

Jim. In case you haven't got this at home, here is another copy for you to play with! We have it on the computer - found thanks to Heidi.

Charlie.  
29/1.

Drs Cees Beuk  
President IVTO  
Albert Cuyplaan 17  
NL - 3723 GK Bilthoven  
The Netherlands

A/5/2

10 September 1997

Dear Cees

### Trade 29 Ladies Hairdressing in St. Gallen

When you were in London on 28th August you asked me to let you have an account of how disciplinary problems were resolved and how the marking was carried out in Trade 29 in St. Gallen.

### Disciplinary Issues

Following the competitors' briefing at 1400 on 2nd July the Swiss expert Viktor Odermatt was seen to be discussing with his competitor a paper, which when confiscated by the chief expert turned out to be the projects prepared by the Swiss Hairdressing Federation (SHF) at the general Secretary's request. The projects had been considerably modified by the jury as some were inappropriate and it was presumed that the Swiss expert was explaining the changes. [The Swiss expert in Trade 30, David Portillo, was also found to have the drafts of the Trade 30 projects in his briefcase but said he had done nothing with them.]

At about 9.30 on 3rd July I and the two excellent Norwegian Chief Experts put the matter to Franz Schropp (FS), Daniel Sommer (DS) and Don Hatton (DH). We discussed options for action including my proposal that the Swiss Competitor should be allowed to compete but be excluded from the medals by making a penalty deduction on the Form 6. FS said that before a decision could be taken we had to allow SH Federation and the two Swiss Experts to put their side of the story. He also thought that if there was to be a penalty deduction to exclude the CH competitor from the medals, he should be told at the outset.

A meeting was called for 9.30 on 4 July (the first day of the competition) but obviously the chief experts were unable to attend. The representative of the SHF explained that she had faxed the draft projects, which were very late, to Viktor Odermatt on 25 June to check as she herself was not an expert. Odermatt, new to the competition, did not seem aware that the projects were confidential, said he was surprised a Swiss project was chosen as he thought others were available and in any case the jury had made many changes.

The witnesses withdrew. DS said that what SHF did was wrong and contrary to his letter of request which had stressed confidentiality but that it was a misunderstanding.

FS was reluctant to punish the Swiss competitor because of incompetence by SHF and Odermatt. The competitor should compete because the time between disclosure and the competition was too short to enable significant additional preparation.

The group decided that Odermatt should be wholly excluded from the jury and competition area, that Portillo should be excluded from the jury (because additionally he had failed to attend any of the preparatory jury meetings), but that the competitors should be allowed to compete without penalty.

This decision/recommendation was reported to the Technical Committee at 10.30 that morning and accepted without comment.

The Chief Expert later in the day accepted the decision commenting that the Swiss competitor was unlikely to win a medal.

Apparently, however, the Swiss competitor's performance improved on the second and third days. This led to the letter from the International Group dated 7th July which was drafted and sent to DS without my involvement. (The International Group was the 6 experts who with the chief expert managed the competition, but did not themselves undertake marking). I do not know whether they had the agreement of the other 12 experts, but I suspect not.

On receiving the letter FS said that he was not prepared to re-open the matter. The decision of the Technical Committee would stand.

In the event the Swiss competitor did not receive a medal and my only regret is that I did not argue more strongly for my original proposal, namely to allow participation but apply a penalty deduction from Form 6.

### The Marking Procedure

Following the instructions of the Technical Committee to maximise objective marking, the jury in Lyon amended the Technical Description to make all marking criteria "objective" by adopting detailed marking criteria. (In reality the marks are "quasi-objective" because they remain judgemental).

This was achieved in St. Gallen by allocating maximum marks to different aspects of a project. As you will see from Form 6 four projects had a maximum of 10 marks and four a maximum of 15 marks.



Thus for instance for a project with a maximum of 10 marks:

Form/Balance would have a maximum of 3 points	
Clean lines	“ ” “ 2 points
Harmony with ornamentation	2 points
Total look	3 points

The marking of projects attracting 15 points was similarly divided into 4 or more aspects with different maxima.

Each aspect was then marked by separate teams of 3 in rotation. They noted their views on working sheets and discussed any judgements where there was a difference of more than 2 points. The marks for each aspect by each expert were then entered on Form 5A. Compatriot marking was excluded by marking an x. The marks of team of three experts, (the teams being different for each aspect,) were then totalled and divided by the number of judgements, (taking account of the x exclusions,) the result being entered in the last line in each Form 5A.

The figures at the bottom of each Form 5A were then totalled and transferred to Form 6 opposite the relevant project letter (A, B, C, D etc). (At this stage it should be noted that because the projects submitted did not correspond to the letters or total marks in the technical description the letters on the left hand side of Form 6 should be ignored. Only those in manuscript are relevant). The figures on Form 6 were then totalled to give the final mark. All forms 5A and 6 were double-checked for mathematical accuracy, although you tell me that unfortunately a few errors still crept in.

