



KC Accredited Judges Trainers – Annual Seminar 13th Oct 2022

Agility Report

Five Accredited Trainers for Agility attended.

The following items were discussed:

Dress code for Judges (what is acceptable and what is not)

The group were shown a picture taken of a Championship Judge at prize giving wearing baseball cap, t-shirt and shorts and which he was wearing whilst judging with the baseball cap on in reverse.

All were in agreement that the Judge's dress code was unacceptable with one saying that this did not demonstrate respect for the occasion. The group have asked if the office could issue a press release reminding judges of their obligations as stated in the Guide for Judges and Stewards. Chapter 1. Code of Best Practice for Judges 1.16 Dress in a conventional and acceptable fashion precluding them from being the centre of attention.

Judges breaching KC rules by blatantly not even making an attempt to judge all contacts.

This item arose after a video of an agility run was put on social media in which it could clearly be seen that the judge on that run was not in a position to see up contact areas. After a discussion it was felt that this should have been reported in the show incident book. The office were asked if this could be retrospectively reported and the answer was yes, although it would be recorded against the judge and used if further violations of the regulations were reported.

Discuss course design element of judges training.

One of the trainers expressed frustration with the amount of time allocated to the course design element of the 2 day KC Agility Judges seminar. The feeling was that there should be more time to enable more discussion and examples on dog's lines. Elements of the seminar were discussed and I advised that all the elements in the seminar are important but the timings can be adjusted to suit the level of knowledge and experience of the attendees at that seminar.

Competitors repeating equipment in the ring - guidance to judges?

A brief discussion took place and it was felt that any guidance could be added to the seminar presentation guidance notes to bring this up for discussion at each seminar.

Tunnel under A-Frame/Dog-Walk – is it a refusal or elimination if dog misses tunnel entrance and runs under contact equipment?

It is believed this was covered in a press release in 2018 – but no one could find this when searching the KC website.

The recollection of the guidance was that as running under the DW/AF cannot be avoided then it should only be a refusal.

Discussions took place as to how far away from the tunnel can a dog still run under with it only still being a refusal? It was felt that this should be judged as seen on the ground at the time.

This item was brought to the group as a judge had been reported in a show incident book for eliminating in a Championship class where the marking as an elimination precludes them from the final. The judge did not know that this guidance had been issued and was following the H regulations.



Use of Yellow leads/harnesses/coats by competitors to highlight that this dog needs space

All disciplines were asked to discuss their views on this.

The Agility AT's expressed sympathy with such owners but felt that they cannot abdicate responsibility by the use of yellow leads, it still should be the responsibility of the owner that the dog is not involved in any incidents as per Regulation H. 13. Removal of dogs from competition.

Following discussion between the show management and/or a veterinary surgeon, a dog shall be prevented from competing and/or removed from an agility show if it is:

...

- c. Interfering with the safety or chance of winning of an opponent.
- d. Of such temperament or is so much out of control as to be a danger to the safety of any person or other animal.

There were a few questions/issues raised:

Mentoring guidelines – are there any?

Online judging videos on the Academy need updating due to regulation changes.

Some questions still wrong in the online exam.

Does the online exam cater for those with Dyslexia?

Is there anyway a report could be produced showing anyone who had failed the online exam and not yet re-taken it? This could then be used to check if any of these are continuing to judge.