

# QBA CLUB DIRECTOR ACCREDITATION COURSE

Successful candidates for QBA Club Director Accreditation need to have:

1. a good understanding of the commonly used laws and the ability to interpret the less common laws
2. knowledge of the more common Mitchell movements: odd, even, twinned, 1½ appendix, appendix & rover
3. knowledge of Howells and three quarter Howells
4. the ability to add late pairs or tables to a movement
5. knowledge of American Whist, New England and Round Robin movements for teams
6. an understanding of double matchpointing including adjusted scores
7. an understanding of the principles of factoring.

1. Law 81C2 gives directors the responsibility of interpreting the Laws. The aim should be to be consistent with other directors as far as possible.

Detailed Notes on the 2017 Laws may be found at [https://qldbridge.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/lawsDetailedNotes\\_2024.pdf](https://qldbridge.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/lawsDetailedNotes_2024.pdf)

Questions may be put to the Queensland Bridge Laws Discussion Group on Google groups. To join the group, either send an email to [janpeach8@bigpond.com](mailto:janpeach8@bigpond.com) and an invitation will be forwarded or go to <https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/directordiscussion> and ask to join.

The ABDA website is also useful.

2-5. Almost all that a club director needs to know about movements may be found at <https://qldbridge.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/clubMovements2011a.pdf>

Most clubs will have reference books available. Bridge Directing Complete, Groner, Judi McKee are just a few that may be found.

Complex and/or unusual movements are best avoided. The director aims to choose the most balanced movement that is suitable for the number of boards to be played. That modern scoring programs can easily handle curtailed and unbalanced movements is not sufficient excuse to use them. The aim must be to run as fair a competition as possible.

**Example:** 11½ tables needing to play no more than 33 boards. Yes, a Skip Mitchell can be scored easily by the computer though time consuming by hand. The NS Rover Mitchell movement is the more balanced choice.

Credit cannot be given for movements that foul. Try drawing a mud map to make sure shares and relays are in the right place or that a skip is needed or not needed.

6. Explanation and exercises in double matchpointing may be found at <https://qldbridge.com.au/manual-scoring>

Directors need at least a basic understanding of weighted scores. When the director needs to adjust the score obtained at a table and there are a number of results that are likely had the infraction not occurred then the score he gives is weighted to reflect those likely outcomes.

Best practice is for the director to consult with non-involved players and other directors when judgement is required. What the director might have done in the same situation has little bearing

unless he is a player of similar calibre playing the same system. The question is what other players of the same skill level and using the same methods might consider doing.

Looking at the traveller to see what scores were obtained at other table is rarely useful. Other tables may have involved players of a different rank using different systems with different auctions and/or different leads and plays.

Note that it is the scoring unit that is weighted (usually matchpoints or imps) and not the table result.

**Example:** The director rules (after consultation) that an infraction caused damage and there is a 60% chance that 10 tricks would have been made and a 40% chance that 11 tricks would have been made in 4S had the infraction not occurred.

The board is scored with each result \* to obtain the matchpoints for each result.

NS Table Score	NS Matchpoints	NS Table Score	NS Matchpoints
420	8	420	9
450	14	450	15
-50	2	-50	2
420	8	420	9
<b>450*</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>420*</b>	<b>9</b>
420	8	420	9
-50	2	-50	2
450	14	450	15
-50	2	-50	2

40% of 14 = 5.6 and 60% of 9 = 5.4

So the weighted score is 11 for NS and 5 for EW.

The board is now scored as an average and the scores adjusted for these pairs.

NS Table Score	NS Matchpoints
420	9
450	14
-50	3
420	9
<b>Ave</b>	<b>8 (NS 11/EW 5)</b>
420	9
-50	3
450	14
-50	3

A computer would usually use the Neuberg Formula for the normal scores. (There is an explanation of this formula at <https://qldbridge.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Manual-Scoring-Neuberg.pdf>)

Club directors do not need to exhibit a working knowledge of the Neuberg Formula but should be able to explain to players why some matchpoint scores have decimal points.

Ideally, all scores on this board would be weighted to cater for 3.6 tables scoring 420 and 2.4 tables scoring 450. This is beyond the average computer scoring package at the moment but a frequency table could be compiled.

NS Table Score	Frequency	NS Matchpoints
450	2.4	14.6
420	3.6	8.6
-50	3	2

Working via the frequency table, 40% of 14.6 is 5.84 and 60% of 8.6 is 5.16 so once again we get the weighted score for NS as 11 and the complement of 5 for EW.

7. Similar material to that below on factoring may be found at <https://gldbridge.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Manual-Scoring-Factoring.pdf>

Players whose scores are to be compared must have an equal opportunity to win the same number of points. Factoring evens out the playing field when contestants play a different number of boards and/or when boards are played a different number of times.

- Note that a standard half table Mitchell, where there is to be a NS and an EW winner, requires no factoring. With an EW sitout, EW play fewer boards than NS. They are not being compared with NS so factoring is not required.

Two questions need to be asked about scores being compared:

1. Has everyone played the same number of boards? If not, multiply Boards/Boards.
2. Were the boards worth the same? Was a slam in one session/section worth the same as in the other session/section? If not, multiply Top/Top.

Sometimes both boards and tops will be factored.

Be alert about the factoring requirements for the following two winner movements:

- 1½ Appendix Mitchell where two EW don't sit out
- a completed NS Rover where one NS pair doesn't sit out (and the curtailed Rover with fewer pairs sitting out)
- curtailed Share & Relay Mitchell movements with a half table (not recommended).
- Skip Mitchell movements with a half table (not recommended).

### Week 1 of a Competition

10 tables Share & Relay Mitchell, 3 boards a round, curtailed one round because of a power failure.

- Did all players being compared play the same number of boards? Yes
- Were boards all worth the same? No. Multiply Top/Top

1 set has not reached the relay table so has been played at all tables so Top 18  
 1 set has not been shared so played 8 times so Top 14 so multiply 18/14  
 8 sets have been played 9 times so Top 16 so multiply 18/16.

### Week 2

8½ NS Rover Share & Relay Mitchell, 4 boards a round. (Colds & Flu epidemic)

- Did all players being compared play the same number of boards? No. Multiply Board/Board EW and one NS play 32 boards. The NS's who sat out play only 28 so Boards/Boards 32/28. All
- Were boards all worth the same? Yes, they were for Week 2 BUT
- Did a slam bid and made in Week 2 earn the same match points as in Week 1? No. Multiply Top/Top.

All boards are played 8 times so all have a Top 16 in Week 2. A Top was 18 in Week 1 so multiply Week 2 scores by 18/16 before totalling.