

# HUNTING RETRIEVER CLUB, INC.



## JUDGES RECOURSE POLICY

---

FROM THE HRC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

AUGUST 26, 2003

Effective Immediately

# JUDGES RECOURSE POLICY

---

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

---

HRC has two “mechanisms” (for lack of a better word) in place to help our clubs and judges be successful in their efforts to conduct quality hunts, both of which insure that our retrievers are tested consistent with our rulebook purposes and philosophy, and test rules and guidelines.

The first is our Judges/Handlers Seminar. We require judges to attend our seminar, which was developed among other things to: help judges understand our rules and guidelines, understand the need to test retrievers fairly and consistently, set up realistic testing scenarios, establish recommendations for successful test set-up and evaluation at each testing level, and offer recommendations to avoid problems in their tests.

The second is our Field Representatives themselves who travel to hunt tests in their respective regions to share their knowledge and experience, and to help insure retrievers are tested in accordance with our rules, guidelines, and seminar recommendations.

On occasion, a judge or pair of judges will set-up a test that, while not “illegal” as respects our running rules, is perhaps one or more of the following: poorly constructed; inconsistent with seminar recommendations; and/or does not meet the standards established at the level being tested. In general, it is the Field Representatives experienced opinions that these tests both will cause problems for the retrievers and hinder the judges’ ability to properly evaluate the dogs.

We’ve asked our Field Representatives to step forward and speak to judges where they see these types of tests that need correcting. At this time however, THERE IS NO MECHANISM in place that gives our judges any incentives (penalties for not complying) to change a bad test at the Field Representative’s request.

---

## PURPOSE

---

The purpose of the Judges Recourse policy is two-fold:

Primarily, to serve as an INCENTIVE to judges to listen to a Field Representative who advises them they need to make a change in a test set-up, which will encourage the judge(s) take corrective measures.

Secondly, to PROTECT handlers and clubs at hunt tests from Licensed Judges who demonstrate a poor or uncooperative attitude and who fail to act on the Field Representatives request that a test be improved. The proposal provides a set of PENALTIES to apply to the above-mentioned judges that will affect a judge’s license status and their ability to perpetuate this behavior at other hunt tests.

---

## LIMITATIONS

---

This policy is not designed to replace existing FORMAL COMPLAINT PROCEDURES.

This policy will apply to LICENSED HRC JUDGES only.

---

## VALIDATION

---

The following is written on the back of every judge's license:

"IT IS UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED THAT THIS LICENSE MAY BE WITHDRAWN, SUSPENDED, REVOKED, OR NOT RENEWED BY HRC, INC., IN ITS SOLE DISCRETION AND JUDGMENT, AT ANY TIME, WITH OR WITHOUT CAUSE."

---

## MONITORING TESTS AND "FLAGGING" A JUDGE

---

As per current procedures, HRC Field Representative will speak to judges when they observe problems in a test and encourage judges to take corrective action.

Only when a judge declines to comply with a Field Representative's request to make a test correction, will the Field Representative file a written report on the incident. This will be termed FLAGGING a judge's file.

---

## PROCEDURES FOR FLAGGING A FILE

---

HRC Field Representative can ask that a judge's file be FLAGGED only for the following reasons:

- ❑ A judge fails to comply with a request to change a test the Field Representative determines is ILLEGAL under our Test Rules and Guidelines.
- ❑ A judge fails to comply with a request to change a test when a Field Representative determines the test DOES NOT FOLLOW SEMINAR RECOMMENDATIONS for good testing and will CAUSE PROBLEMS for the dogs.

## NOTIFICATION

The HRC Field Representative will IMMEDIATELY advise the judge that a written report for NON-COMPLIANCE OF A HRC FIELD REPRESENTATIVE'S TEST CORRECTION REQUEST will be filed detailing the incident, and will include the following: (see Flagging Report Form)

- ❑ Hunt name, time, date, location, test level, flight, and judge involved.
- ❑ Reasons the rep determined a change needed to be made in a test.
- ❑ Verification the judge did not elect to comply with the rep's request to make a change.

