetings where there is a lot to comment on. All candidates should ensure that they have copies of their reports and these can also be filed with the above. (Another useful thing to file in your logbook, which I did not have time to discuss on the day, is the answers to the discipline specific questions on the candidates disk which you will have worked through and discussed with your mentor)*

#### **2) Is there evidence of self assessment and subsequent learning?**

*We have all come across the official who thinks that they are God's gift to the sport and that they know it all – such people are not going to be an asset to the National list. Neither are people who are so self critical that they worry themselves to death over every little thing. What is being looked for is enthusiastic officials who have a wide range of experience, a high level of skill and are keen to learn and also recognise that learning will continue even when they*

get onto the National list. If they make a mistake they learn from it.

This is the main thrust of the logbook sheet which we will look at now. **Top section self explanatory** – (returned to mentor aspect later)

**Duties allocated-** I would be tempted to roll the two questions into one and answer them together eg. At a league meeting you might record the following:-“Umpiring at break line – checked that cones and flags were available. Placed cones and signalled clearly to the referee”. Show that you thought about the duty prior to carrying it out. This comment is very different to; “went to break line but there were no flags so I waved my board” – this suggests last minute arrival. However if you were sent at the last minute you would word it accordingly.

If your duties changed, either because the referee had to reallocate officials or because you noticed something that was not being covered and helped out then record that as it would show that you were capable of using your initiative.

An example of an entry from a field official was as follows; “ Assisted Field referee with setting up ready for the competition to begin. Helped other teams with LJ, TJ and javelin as they had insufficient graded officials.” (league meeting where clubs have to provide the officials for a specific event, her allocated duty was as team leader for the shot)

#### **What went well?**

Examples were read out from some logbooks submitted last year. Only one is given here.

eg. “Lap Board and bell – very pleased with performance on this – the first race was a 10K and I was on lap board. Although there were only 4 athletes it was excellent practice – there was a lot of lapping.”

The same official gave the following answer to the next question for the same meeting:-

#### **What Might I do differently next time?**

eg. “The wind gauge – forgot to round this up or down as appropriate.”

It is good to be pleased with the things that you do well but realism is needed for those things that can be improved.

#### **Did any specific incidents occur you want to comment on? How were these dealt with and by whom?**

The following incident shows how important it is for candidates for Level 3 to work at a range of meetings so that they learn the correct procedures and are capable of noticing when senior officials have got it wrong.

Eg. “On javelin the official with the warning horn wasn’t watching that the other officials were acknowledging the horn, he just blew the horn then allowed the thrower to throw. Difficult to do anything about it as the person with the horn was a Grade 1 Ref/Chief.”

### **3) Is there evidence of mentoring ie. Candidate seeking or being offered and taking advice?**

The next section on the sheet gives a space for feedback from your mentor, if present. The aim is for all those who are aiming to progress to Level 3 to have a mentor. Many candidates arrange this for themselves but in some cases the Tri Regional Officials group may have to help with this. A mentor needs to be someone with recent experience of working at higher level meetings and with a considerable amount of expertise. They also need to be the sort of person who encourages up and coming officials!!

Some officials may not see their mentor frequently but hopefully mentoring will be taking place anyway – all officials should be offering help and advice to those who are learning. If you are offered advice at a meeting then that can be recorded in that section – please mention officials who are helpful.

### **4) Does what you have read in the logbook support the candidate’s application for Level 3?**

Hopefully the answer to this question will be Yes. The Tri Regional Officials Group should be doing a certain amount of monitoring of those who have indicated that they wish to progress to Level 3 and will be offering advice as to when they are ready to apply.

For 2 candidates in 2008 the logbooks proved very important at Peer Group level. They provided additional evidence which helped to determine the course of action taken by the Peer Group. The logbook can help the candidate to present their own case irrespective of the level of efficiency of any of the committees or other officials involved! If you are completing a logbook it is you who is in the driving seat – make the most of it.

