



Member of the Federation Internationale de l'Art Photographique

AWARDS FOR PHOTOGRAPHIC MERIT RESULTS SPECIAL

Print, Slide & PDI Adjudication held at Wilmslow 27th & 28th November 2010

31 applications were adjudicated at CREDIT PRINT level, the following 21 were successful

Derrick Clarke	Bottisham & Burwell PC	EAF
Maurice Baker	Crewe PS	L&CPU
Stephen Coyne	Macclesfield CC	L&CPU
Geoff Dearden	Halton PS	L&CPU
William Edwards	Altrincham & Hale PS	L&CPU
Diane McCudden	Isle of Man PS	L&CPU
Robert Millin	Hassra Fylde PS	L&CPU
Angela Nicholls	Chorley PS	L&CPU
Sandie Holyland	Burton upon Trent PS	MCPF
Mary Jennings	Smethwick PS	MCPF
Tim Pile	Smethwick PS	MCPF
Peter Beachell	Penrith & District CC	NCPF
Stuart Skelsey	Bracknell CC	SF
Marilyn Taylor LRPS	Guildford PS	SPA
Beryl Heaton LRPS	Bristol PS	WCPF
Danny Heaton LRPS	Bristol PS	WCPF
Richard Johnson LRPS	Wadebridge & District CC	WCPF
Alison Mayers LRPS	Plymouth CC	WCPF
Brian Hopkins LRPS	Selby CC	YPU
Kenneth Peck	Scarborough PS	YPU
Caroline Watkins	Doncaster CC	YPU

11 applications were adjudicated at CREDIT PDI level, the following 7 were successful

Christopher Moncrieff BPE 3*	Maidstone CC	KCPA
Anthony Holloway	Holmes Chapel CC	L&CPU
Sue Jones	Isle of Man PS	L&CPU
Brian Law	Macclesfield CC	L&CPU
Joyce Streets	North Cheshire PS	L&CPU
David Tolliday	Macclesfield CC	L&CPU
Tracey Wilkinson	Chorley PS	L&CPU

e-news is sponsored by  www.permajet.com

Print, Slide & PDI Adjudication held at Wilmslow 27th & 28th November 2010

4 applications were adjudicated at **CREDIT SLIDE** level, all were successful

Keith Mason LRPS	East Grinstead CC	SPA
Linda Harvey LRPS	Keynsham PS	WCPF
Sheila Imrie	Paignton PC	WCPF
Alan Stopher	Huddersfield PIC	YPU

27 applications were adjudicated at **DISTINCTION PRINT** level, 6 were successful

Valentina Kulagina ARPS	Oxford PS	CACC
John Hartshorne LRPS CPAGB	Smethwick PS	MCPF
Dawn Osborn FRPS	Smethwick PS	MCPF
Wendy Collens CPAGB	Farnborough CC	SF
Basil Groundsell CPAGB	Farnborough CC	SF
David Robinson ARPS	Blackburn Leisure PC	YPU

9 applications were adjudicated at **DISTINCTION PDI** level, the following 4 were successful

Chris Mowatt LRPS CPAGB	Ormskirk CC	L&CPU
Austin Thomas	Wigan 10 FC	L&CPU
Gianpiero Ferrari ARPS BPE 4*	Sileby PS	N&EMPF
Pam Sherren ARPS	Paignton PC	WCPF

6 applications were adjudicated at **DISTINCTION SLIDE** level, the following was successful

Martina Bennellick ARPS	Cheam CC	SPA
-------------------------	----------	-----

6 applications were adjudicated at **MASTER PRINT** level, the following 3 were successful

Gordon Bramham ARPS AFIAP DPAGB	Upminster CC	EAF
Colin Marr AFIAP DPAGB	Dumfries CC	SPF
Jenny Hibbert DPAGB AWPf	Bridgend & District CC	WPF

4 applications were adjudicated at **MASTER SLIDE** level, the following was successful

Duncan Hill DPAGB	Scunthorpe CC	N&EMPF
-------------------	---------------	--------



Rock Concert by Sue Jones CPAGB

Print & PDI Adjudication held at Carlisle 4th December 2010

25 applications were adjudicated at **CREDIT PRINT** level, the following **20** were successful