The Rep will forward this report to the HRC Administrative Secretary within 7 days of the hunt test. The HRC Administrative Secretary will advise the judge in that a flag has been recorded on their file, and send the judge a copy of the flagging report.

## **CONSEQUENCES OF RECEIVING A FLAG ON THE JUDGE'S RECORD**

- ❑ Upon receiving a fully completed and signed written report which indicates the Field Representative has requested that a judge's file be FLAGGED, the HRC Administrative Secretary will immediately SUSPEND a judge's AA status (at all levels) if they hold this designation.
  - The AA suspension will be lifted when the judge has judged a minimum of three times with an AA designated judge(s).
  - Judge must request AA reinstatement to the Executive Committee in writing.
  - The judge's AA status will be returned to the level held prior to the suspension.
  - Lifting of the AA suspension does not expunge a flag from the judge's record.
  
- ❑ Upon receiving a second flag on their file, a judge will be immediately removed from the list of current judges until they have completed the following reinstatement requirements:
  - Attend a Judges/Handler seminar (regardless of last date of attendance)
  - Request reinstatement in writing to the HRC Executive Committee
  - Re-comply with requirements to earn AA status (if they held such designation) at the level they had prior to being suspended
  
- ❑ Upon receiving a third flag on their file, a judge will be immediately suspended from judging at HRC licensed hunt tests for a period of no less than one year. To begin judging again, the following requirements would need to be met:
  - A judge must request re-instatement in writing to the HRC Executive Committee
  - Begin again as if they are a new judge in our program by apprenticing at the Started level, etc. (as if they had never judged)

## **JUDGES RECOURSE – WRITTEN RESPONSE**

If desired, judges receiving a FLAG on their judge's file may respond as follows:

- ❑ File a written response to the notification of their file being flagged, postmarked within 7 days of receiving a flagging notification, with the HRC Administrative Secretary. A response should include the following:
  - Judge's account of the incident
  - Reason for non-compliance
  - A statement requesting administrative review of the flag
  - Judge's signature and date of response

## **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND DISPOSITION OF FLAGGING REPORT**

If the judge complies with the required written response procedures and requests an administrative review in writing, such request will be forwarded to the HRC Executive Committee for consideration. The Executive Committee will review the report and circumstances of the flagging. The HRC Executive Committee will obtain any other information as necessary, consult with other Field Representatives, knowledgeable judges, or other HRC members if desired or warranted, and will make a determination to either UPHOLD the flagging report or OVERTURN it.

Flagging reports that are overturned will be cleared from the judge's record and the judge's status will return to the level held prior to the flag.

Such review by the HRC Executive Committee will be done in as expedient a manner as possible given the scope and depth of the review necessary as determined by the Executive Committee.

The Field Representative and Judge involved will be notified in a timely manner by the HRC Administrative Secretary of the results of any review of a flagged file.

---

### **CONSIDERATIONS**

---

The Field Representative cannot "flag" a judge for a "legal" test set-up unless it meets both of the following criteria:

- ❑ The test does not comply with seminar recommendations for good testing.
- ❑ The test as constructed will, in the Field Representatives opinion, cause substantial problems for the dogs running.

The Reps will make every possible effort to convince a judge to make a correction, only use the threat of flagging as a last resort, and only actually flag a judge when there is no other recourse left.

The flagging policy is not applicable to judge's decisions regarding EVALUATION OF A RETRIEVER'S PERFORMANCE!

A judge's file cannot be FLAGGED by a hunt test committee or by request of a handler.

A judge's file will not be FLAGGED for incidents not directly related to testing, such as a judge's attitude.

ASSISTANT FIELD REPRESENTATIVES do not have authorization to flag a judge file.

Flagging reports be kept CONFIDENTIAL.

---

### **IMPLEMENTATION**

---

Implementation of this proposal is an HRC Executive POLICY decision, fully within the scope and realm of the HRC Executive Committee's duties and responsibilities.

Effective Date: August 26, 2003