There is a section for Chiefs to complete if they wish – some people have said that they could be inundated with 3 or 4 people wanting feedback at the same meeting. I would be thrilled if this happened as it cannot be a common occurrence! I would expect any potential Level 3 to have identified themselves prior to the meeting so if there were several it might be worth assigning them to another senior official to act on your behalf. Remember it is only a minority who are completing logbooks. Having several candidates at the same meeting would be most likely to occur at a territorial champs. If as Referee/Chief you have a lot to say about the candidate then why not simply sign the sheet and offer to complete a report form which you can do at home. Obviously some verbal feedback on the day is important but unless this is especially contentious this could be begun on the day and continued by telephone/email. I think that

this is an area in which common sense has to be used. This should not be seen as a chore for either the potential Level 3 or the Referee/Chief. The purpose of the logbook is as a tool for learning – it is not something to be completed slavishly for the sake of it. I think that it is a useful tool and an official whom I have been mentoring through from Level 1 to Level 3 is continuing to complete self assessment sheets as she finds it helps her to consolidate and extend her learning. I hope that you will also find it useful.

## REPORT WRITING – A TWO WAY EXERCISE

### QUALITIES OF A REPORTER

Officiating experience over a credible period of time.  
Knowledge of current Rules of Competition.  
Ability to put Reportee at ease at the outset.  
Objectively analyse the Reportee's performance.  
Objectively evaluate performance on the day to give a considered decision. If they are having a bad day the report should still be submitted.  
Ability to prioritise strengths and development areas – should another section be added to show 3 Strengths & up to 3 Development areas?  
Ability to provide solutions to perceived shortcomings.  
Ability to motivate whilst offering advice during meeting.  
Ability to collate information to conduct a short debrief at the end.  
Ability to present all the relevant information in a legible written format within the given timescale although at times the Reporter has a number of various reports to do at a meeting but the Official's is the most important.  
Chasing reports at the end of the season is too late but Cofsecs could take this on if they are advised of a report being done and they should be copied in on reports.

### WRITING THE REPORT

Be accurate recording name, meeting, venue, date etc.  
Write in the 1<sup>st</sup> person (You reported the infringement...)  
Make reference only to the meeting you are dealing with and not previous meetings you have both been at.  
Bear in mind that Indoor reports are necessarily limited and should really be used as supportive evidence.  
Ensure each section contains detailed comments.  
Start each section with a positive and end likewise.  
Detail areas which attract critical comment (you reported No 57 running on the inside lane line but had to be questioned as to how many strides)

### WHAT IS THE OFFICIAL LOOKING FOR?

A friendly welcome.  
Constructive advice.  
Concise debrief with feedback given during the day.  
A reasoned decision.  
Written report within timescale.

### UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE

Some think Umpiring is boring but it is not all judging.  
Concentration.  
Communication.  
Be aware of Safety issues and of keeping the Competition area clear.  
There for athletes, not to be Star of the Show!!

### ABILITY TO FOLLOW THE DUTY SHEET

Did they allow time to go through it all?  
Did they anticipate moves to get into position in plenty of time?

### POSITIONING

Did they vary to get a better view and did they adjust to cover another Official?

### KNOWLEDGE AND APPLICATION OF RULES INCLUDING INFRINGEMENTS

Did they display sound knowledge of UKA Rules and know the differences with IAAF and have both handbooks.  
Were infringements reported to Referee or a view taken and were they made quickly and concisely?  
Did the written report match the verbal?  
Ensure you have a bank of questions.

### JUDGING ABILITY INCLUDING LAP CHARTS

Was the board ruled to make it easier to check and reasonably clear?  
Were results in line with majority? (Consider whether races were tight or not & Photofinish) and were Last 3 or 4 and reliable?  
Lap Charts – clear and accurate – difficult race!  
LBBA – did they agree who does what?

RELATIONSHIP WITH ATHLETES - Follow Referee's instructions as to whether to talk or not and if so was it in a friendly fashion?

Did they physically handle athletes and were they aware of injuries?

ABILITY TO MAKE QUICK DECISIONS – FIELD - Long & triple fouls etc. Javelin validity – positioning!

Shot arm action.

Out of sector.

High/Pole - breaking the plane. Timed out.

Were these decisions made promptly and with confidence?

OTHER COMMENTS - Give a general overview of their performance including anything which may have had an adverse affect on their performance e.g. weather etc. Give reasons behind your final decision.

### MY THOUGHTS AND THOSE OF OTHERS.

Are the present report forms too restricting? Should we consider identifying 3 Strengths and up to 3 Development Areas as an additional section? This is now being trialled by two counties. Should the time for submission of the report be shortened? There is a need for guidelines to be issued to Reporters and feedback given to them on the standard of the report as not all Officials find reports easy to do? Field reports - can a report be done for Level 3 by TM or Ref? TM can only report on CoC but Ref can use Team Leader to help with information. Could SEAQA re-consider appointing Mentors for Level 2 (Region) as it seems to depend where you live?