Susanna Saunders LRPS	Whitstable PG	KCPA
Robert Lewis	Chester PS	L&CPU
Dr John MacFarlane	Keswick PS	NCPF
John Tillotson	Penrith & District CC	NCPF
Alan Walker	West Cumbria PG	NCPF
Julie Walker	West Cumbria PG	NCPF
Ian Woodley	Whitley Bay PS	NCPF
Dugald Bell	Kirkintilloch CC	SPF
Chris Bonnington	East Kilbride CC	SPF
Douglas Hamilton	Edinburgh PS	SPF
Sue Hamilton	Edinburgh PS	SPF
Ronald Russell	Kirkaldy PS	SPF
Frank Sala LRPS	Kirkaldy PS	SPF
David Scott	Dunfermline PA	SPF
Kenny Shields	Queens Park CC	SPF
Anne Eckersley LRPS	Bracknell CC	SF
David Multon	Dorking CC	SPA
Alan Jenkinson AWPf	Bridgend & District CC	WPF
Charles Akerstrom	Sydenham CC	WCPF
Dennis Hancock LRPS	Downend CC	WCPF

11 applications were adjudicated at **CREDIT PDI** level, the following **8** were successful

Derek Collis LRPS	Halstead & District PS	EAF
Garry Shorter	Ashford PS	KCPA
John Fletcher	Ribblesdale CC	L&CPU
Jeremy Malley-Smith LRPS BPE 2*	Wigan PS	L&CPU
Ian Whiston	Crewe PS	L&CPU
Judith Cook	Havant CC	SF
Margaret Ewer	Paignton PC	WCPF
Jeannine King	Paignton PC	WCPF



left; Troops Out by Jeremy Malley-Smith CPAGB



above; Dungeness Beach by Judith Cook CPAGB

Opinions expressed are not necessarily the opinions of The Photographic Alliance of Great Britain and the PAGB accepts no liability for any content.

Please forward e-news to anyone who would be interested and we would be delighted if you print it for your club notice board, etc.

Anyone who would like to receive e-news may register by e-mail to rod@creative-camera.co.uk
e-news editor - Rod Wheelans, 43 Lovers Walk, DUMFRIES, DG1 1LR tel :01387 257906

21 applications were adjudicated at **DISTINCTION PRINT** level, the following 11 were successful

Cathy Roberts FRPS	Beckenham PS	KCPA
Patrick Whalley	Crewe PS	L&CPU
Angela Adams	DAPA Group	MCPF
Paul Ashton	DAPA Group	MCPF
Joe Brennan LRPS	Wolverhampton PS	MCPF
Cherry Larcombe	DAPA Group	MCPF
John Powell	DAPA Group	MCPF
Robert Powell	DAPA Group	MCPF
Stephen Byard	Northallerton CC	NCPF
Rosamund Macfarlane LRPS CPAGB	Keswick PS	NCPF
Nige Nicholas	Brigden & District CC	WPF

GB Cup 2011

Open, Small Clubs and Nature

The Closing Date for entries will be 9 January 2011
for judging on 12/13 Feb 2011

Depending on entries, it may be necessary to judge the GB Cup Nature on a different weekend.

**EVERY ENTRANT CLUB GETS AN AV SHOW ON CD OF THE GB CUP
THEY ENTER WHICH WILL FILL A GOOD NIGHT AT YOUR CLUB.**

RULES AND ENTRY FORMS HAVE BEEN APPENDED WITH THIS NEWSLETTER






17th National Audio Visual Championships

16th to 18th September 2011
at Nottingham University - Sutton Bonington Campus



Details :-
www.navc.org.uk (from March 2011)
e-mail - enquiries@navc.org.uk

The Singer by Joyce Streets CPAGB

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

I receive quite a lot of feedback after every adjudication, many from those who thoroughly enjoyed the day but more than a few from entrants understandably disappointed with the result they obtained. Most of these are very dignified and courteous and we reply to everyone. There is an FAQ leaflet which we send. This addresses most issues but doesn't always satisfy the readers! It might be worth expanding on some of common themes from most submissions.

POORER SCORES THAN PREVIOUS ADJUDICATIONS

If you are entering for the second, or third, time you naturally use the pictures which scored well previously. These are your "bankers" and it is devastating if these do not score as well this time. It is natural to assume that your higher score was the correct one. but tis is not necessarily the case . We understand the disappointment and this extract from the FAQ tries to explain how this can happen.

Even judges are human and 6 acting together cannot be as precise as one alone. This variation is seen at club level when pictures are entered in different competitions and becomes even more noticeable if the picture is entered to several exhibitions. Over the longer term these fluctuations should even out. Sometimes photographs will score higher in a subsequent adjudication. Where you have a high score and a low score for the same picture it is probably borderline and the Adjudicators shaded their marks up or down to your benefit or disadvantage. You probably need to improve your entry. However, the fact that the same people have conducted the Review for many years ensures that these observed fluctuations in scores are taken into account.

