

Modern Era 6.0 Judging System

Introduction

The system is a combination of the traditional 6.0 system using its proven successful features with the addition of the desirable features of the proposed Code of Points system and the introduction of an innovative new scoring method and judging selection.

The system is simple, straight forward, easy to understand, easy to learn, easy to introduce, and easy to use. It is practical and suitable for the highest level of competition such as the Olympics and for the lowest level of club competition of the smallest federation member of the ISU.

The system provides visible assessment of the performances of the skaters by every judge drawn from a cross section of ISU members. The system is user friendly, skater friendly, fan friendly and public friendly.

The Revised 6.0 System Submitted for ISU Agenda

An alternate proposal for scoring system reform has been submitted by ISU member Australia for consideration at the 2004 ISU Congress to be held in the Netherlands next June. This proposal consists of an extensive set of revisions to the current 6.0 system, with the aim of meeting the dual goals of improved honesty and integrity in judging, and an improved method of evaluating skating performances. The proposal incorporates the best of the current 6.0 system with many of the desirable concepts under discussion in the Code of Points system approach, but with none of the latter system's many serious flaws. It retains the 6.0 judging system which is the emblem of figure skating, and the mark known over the world as the symbol of perfection, the attainment of which is the dream of all skaters. The proposal is sufficiently simple, open and transparent in its use so that skaters and fans can easily understand the results and have confidence in their reliability and integrity. It provides detailed feedback to the skaters and the public to explain why each of the skaters placed as they did, and gives the skaters and coaches the detailed information they need to improve their performances. It decreases the amount of subjectivity in the process and increases the objectivity. It allows the use of sophisticated technology but not to the extent that the system is so expensive as to prohibit its use by small federations or in small competitions. To this end a simple manual method of using the system is also possible so that all competitions at all levels can be judged according to the same criteria.

COMPOSITION OF THE PANELS OF JUDGES

The panel of judges would be significantly altered to bring greater immunity to misconduct or error on the part of the judges. For Championship events, panels would consist of 11 judges and a substitute judge, plus the referee and assistant referee. To eliminate block judging and deal making the panel representation will be limited on a geographic basis.

Six geographic regions are specified in the proposal, four in Europe, one for the Americas, and one for Asia, Africa and Oceania. Membership on panels would be limited to a maximum of two from each region so block judging would be effectively eliminated from the scoring process.

CALCULATION OF THE RESULTS

All the marks given by the judges will be entered in the computer and will be displayed on the score-board. The two highest and two lowest marks, both in the mark for Technical Merit and the mark for Presentation, will be dropped and the remaining seven marks averaged. This is called a double trimmed mean. For non-championship events or the Four Continents Championships either seven or nine judges would be used and only the highest and the lowest mark will be dropped thus giving a single trimmed mean. In this approach, judges who give excessively biased marks will have their marks omitted from the average that determines the results. Seven marks will go into the averages, instead of the five used in the Code of Points system, resulting in increased statistical accuracy compared to it. Further, the impact of a single biased judge that might slip through the double trimmed mean is reduced by 40% in this proposal compared to the Code of Points system.

The results will be calculated on total points and not on factored places. This approach has been taken to prevent place switching in intermediate results, to preserve the truest indication of victory and margin of victory in the results and to allow skaters in the long program the opportunity to win the event after a poor short program performance without requiring "help" from any other skaters.

The relative value of each part of an event would remain the same as currently; e.g. 1/3 for the short program and 2/3 for the long program. The total points in each part of an event will be multiplied by the same weighting factors as today and then added together. The highest total of points determines the winner.

JUDGING

The proposal retains the 6.0 scoring scale and the main marks for Technical Merit and Presentation, but includes significant changes as to how those marks are applied to evaluating a skating performance. The proposal uses completely "reflective" judging in the use of the marks. Reflective judging is a hybrid of absolute judging (or judging "in the moment") and relative judging (comparing each performance to the others).

Both the Technical Merit and Presentation marks are broken down into several sub-marks

The mark for Technical Merit is divided into three (3) sub-marks that specify the contribution from each type of element in a program.

	Singles		Pairs	
Jumps	0 – 3.0	Lifts, Throws and Jumps	0 – 3.0	
Spins	0 – 1.5	Spins and Death Spirals	0 – 1.5	
Steps and Sequences	0 – 1.5	Steps and Sequences	0 – 1.5	
Total	0 – 6.0	Total	0 – 6.0	

In both marks only the total mark (the sum of the sub-marks) for each judge will be displayed on the score board while the separate sub-marks awarded by each judge to each competitor for each component will be entered in the computer and will be shown in the classification lists and in the competition protocol. This will allow the competitors to have feedback on how the mark was composed.