The above is a summary of my presentation including comments made by those in attendance.

Terry Williams

# DIFFERENCES BETWEEN UKA AND IAAF RULES.

## David Littlewood's Conference Presentation

### WHAT DO IAAF RULES ASSUME?

#### Competition

- Is for over 15s for Track and Field & over 18 elsewhere
- Is fully equipped technically
- Is fully staffed with experienced Officials
- Is held in a stadium with 8 lane synthetic track
- Is held in a stadium in which all equipment is IAAF certificated
- Assumes Championships are held over at least 2 days
- Assumes also that the event will be televised

### WHAT DO UKA RULES ASSUME?

Competitions range from near International level to definite grass roots—rules must cater for all.

Technical Officials will vary in experience and understanding.

Athletes competing will vary in experience right down to first time in a competition.

Facilities will vary in standard. Rules must try to avoid eliminating venues from competitions whilst paying due regard to H & S

Equipment may be limited in quantity and quality

Time, even in Championships, may be limited so rules must reflect this fact.

Rules must also reflect the wide range of ages covered by competitions under UKA rules.

Rule wording must be simple and clearly written.

### WHAT ARE THE MAJOR DIFFERENCES IN THE RULES?

#### ADVERTISING

IAAF Rules gives detailed instructions about advertising boards and advertising on equipment. UKA very limited IAAF Rule states vests should have the same colour front and back.

IAAF Rules allows manufacturer of "vests" to have logo 30 sq cms—UKA Rules allows 20 sq cms.

IAAF Rules have 11 pages of conditions for clothing advertising!

UKA Rules allows for personal sponsor identification.

IAAF does not allow this.

IAAF Rules varies its advertising regulations for vests depending on the category of the competition.

Club name on vest—IAAF maximum of 40 sq cms. UKA should be no larger than 4 cms high but any width. IAAF allows a club name on the back of the vests maximum 4 cm high but any width.

#### TRACK

Lane running: IAAF mandatory disqualification for one foot on the line around the bend. UKA allows Referee to weigh up the advantage gained.

False start obviously different—may get further apart in 2010!

Starting Blocks: Compulsory under IAAF Rules but optional under UKA.

Rest periods between rounds of an event.

UKA: Up to 100	20 mins
Over 100 up to 200	40 mins
Over 200 to 400	60 mins
Over 400 to 800	80 mins
Over 800	100 mins

IAAF: Up to & including 200	45 mins
Over 200 to include 1000	90 mins
Over 1000	Not on same day

Break Line: IAAF Rules require cones or prisms to be placed in front of the break line. UKA Rules do not have this requirement as clearly most UK tracks do not have these as part of the standard equipment. (May well be introduced to the 2010 Rulebook as an option)

Lap Board & Bell: IAAF Rules insist that the lap board be changed as the leading runner enters the home straight. UKA rules do not stipulate this.

Lap Scoring: IAAF requires lap scorers in distances of 5000m or longer to record times for each of a maximum of 4 athletes in a race. UKA Rules require the Referee to appoint lap scorer(s) in events longer than 1500 to record the whole field.

Relay Check Marks: IAAF Rules stipulate maximum size of check mark to be used (5 cm x 40cm). UKA only stipulate that only 1 check mark may be used—no dimensions quoted.

Ties on time: Both sets of rules allow times to 1/1000ths—IAAF allow for a draw by lot to decide if times are still equal.

#### FIELD

Warm Up: IAAF stipulates that in throwing events warm up must be in draw order. UKA Rules do not stipulate order of jumping/throwing; IAAF requires new draw after three rounds in reverse order of ranking at that time and changed again after five rounds. UKA uses same draw throughout the competition.

Personal Throwing Implements: IAAF Rules—must be certified implements. Athletes may be allowed to include their own implements if not on supplied list for event. Then any athlete may use that implement. UKA allows personal implements, if checked, but can only be used by others with owner's permission.

Triple Jump: IAAF stipulate 11m or 13m boards. UKA allows 7,9,11 or 13m.

Pole Vault: IAAF (for most competitions) & UKA Rules have different dimensions for beds. **IAAF**: 6m x 6m x 0.8m. **UKA** 5m x 5m x 0.8m.

High Jump: IAAF Rules demand white line must be drawn 3m outside of each upright. **UKA** say line "should" be drawn.

