



A program run by the

ACT JUNIOR CHESS LEAGUE

With the support of

SPORT & RECREATION ACT

2005 WOMEN'S GRANT PROGRAM



The 2005 Canberra Chess Chicks were –

Bronte Bell, Abiah Bull, Jerushah Bull, Caitlin Cameron, Wendy Chak, Alana Chibnall, Rebecca Davey, Simone Davey, Emma Dunstone, Courtney Evans-Turner, Amy Flood, Lucinda Flood, Amy Frost, Priya Gakhar, Emma Guo, Gala Huang, Grace Huang, Holly Johnson, Karen Khoo, Alice Kristofferson, Joanne Lee, Kelly Lokan, Savannah McGuirk, Alison Murray, Amy Nicholson, Beth Nuttall, Rose Nuttall, Megan Setiabudi, Natalie Shadwell, Kayleigh Smith, Danica Spitaler, Sophie Trigger, Carys Trowell, Jennifer Williams, Yi-Jing Zeng & Yi-Ying Zeng

Contents

Why this Program?	4
Selection of Participants	5
Structure of Program	6
Inclusions	9
How did we go? <i>Our perspective, feedback and player outcomes</i>	10
Attachment 1 – Grant Application	12
Attachment 2 – Financial Report	14
Attachment 3 – Exit Survey Results	15
Attachment 4 – Tournament Results	18



Bronte Bell – age 7 years

Why this Program?

The 2005 Canberra Chess Chicks program aimed to identify enthusiastic young female players and offer them the chance to make new friends, improve their standard of play and consider chess as a sport full of opportunities!

It is recognised that girls fill a small minority of places in chess tournaments at all levels, from school, club and national tournaments to the international events. ACTJCL is acknowledged as a leader in developing young female players in Australia (contributing 11 of the 27 girls to play the 2005 national junior championship) but has itself experienced difficulty in broadening the participation base.

Specifically, the Chess Chicks program was structured around “team” participation, helping girls to build friendships with new players and encourage one another. It required the most experienced young members to take on leadership roles and take an interest in the progress and achievements of new players. There was a focus on quality, highly targeted coaching with a view to building skills and, alongside that, confidence as a player.

And it was meant to be fun



*Sometimes we were having so much fun we forgot we were working hard ...
AmyFlood (9), Rose Nuttall (12), Holly Johnson (9) Chris Tran (coach)
& Amy Frost (11)*

Selection of Participants

ACTJCL tracked the participation of girls through 12 months of events identifying almost 100 female participants (excluding inter-school events which have around 300 girls). The figure of 100 came as a bit of a surprise, almost causing us to revisit the need for such a program. However, once the group was narrowed down to those girls to participate in **more than one event** (exclusive of inter-school chess) we had a shortlist which was barely long enough to fill the 36 places allocated in the Chess Chicks program. Demonstrating again, that many girls had an interest in chess but few were sufficiently inspired by their experience to actively pursue it.

Six team leaders were selected from the group. These girls were our strongest and most experienced participants but ranged in age themselves from 8 to 13 years. Additionally, around 6-8 selected players could be regarded as regular, or semi-regular players with a pattern of participation that included tournaments and/or junior clubs but had not progressed to representative activity.

The remaining 20+ places went to girls with very, very limited tournament experience, little or no previous exposure to coaching & development activities but possessed of a “spark” of real enthusiasm for the game. Chess “ability” was not a criteria for selection. Almost all places were accepted on first offer with those who declined doing so due to other commitments rather than disinterest. Most actually, requested inclusion “next year” instead.



Jennifer Williams(10)from Bungendore & Yi-Jing Zeng (7) from Curtin

Structure of Program

The program ran from 9am until 5pm over three consecutive days. All the challenges, competitions and activities had the possibility to accumulate points towards the overall score for your “team.”

Monday 11 July

- 9am** **Player registration & team allocations**
Players were allocated to teams based on a series of random draws. Each team was made up of one player from each of the six (ability-based) coaching groups.
- 9.30am** **Chessboard relay!**
A very popular (and invigorating) start to each day as the teams raced one another to collect all the equipment needed to set up a board ready to play!
- 9.45am** **1st coaching session**
Each group had one session with each of the six coaches covering a range of essential skills. Each coach was able to tailor the sessions appropriately to cater to the differences in skill between the various groups which ranged from girls with international experience to rank beginners of only 6-7 years of age.
- 11.30am** **Test your memory!**
A memory game where each team had to try to remember the 30 items concealed under the tablecloth. This was a very successful cooperative challenge.
- 11.45am** **lunch break**
- 12.30pm** **2nd coaching session**
- 2pm** **Mystery relay!**
Probably our least successful activity. Passing an orange from one end of the team to another (under the neck & no hands) was either too difficult or too embarrassing for some of the girls although it was the source of much hilarity at the time. (*“Gross – it was like kissing” – Carys Trowell*)
- 2.15pm** **3rd coaching session**
- 3.45pm** **Transfer tournament**
Transfer is a chess variant played with a partner. Captains were asked to make up three transfer teams from their own team of six players with an emphasis on putting together teams to

achieve the best result (score) for the whole team, and not just for an individual partnership.