You may be surprised to know that a 6 point swing occurs very often. We do not consider this to be inconsistency. From our point of view such a swing is quite understandable.

To illustrate, let us say that you require a "100%" picture to get a 4. If your picture is (say) a "95%" image - one that is very close to the standard required but still debatable - then all 6 judges will be on the cusp of hitting 3 or 4. If they all shade up it gets 24 and if they all shade down it gets 18. Someone may see something that others don't and may hit a 2 or a 5 so the score could be 17 or 25 from one panel to another. A swing up is as likely as a swing down but we don't often get complaints for the former. I attend every adjudication and I try to see every score by every judge. It is my job to ensure a degree of consistency from one panel to another and I have the power to increase the points given to low scoring pictures. Obviously, I do not have the power to reduce the points for high scoring pictures even if I have a different opinion. With the checks and procedures we have in place, I still feel justified in claiming that no-one has failed who should have passed but I cannot claim that no-one has passed who should have failed.

I realise this makes it very difficult to formulate the next submission but, although we do everything we can to iron out the scoring, judging is not a science and there is inevitably a small element of luck involved. If a picture is scoring on either side of the average you require it is probable that it is not quite good enough and you need a better image to ensure success. Most successful panels contain pictures that are potentially good enough for the next level and so obtain a sprinkling of 5s. Scores above 20 compensate for lesser scores.

EXHIBITION ACCEPTANCES WHICH SCORE POORLY AT DPAGB

From the FAQ. Regular exhibitors know that there is no such thing as a guaranteed acceptance and that a medal winner at one event can be rejected from the next.

We use "exhibition standard" as the level at which we assess DPAGB but this is only a rough guide. There are no objective criteria to describe what exhibition standard is. Our judges have a great deal of experience and are specifically briefed plus they have the advantage of seeing a panel of pictures which are right on the standard before they begin. Despite this there are bound to be variations from one set of judges to another.

Entering exhibitions is a very good guide but getting into an exhibition doesn't necessarily mean that a picture will be considered by the APM judges to be of "exhibition standard". If you enter a picture in a sufficiently large number of exhibitions it will eventually be accepted somewhere. Judging at exhibitions is generally against a standard but the pass mark ultimately depends on the quality of the total entry and sometimes judges will hit high scores for pictures that are not up to the standard but which they think will add variety to the exhibition. The "We have not accepted much landscape (say) so far" criteria.

Different criteria and fashions also apply in different countries so some pictures accepted frequently abroad may not necessarily strike UK judges as being of "exhibition standard". This is not to denigrate overseas exhibitions but the PAGB APM obviously reflects a UK viewpoint.

One exhibition can have completely different objectives and criteria from another. They may prefer a certain style and content of photography which the next exhibition does not favour.

Many exhibitions are assessed by judges who are not yet considered sufficiently skilled or experienced to be added to the PAGB list - of course there are very many excellent judges who are missing from our list. (If they are not nominated we may never know about them). In any case we have no idea of the standard required to gain an acceptance into any particular exhibition. Just as Good Club Photography varies from Club to Club so "Open Exhibition Standard" varies from exhibition to exhibition.

I was approached at a recent adjudication by someone who said that two pictures which had scored very poorly had been accepted into many exhibitions and I took the opportunity to look at them. They had been accepted many times but neither the judges nor I thought they matched our understanding of "exhibition standard". This illustrates perfectly the difficulty in valuing an image for your entry. (The good news was that the entrant concerned fell into the review range and we were able to find sufficient points - just a few - to justify the award of DPAGB).

Another entrant has quite understandably expressed disappointment that a picture which had been accepted in 10 out of 17 exhibitions had only scored only 14. To score 4 at DPAGB the picture has to be thought capable of a high rate of acceptance and 10 acceptances out of 17 is not bad although 7 exhibitions didn't think it was good enough. Were they wrong? Although it is hard to explain the score without looking at the image, especially as it also had obtained a "major award", we have no way of assessing the quality of the exhibitions concerned. At the end of the day most exhibitions accept 20% or more of the pictures submitted even if the general standard is lower than the organisers hoped for.

By the way, to get a 5 at DPAGB it has to be good enough to get a 4 at MPAGB - a high probability of being accepted most of the time and to achieve occasional awards. So, if you are assessing previous pictures for use in an MPAGB submission, only pictures scoring 25 or more have been considered by even one of the judges to be good enough at M level

SOME GENRE OF PICTURES ALWAYS DO BADLY

This is a more difficult issue. We often get letters and e-mails saying that the judges didn't like creative or portraits or landscapes or sport or architecture or something else. It is hard to substantiate this as such concerns often don't take account of the quality, or lack of quality, which really cannot be seen by the audience. When I look at the archive of retained pictures there seems to be a fair distribution of styles and genres.