Throwing Events: **IAAF** allows a marker to be placed only on the ground in the area immediately behind or adjacent to the circle. Not included in UKA Rules.

Hammer: Differences in specifications for cage for this event between IAAF and UKA.

**General Field: IAAF**: Judge shall not raise a white flag to indicate a valid throw until trial is completed.

Field General: IAAF designate that in all events except Pole Vault & High Jump where there are more than 8 athletes, after 3 attempts the best 8 shall have 3 more. UKA: allows from 3—6 trials in total, or allows all to have 3 trials and then the best 3—8 progress to 3 more trials.

Field General: IAAF allows for protest immediately by athlete who has had a trial disallowed. May have distance recorded for any later decision by Jury at discretion of Referee. UKA doesn't allow this.

Competition General: IAAF—allows for a Jury of Appeal. UKA says Referee's decision is final.

IAAF allows a Call Room Referee to warn or disqualify an athlete for misconduct. UKA does not recognise this position.

### SEEDING AND LANE DRAWS

**IAAF**: have complex charts for identifying how many rounds there will be in each event for any given entry. Also identifies qualification conditions for progression. These shall, in the absence of extraordinary circumstances, be used.

#### Seeding from Round 1 heats to next round:

**100m Heats**: 4hts. First 3 and 4 fastest to the next round. Rank the qualifying athletes from 1—16 as this will dictate in which heat the athlete will run in the next round.

#### SEEDING RANKED ATHLETES TO HEATS AND LANES

- Athletes from the ranking are placed in a zig zag pattern:

**Heat 1**  
Rank 1  
Rank 4  
Rank 5  
Rank 8  
Rank 9  
Rank 12  
Rank 13  
Rank 16

**Heat 2**  
Rank 2  
Rank 3  
Rank 6  
Rank 7  
Rank 10  
Rank 11  
Rank 14  
Rank 15

#### SEEDING FROM HEAT TO NEXT ROUND 100M Heats. 1st 3 and 4 fastest to semi final

Heat 1	Heat 2	Heat 3
12 10.02	90 10.04	30 10.01
45 10.03	72 10.05	3 10.04
37 10.11	34 10.09	23 10.05
53 10.25	24 10.11	9 10.24
21 10.26	18 10.23	4 10.24

**Heat 4**

67 9.98
8 9.99
19 10.01
22 10.04
66 10.28

#### SEEDING AND DRAW FOR SEMI FINALS

1	67	SF1 67; 90; 8; 72; 19; 37; 22; 9;
2	30	
3	12	
4	90	
5	8	
6	45	SF2 30; 12; 45; 3; 23; 34; 24; 18;
7	3	
8	72	
9	19	
10	23	
11	34	
12	37	
13	22	
14	24	
15	18	
16	9	



## A Letter from America (with due deference to Alistair Cook)

### Doug Weir

I still work for the same company, the same department doing much the same job, just 4,000 miles away. That was the result of being made redundant in Kent and moving to South West Michigan late in 2008. Fortunately my COFSEC, Gill Freeman, was on the UKA official's exchange to the US last summer and met a Michigan official who provided contact details. I sent off a few emails but received no reply at first. I was under the impression that I had to register before the end of the year, but the reality is that all the officials lose their certification (as it is called here – we must all be mad anyway) after the summer Olympics and the next 4 year cycle starts the following January. I thought there might be some cross country races in the winter but quickly came to realise that it's far too cold here. It's icy and often sub-zero (Fahrenheit) or too much snow to be able to run anywhere. You could easily freeze to death. In fact, we arrived to find winter had come early and snow was already on the ground. Getting out of the house to work and shop were more important than athletics. Off to buy a snow blower!



#### **Clearing another heavy snowfall**

January saw a flurry of emails and telephone calls with Eric Zemper, the certification chair for the state and an experienced starter and ITO. USA Track and Field don't have exemptions from the first level. There are four; Association (often the state), National, Master and Master Referee. NTO is the next step. If things went reasonably I could go to National level in 2010 instead of the customary 2 years or more. High school and college athletics (the latter is very important here) have their own rule books to learn in addition to the IAAF and USATF rules. What really did surprise me was the number of disciplines; so many that they think of us as generalists! There are an astonishing 27 skills listed at Association level with more at National and Master level. For example all 8 field events are considered separate, as is judging, umpiring and lap scoring and wind gauge operator. Certification is not free. You have to join USATF as they provide the insurance cover. This costs \$30 a year or \$100 for the 4 year period. You then have to join your local association (another but lesser fee) I've been told these are tax deductible!