5pm Pick up time

Tuesday 12 July

9am Chessboard relay!

9.15am 4th coaching session

10.45am Super puzzle challenge

Another less successful activity. Every player had a sheet of puzzles mixing logic & lateral thinking puzzles with chess puzzles and wordsearches. Some may have been a bit difficult (although each ability-based group received a different set of puzzles) however the principal problem seemed to be their desire to tackle the most difficult (5 point) puzzle without success, and not move on quickly to the easier, but lower scoring, puzzles.

11am 5th coaching session

12.30pm lunch break

1.15am Mystery relay!

A much more successful relay was our egg & spoon obstacle race involving crawling under tables and weaving around chairs. Making the coaches compete as well was a highlight many of the girls relished! Better weather and this was intended to be an outdoor and more adventurous challenge.



A very (not) excited group of coaches challenged by their pupils to the egg & spoon obstacle course – Marija Jovanovic, Shervin Rafizadeh, Chris Tran, Tor Lattimore, Brian Fitzpatrick & WFM Shannon Oliver

1.30pm **6th coaching session**

3pm **Lightning tournament**
Lightning or “blitz” chess is another variation on the traditional game with only 5 minutes per player on the clock.

5pm **Pick up time**

Wednesday 13 July

Chess Chicks Championship

7x games with 30mins per player on the clock
Analysis of games

Presentation at 5pm



Coach Chris Tran helps Megan Setiabudi (standing) analyse her game with Rebecca Davey

Inclusions

6 x coaching sessions with coaches Marija Jovanovic, Tor Lattimore, WFM Shannon Oliver, Shervin Rafizadeh, Chris Tran & Brian Fitzpatrick.

1 x Chess Chicks shirt for each participant carrying the ACTJCL logo, Sport & Rec ACT logo, the Chess Chicks logo and names of all participants.

1x Chess Book valued at over \$20 for each participant.

Personalised scorebook and folder for each participant.

Afternoon tea supplied daily including fruit and a mix of other healthy & “naughty” options.

Pizza lunch and drink supplied on Wednesday.

Trophies for the winners & runners-up in the Transfer event.

Trophies for the winner & runner-up in the Lightning event.

Trophies for the winner & runner-up in the Chess Chicks Championship.

Trophies and movie tickets for all members of the overall winning team (having accumulated the greatest number of points across all games and challenges held over the 3 days).

*Sophie Trigger (10)
& Abiah Bull (7)*

*Abiah found the view
was better sitting **on**
the table!*



How did we go?

"I really enjoyed everything - there was nothing that I didn't like." – **Natalie Shadwell**

"Sophie really enjoyed the Chess Chicks program. We would support her to attend again if she had the opportunity to do so. Her chess improved considerably and she enjoyed the fun and friendship." – **Georgina Trigger** (parent)

"Thanks so much for organizing the "Chess Chicks" program. Amy really enjoyed herself, she really enjoyed the coaching and the whole program. She said to say thanks and she really likes her book – said she read some last night, reckons she couldn't have got a better book. She likes the puzzles." – **Sue Frost** (parent)

"The random relays like the oranges and egg and spoon relays, they're fun and keep the little kids interested. It was really good that we were in teams and were able to help the little people and get them involved in the many activities like the relays and the competitions. It was also a very good idea to get the games analysed. Going through the games with the coaches is a very good way of learning." – **Alice Kristofferson**

"I still say it was all great. Thanks for some wonderful days!" – **Alana Chibnall**

"Carys was bouncing after each night of the Chess Chicks program. She loved it." – **Stephen Trowell** (parent)



Alice Kristofferson (13)

Feedback from this program was overwhelmingly positive and 28 of the 36 participants have continued to participate in some ACTJCL activities after the program. Almost 60% of participants completed the survey and analysis revealed those who did not "get around" to completing the survey were mostly our (already) active players as well as a small number of more marginal candidates for the program.

There has been intense demand from the girls to "do it again" suggesting our program more than met the "fun" criteria we set ourselves.

"It was good, it was fun. I would like to do it again." – **Amy Frost (11)**

"Emma thought the program was great and would love to do it again. She learnt a lot and had a lot of fun." – **Lesley Dunstone** (parent of **Emma**, 6)

"I would like to participate in the same event next year if there is one." – **Megan Setiabudi (8)**

The friendships forged at the program have also been in evidence at events. One girl recently expressed disappointment on arriving at an event because she had expected a particular fellow "Chess Chick" would be there and wasn't. A brief moment of sadness evaporated when she spotted another Chess Chick she knew, reinforcing the positive influence of the new friendships on their participation.

