

GUIDELINES FOR THE COMPLETION OF SIT-IN AND SHADOW JUDGING FORMS

The Sit-In form has been amended to include an assessment of 'Satisfactory' or 'Needs more training', this amendment was made to give the JE/M more options to work with and allow for greater expansion in their assessment. If the form does not contain sufficient space for your notes, please attach a separate document in a PDF format.

Shadow Judging

Before the competition

1. Before the competition starts assess the appearance, punctuality and attitude of the candidate. Check how well they have communicated with the OC, negotiated where to sit and their preparation to provide their own writer and enough test sheets.
2. Ask the candidate to put as many remarks in as possible for each movement and in the collectives summing up

After the competition

1. At end of the competition, make sure you have a copy of the results of yourself and the candidate (ideally scorers will add up along the way but if not candidate must do this in a prompt fashion)
2. Work out the Ranking for the Candidate compared to yours
3. Go through the results quickly according to ranking, percentage and spread of results
4. Mark each movement where there is a difference in the marks of more than 1.5. Note the total number of each of the differences, i.e. 2x1.5, 1x2 and 1x3 on the top of each test sheet
5. Look at the correlation between marks and remarks and the technical language used. Highlight any irregularities, points for discussion
6. Then arrange a meeting with the candidate for discussion about the outcomes
7. Give the candidate the opportunity to explain the marks that have been given in order to give you the chance to check their knowledge on the principles of dressage and judging dressage

SJ assessments should inform the candidate, in as much detail as possible, about the outcomes of each of the 8 criteria, give constructive feedback to the candidate judge, emphasising any strengths and weaknesses and provide further recommendations on any issues that require a deeper understanding.

It is also vital that JE/M's are very honest with their feedback, we owe this to the candidate, even if it means the resulting assessment on the day is 'needs more training'.

Ultimately SJ and Sit-in assessments are to prepare and educate each candidate so they have every opportunity to be successful in their practical exam.

We all have our own styles but SJ assessment forms with ticks or one or two words only in the 1-8 criteria is not sufficient for either the candidate to improve or for the practical examiner to have guidance about the candidate.

Often the Examining Judge of the Practical Exam asks to see the candidates Sit-In and Shadow Judging Assessments therefore it is imperative that they are informative.

The following are examples of assessments:

Good example of a Sit-in assessment

Sit-In Assessment

- 1. Candidate was well committed and prepared for the sit-in. Discussion on the role of the judge at C and general judges responsibilities as well as during the competition. Candidate was encouraged to propose comments and marks. The candidate had an observant eye, but she could be quicker to express comments and arrive at the mark before the next movement. Needs more practice of giving their thoughts out loud, and watching as many flying changes, pirouettes and half passes at this level will benefit the candidate in their development. Continue to ask questions so to be clear on the technical aspects of the test.*
- 2. The candidate was not afraid to give comments and improved as the tests progressed. Candidate needs to develop the terminology. Marks are generally in line when asked to contribute.*

Good examples of SJ assessments

Shadow Judging – Satisfactory Assessment:

- *Good preparation and commitment*
- *Correct winner and correct at bottom range but large difference with several horses. Horse A - Mentor 3rd and candidate 13 – 67.60%, Horse B – mentor 5th and candidate 9th, Horse C – Mentor 15, candidate 12*
- *Although % correct the placing was too high*
- *Clear top and bottom, middle range ranked riders needed to be more correctly separate*
- *Comments were the weak point. Be clear of the requirements for each exercise, especially pirouettes and changes. If there are problems the candidate needs to be clear if this is a weak point as to whether is it a major or minor fault*
- *As above, make sure it is appropriate terminology for the exercise*

Shadow Judging – Satisfactory Assessment:

- 1. Well committed to the process and well prepared*
- 2. Ranking for 2nd placed horse was high. The quality (Mentor 4th, Candidate 2nd) was only just satisfactory with little harmony and confirmed collection*
- 3. % of total competition appropriate. Terminology needs to be more comprehensive and specific. All judges need solid knowledge of underlying principles*
- 4. Be clear on requirements for each exercise which allows you in a competition such as this to 'tease out' differences*
- 5. Recommend the candidate take every opportunity to assess more combinations at this level to provide more experience and confidence you will need to draw on while judging*
- 6. You will often need to deal with difficult issues and need to be really secure in your judgements to be able to discuss with fellow ground jury member*
- 7. Communication skills are a vital part of the judging equation???. This system is not just about 'ticking the boxes' but designed to show your strengths and weaknesses*
- 8. So make sure you give yourself every opportunity. Practice certainly makes for better judges and judgements. Good luck.*

Shadow Judging – Needs More Training Assessment

- 1. Good, however needs to show scores to 3 decimal places*
- 2. Not in agreement, except last placing*
- 3. Marks a little high, not enough spread highest to lowest. Last horse final score 56.176% candidate 63.08% with 2 x EOC (not belled) not noted by candidate*
- 4. See above, rankings not in line*
- 5. At times quite good, but many times not relevant. Some "kind" but non constructive comments. Terminology incorrectly applied. Collective marks not always appropriate to test*
- 6. Frequently not. Candidate did not adjust mark when horses broke pace. Giving high marks for transitions from lengthen canter to working, when lengthen not clearly shown*
- 7. Not always appropriate, e.g. misuse of word "elastic"*
- 8. Needs clearer understanding of collectives and their relationship to body of test. At times too high or low compared to test. Marks not reflective of issues within the test, particularly Paces mark. Collective marks and comments not aligned.*

It is recommended that the candidate take the opportunity to complete more sit-in's, not necessarily all on a formal basis but to assist with the understanding of major faults, mark allocation and to develop more correct terminology.