Not surprisingly given the harsh winters there are a number of indoor tracks. Most are apparently not banked and 6 lanes on the circuit tend to be standard. The first meeting I went to at Grand Valley State University was at a new facility with a 300m track and turf infield which is also used for other sports, primarily (American) football practice. A leisurely afternoon was spent judging the long and triple jumps. Now I know why so many want to be field judges.

The Michigan Masters at Eastern Michigan University at Ypsilanti brought a new job – finish line coordinator. It's to ensure that the judges and timekeepers (not that there were any of either) and photofinish are ready for the next race and to signal the starter (as a chief timekeeper would) and to keep the finish area clear of unnecessary bodies. In addition I ended up doing lap charts for the 3000's, calling splits for the mile and 800's and doing some marksman's duties. They don't have marksmen here. The role of clerk of the course is very different to the UK and is a cross between a marksman and a seeding officer, with the recall starter helping to check that athletes comply. It's where I've found the biggest difference so far and I guess I'll comment further some other time when I've seen more.

The following week saw me at an invitational meet at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor where I shadowed the meeting referee. This was most useful to see how a meeting is run on this side of the Pond. The referee carried a set of warning cards football-style which could be administered to athletes or coaches who overstep the mark. This apparently rarely happens, particularly at college level where the comeback on haranguing officials is severe.



### **University of Michigan indoor track.**

There has been no opportunity to time keep officially as there haven't been any timekeepers at the indoor meetings even though there is a requirement in the rule book. Track judges needn't laugh either as only one meeting had judges as well as umpires. To be fair only one venue would have had enough space for them.

My first impressions are that there are many similarities to the UK which includes the friendliness of the officials. Patti and I have been made to feel very welcome. The issues they have appear to be similar in many respects to ours – we are not alone!

I attend my certification course at the end of March so you may hear more about that later and about the outdoor season (editor permitting)

# SEAOA

**Chairman and Treasurer**  
**Stan Burton**  
stanburton@seaoa.co.uk

**Secretary**  
**Ros Alterman**  
rosalterman@seaoa.co.uk

**Track Sub Committee**  
**Terry Williams**  
terrywilliams@seaoa.co.uk

**Field Sub Committee**  
**Tony Shaw**  
tonyshaw@seaoa.co.uk

**Timekeepers Sub Committee**  
**Paul Langston**  
Paullangston@seaoa.co.uk

**Photofinish Sub Committee**  
**Mike Scott**  
Mikescott@seaoa.co.uk

**Starters**  
**Vacant**



Whilst we were all trying to cope with a few inches of snow in February and the travel chaos it caused this picture and message were received from Doug!

*It's too bad about all of your snow (if you have any). As you can see ours is really starting to melt and things are looking good now!*

## OLYMPIC QUIZ - How much do you know?

- 1 Which is the only Women's throwing event in which Britain has won medals?
- 2 In which years did Jonathan Edwards win his silver and gold medals?
- 3 Which is the only field event where Britain has never won a medal?
- 4 Have Britain won more gold medals at 4 x 100 or 4 x 400?
- 5 Who won Britain's only women's 10,000 medal and which colour was it?
- 6 In which event did Chris Brasher win gold in 1956?
- 7 Of Britain's 4 Men's javelin medals who has won 3 of them?
- 8 What colour medal did Jonathan Edwards win in 1996?
- 9 Which 2 members of the same family both won silver medals in 1968 and in which events?
- 10 What distance did Lynn Davies jump to win gold in 1964?
- 11 Which event did Eric Liddell win in 1924?
- 12 Which British sprinter won gold in 100 and silver in 200 in 1980?
- 13 What colour medal did Lord Burghley win in 1924?
- 14 In which event did Dennis Horgan win Britain's only ever Olympic medal in 1928?
- 15 Patrick Leahy won 2 medals in 1900. In which 2 events?
- 16 In which event has Britain won most gold medals?
- 17 Who won bronze for Britain in the Women's long jump in 1984?
- 18 In which year did the women first compete over heptathlon?
- 19 Who took the bronze medal when David Hemery won gold in the 400 Hurdles?
- 20 Who jumped 2.35m to take High Jump Bronze in 1996?