Singles:

In singles jumps would therefore account for one-half of the Technical Merit mark (0 to 3.0), while spins would be one-quarter (0 to 1.5), and sequences and connecting moves the final quarter (0 to 1.5).

a) Jumps: number of different solo jumps, jump combinations and jump sequences, their difficulty and quality.

b) Spins: spins, flying spins and spin combinations (difficulty, quality, number of revolutions and positions, speed of rotation).

c) Steps: overall skating quality; multi directional skating; glide and flow; depth and quality of the edges ; difficulty and variety of the steps; difficulty, quality and originality of the steps linking the elements; connecting moves; difficulty and originality of step and spiral sequences.

Pairs :

In pairs, lifts, jumps and throws would make up one-half the Technical Merit mark (0 to 3.0) spins and death spirals would be (0 to 1.5) one-quarter, and sequences and connecting moves (0 to 1.5) the final quarter.

a) Lifts, Jumps and Throws: jumps, jump combinations and sequences, lifts, throw jumps, their difficulty and quality.

b) Spins: solo spins, pair spins, spin combinations and death spirals (for spins : difficulty, quality, number of revolutions, speed of rotation and for death spirals, number of turns of the lady in spiral position, speed of rotation)

c) Steps: overall skating quality; multidirectional skating; glide and flow; depth and quality of the edges; difficulty and variety of the steps; difficulty and originality of the steps linking the elements; connecting moves; difficulty and originality of step and spiral sequences; unison

In this approach, the contribution of each type of element to the skater's score is rigorously established. For singles, jumps would make up 25% of a skater's total score, compared to the Code of Points system where jumps make up about 42% of the total score. Spins would make up 12.5% of the total score compared to 8% under the Code of Point system. With the publication of these sub-marks all would know exactly the relative contribution of each type of element to the total score and where each skater stands for each type of element.

In order to make consistent use of the five sub-marks, the technical committee would be called upon to provide specific examples of the marks appropriate for common examples of program content. The purpose of this is to insure consistency in the marks from competition to competition and to assist in implementing completely reflective judging.

The Presentation mark is subdivided into two sub-marks for Harmonious Composition of the Program and Choreography (0 to 3.0 for each).

The sub-mark for composition would include

- conformity with the music
- utilization of space and ice
- carriage, style, and body alignment
- variation in speed
- seamless transitions between the elements
- unison (pairs)

The sub-mark for choreography would include

- creativity and originality
- conformity of elements and steps to the music
- interpretation and expression of the music
- expression projected to the audience

In the proposal the meaning of each mark has been more precisely defined to include both a standard of difficulty and quality.

0 = Not skated.

1 = Very weak difficulty and skill, executed with corresponding quality.

2 = Weak difficulty and skill, executed with corresponding quality.

3 = Mediocre difficulty and skill, executed with corresponding quality.

4 = Good difficulty and skill, executed with corresponding quality.

5 = Very good difficulty and skill, executed with corresponding quality.

6 = Outstanding difficulty and skill at the maximum possible limit of human ability, executed perfectly.

Decimals to two places to the nearest 0.05 are permitted as further intermediate values (e.g. 1.15, 3.85, 5.55)

This doubles the number of individual marks and increases the number of total marks by a factor of four. Under this proposal marks do not have to be saved, completely reflective marking can be used, and the point differences from one place to another become statistically meaningful.

ADVANTAGES OF THE SYSTEM

The proposal offers many improvements to the process of judging skating competitions without introducing any of the problems associated with the Code of Points system. It is sufficiently similar to the current 6.0 system to guarantee it will function as expected without the need to extensively retrain all judges, which means it can be painlessly adopted for use in all countries for all levels of competition. It is sufficiently new and innovative that it can bring real reform to the problems and concerns that face the judging of figure skating. Specifically, it offers the following benefits compared to the current 6.0 system and the proposed Code of Points system.

- **Preservation of the 6.0 marking scale maintains continuity with past results and records.**
- **Results fully reflect skaters' performances and the differences between them.**
- **Skaters receive consideration of every element and all aspects of their performance.**
- **All the numerical scores for each skater from each judge are published, providing complete transparency of information for skaters, the public and the media.**
- **Skaters can analyze their scores and the judges' assessments element by element to assess their programs' strengths and weaknesses in detail.**
- **Average point scores are used but the highest and lowest scores awarded for each element are not considered, ensuring that anomalous scores do not affect the result.**
- **The lack of judging anonymity guarantees problems will not be swept under the rug and enhances public confidence in the system.**
- **The lack of random selection of marks prevents results being determined by "a flip of the coin."**
- **The use of both "judging in the moment" and relative judging produces results with the greatest statistical accuracy possible, and produces the most meaningful results possible from a human judging system.**
- **The extensive statistical information enables rigorous comparison of results from different competitions and allows evaluation of the judges.**
- **The system can be used with a computerized note taking system or as a manual system, allowing use of one system for all competitions at all levels, regardless of the size of the competition or financial resources of the organizers.**