This procedure was explained to the experts by the chief expert and agreed at the outset of the competition. I also personally cleared it with Daniel Sommer as being acceptable.

The following points are also relevant to the marking procedure:

1. All the marking was done by 12 experts. The chief expert and 5 others formed the “International Group” (one from each continent) who managed the competition.
2. All the experts who were marking remained in the restaurant during the whole competition, (visiting the toilet in pairs!) and the teams of 3 were called in succession to do the marking.
3. All equipment was removed from the working positions before marking began and mirrors were only identified by number, the key to which competitor worked at which mirror being confidentially recorded.
4. Sometimes mirror numbers were changed (and recorded) during a project to minimise risk of

disclosure.

5. Compatriot marking was excluded.

6. Because the Korean expert feared she might have marked "lower value" aspects I did a check and found that over the whole the competition experts marked out of between 22 and 32 marks, Mrs Lee marked out of 31 so had no cause for complaint, but this allocation of duties should be more accurately divided in future.

7. The whole competition was managed sympathetically but also with great determination by the Norwegian chief expert, who both listened to all views and then acted decisively.

8. The general atmosphere at the conclusion was one of great satisfaction and indeed happiness that it had been a very fair contest with little ill-feeling.

#### Other matters

You will be aware that the Trade 29 Austrian expert was excluded from marking on the last day by decision of the Technical Committee on recommendation of FS, DS, DH, the chief expert and myself after a hearing at which he, accompanied by Joseph Blattner were heard.

I attach a copy of my written account of the matter and subsequent correspondence between FS and Blattner.

#### Final Remarks

1. My own view is that the chief experts of Trades 29 and 30 precisely followed the intentions of the Technical Committee in making use of "quasi-objective" marking and in excluding experts who were to mark from the competition area. (Some of them found this irksome but I understand it is international practice)

2. The chief expert and I took decisive action to deal with each breach of the rules and whilst you might disagree with the Technical Committee's decision in respect of the Swiss competitor the matter was fully and openly discussed. Any member could have questioned the decision.

3. At the final Technical Committee meeting I expressed concern that all the marks in Trade 29 were below 500 and suggested that there would surely be a way of rectifying this mathematically since the experts were making relative rather than absolute judgements. FS said that the low marks were the fault of the experts and DS did not point out that the BIC system should have corrected this.

4. The competition in St. Gallen would have been generally much more satisfactory if more chief experts and jury presidents had put any suspicions and evidence they had before FS and the Technical Committee, rather than grumbling behind everyone's back and sheltering behind the excuse of "inadequate evidence". It is for the chairman and the Technical Committee itself to make a judgement on the "balance of probabilities".

5. This suggests that the disciplinary procedure should be clearly described in the competition rules and then vigorously used in Montreal and subsequently. I attach a draft which the UK purposes to submit for consideration by the Executive Board. It has been deliberately kept as simple as possible and presumes that it will be interpreted with common sense rather than legalistically.

I apologise for the length of this letter but I was extremely concerned at your implied criticisms which I regard as unjustified.

I hope that after careful consideration of what I have written you will accept that, whilst one can always learn and do better next time, Trades 29 and 30 were fair and well-arranged contests in St. Gallen.

Yours sincerely

JDG HAMMER CB  
UK Technical Delegate



IVTO

Competition Rules

Appendix 7: Disciplinary Procedures

1. Appendices 2, 3, 4 and 5 refer to the experts, chief experts and workshop supervisors who are 'found guilty of dishonest conduct, or refuse to comply with the regulations or the directions of the Organisation's officers, or behave in a manner prejudicial to the proper conduct of the Competition, will be disqualified from the Competition'.

These same provisions shall apply to any observer, interpreter, delegate or official accused or suspected of such conduct.

2. The jury president, chief expert, official or delegate who becomes aware of conduct in breach of the rules or likely to bring the IVTO into disrepute should in the first place report the matter to the Chairman of the Technical Committee.

3. The Chairman of the Technical Committee after due consideration and consultation will decide whether a formal hearing is justified and will arrange it for the earliest possible time.

4. The Chairman of the Technical Committee will be assisted by at least one vice president and the General Secretary will be in attendance. Appropriate interpretation will be available.

5. The person making the accusation may call witnesses.

6. The person accused may be accompanied by his/her technical or official delegate and may call witnesses.

7. In addition to the Chairman and vice president(s) each party shall have the right to put questions to those making statements or giving evidence.

8. The Chairman and vice presidents(s) will then decide upon their recommendation which will be put to the Technical Committee for ratification.

9. The members of the Technical Committee shall be entitled to put questions to the Chairman before voting on the recommendation.