There is little doubt that nature generally scores better than other subjects but there is little doubt either that nature photographers in general produce a higher standard of work than most other genres. Possibly some judges approach nature from a slightly different point where clarity, sharpness and lack of distraction is a tad more important than content. I've heard club judges say that "if it shows the behaviour in its proper environment and it is sharp throughout how can you mark it down?" I've never heard that said about a picture of a person.

Opinions expressed are not necessarily the opinions of The Photographic Alliance of Great Britain and the PAGB accepts no liability for any content. Please forward e-news to anyone who would be interested and we would be delighted if you print it for your club notice board, etc.

Anyone who would like to receive e-news may register by e-mail to rod@creative-camera.co.uk
e-news editor - Rod Wheelans, 43 Lovers Walk, DUMFRIES, DG1 1LR tel :01387 257906

Landscape is the one genre often identified as not doing well at the APM but I have seen little evidence of this. Good landscape gets good marks and we have quite a few DPAGB and MPAGB holders who specialise in landscape. However, much of the work submitted is unexciting and technically poor - more so I would say than most other subjects. It is a genre which seems to encourage lack of originality. Original landscape photography well presented always scores well.

The judges are specifically briefed on subjects such as Architecture and record work and the evidence is that they give good marks to good work. Where the content is less pictorial the technical quality has to be top rate and many fail for lack of sharpness and poor shadow detail.

We are all aware of fashion trends in amateur photography with some themes becoming very acceptable for a while but eventually becoming overdone. The real secret of success is to lead the trend or at least be in at the beginning. After a while, despite their best efforts to assess every picture on its merits, judges will become bored with the most frequently seen fashions.

THE REVIEW

The review process means that the same team of people look at all the submissions which miss by 5%-10% of the total mark. For scores below that, even if we feel some pictures have been under marked, it is unlikely that any panel of judges would have given a passing score.

The process has a double advantage. Most importantly it gives entrants who have just missed an opportunity to gain a few more points and achieve the award but it also serves as a check on the accuracy of the judging panel. If nothing can be upgraded from even a few points under then perhaps the marking has been a little generous. If we upgrade from scores more than 5 or 6 points below the target then perhaps the scoring has been a little low. Almost always the submissions that are upgraded are right on the edge and require a generous review to succeed. This demonstrates just how accurate our judges are.

THE FINAL (?) WORD

There is potential for a PhD to be done on the dynamics of a 6 judge panel! How they interact and how the total score is arrived at. From the entrants point of view almost the worst thing that can happen is that they all agree with each other! I can hear your incredulity!

The judges are not marking out of 30. We think of the marks as votes rather than scores. 4 is a vote for, 2 is a vote against and 3 is a near miss. In the main they are making a very narrow decision between 3 and 4, only relatively occasionally having to consider 2 or 5. If all 6 judges vote in perfect unanimity there are only 4 possible scores. 12, 18, 24 or 30. Two pictures could come up one after the other and be of very similar standard. If the first just misses it gets 18. If the next is very slightly better, just achieving the standard it will get 24. We rely on disagreement between the judges to obtain all the in-between scores without which the assessment wouldn't work successfully. So we actually want our judges to disagree, to interpret differently, to utilise their different skills and, ultimately, to mark differently.

About 100 years ago (or so it feels) I got my very first FIAP Gold Medal. The same print was awarded 6 points at the next exhibition and was rejected. How do you explain it? Who was right, who was wrong?

APM Adjudications must be the most difficult job that judges are asked to do. Every score counts and they have to maintain their concentration over two days and at three completely different standards. Our judges are very experienced and highly skilled. They bring immense knowledge and experience and they try very hard to mark to the specified standard. However, judging is an art, not a science and there will always be variations in opinion and interpretation. In my submission that will be much more apparent in the judging of exhibitions than in the assessment of the APM.

Rod Wheelans MPAGB FRPS MFIAP FIPF HonPAGB APM Chairman

Opinions expressed are not necessarily the opinions of The Photographic Alliance of Great Britain and the PAGB accepts no liability for any content.

Please forward e-news to anyone who would be interested and we would be delighted if you print it for your club notice board, etc.

Anyone who would like to receive e-news may register by e-mail to rod@creative-camera.co.uk
e-news editor - Rod Wheelans, 43 Lovers Walk, DUMFRIES, DG1 1LR tel :01387 257906