The survey supported the overall success and excitement which surrounded the program over the 3 days it was held. It supported the observation that the “orange relay” was unpopular or marginally popular and that the “team” structure of the event was immensely successful.

Having games “analysed” was a part of the program that clearly caused a level of concern for some participants. This seems to have been on two fronts. The first was the requirement to record moves, something that can appear difficult & tedious to inexperienced players. The second was the perception that “analysis” amounted to “criticism.” Although within the survey this was often contradicted with some players expressing concern on one hand but almost all indicating they found the analysis really helpful.

Although all coaches are experienced with young & beginner players it is possible we may need to make a more concerted effort to emphasise the positives in future analysis of games. Equally important may be the need to explain to participants the benefits of really understanding the impact of every move. Inexperienced players tend to be very “result-focussed” and may not always recognise that a “won” game may have been able to be lost and a “lost” game may have held many opportunities to win.

Another interesting factor to emerge from the survey was that fewer girls than we expected identified “friends” or a lack of female participants as factors in deciding to participate in events. In predicting future participation, the survey appeared to indicate that increased participation following the program was most likely to be a consequence of a player feeling they were *more able*, and to a lesser degree because of new friendships.

Both factors were predictable but the emphasis on *ability* was less expected. It reinforces the need to continue to offer opportunities for girls to develop their play as competence builds confidence and confidence appears likely to build and retain player numbers. And, in providing such opportunities, clearly “girls-only” events are well subscribed and attractive to girls as our past school holiday development activities (open to boys & girls) attract children at around 75% boys and 25% girls – or around 10-14 girls per event. But the Chess Chicks program filled 31/36 places on first offer *and had a waiting list!*

In conclusion, it is highly recommended that ACTJCL run this activity as part of the annual program when funding permits.



Attachment 1

ACT JUNIOR CHESS LEAGUE

2005 Women's Grant Program

Application



1. **Program Name** *Canberra Chess Chicks!* – a 3 day school holiday program for girls who love chess!
2. **Level of funding requested** \$1800
3. **Program Aim** The “Chess Chicks” program aims to increase participation in chess activities by young girls.

Firstly, players will be identified through our Term 1 activities for girls. This is the time when we run our Primary School Championships for about 250-300 girls. We follow them with a weekend event for girls only, and a school holiday day for girls only. At the conclusion of these activities we intend to have identified 30-50 girls who we would like to encourage to further their involvement in chess. This will partly be talent identification and partly a reward for demonstrated interest & enthusiasm.

Thirty to thirty-six places will be available in the “Chess Chicks” program. The program will be structured in a way to allow the girls to build networks with other female players, be mentored by successful older female players and role models in the sport, and to improve their overall standard of play.

To facilitate these outcomes, girls will be allocated to teams. Each team will be led by an experienced female player/coach. Throughout the program, the girls are able to gain points for their team by participating in a series of games and challenges, and finally by a demonstration of their chess skill in the final day competition. We hope this will allow the girls to build social networks and friendships around chess as many fail to participate through the fear of “not knowing anyone” or not having a supportive friend with whom to share their interest.

The focus on the first two days will be on chess coaching in small, ability-based groups (not the teams themselves). Players will spend time with each of the 6 coaches over the course of the program. Each coaching session will last 1½ to 2 hours. Between coaching sessions (and occasionally, during) we will run challenges for the teams including fun, “ice-breaking” games, basic physical challenges and sports activities, trivia quizzes and chess-related problems.

4. **Project Need** The 2005 Australian Junior Chess Championship attracted 170 participants to Mt Buller in Victoria. Only 27 of those children were girls. Of those 27 girls, 11 came from the ACT.

We are already highly regarded in Australian chess for our development of female players. We are the 2003 & 2004 Australian Primary Girls Champions, have won the Australian Under 10 Girls Championship for the past three years (and placed second in that division also in the past two years), and have produced two female players with internationally recognised titles – WIM Laura Moylan and WFM Shannon Oliver. However that success is not far from a full expression of our female player population. It is not unusual to attend an inter-school Championship with 160 children and only identify 5 or 6 girls. Even running a highly successful inter-school event for girls in Term 1, the flow-on has not been a marked increase in the number of girls competing in the Open events in Term 2.

Similar to many sports, we have a major drop-off in participation by older girls when they reach secondary school. With numbers being small to start off with, the impact is catastrophic and leaves those who continue “socially isolated” at events, perhaps as the only girl, or only girl over 12 in a competition of 60+ boys.

We hope our program will **help the girls to build networks with other players**, allowing them to look forward to entering events to meet up with their “chess friends” – especially important for girls who may not have strong networks at their own school. We also **aim to improve their overall standard of play**, allowing them to play more confidently and be less intimidated by the strength of others. And finally, we aim to **show them the opportunities chess has to offer** by introducing them to our best players and role models and encouraging them to set goals for themselves.

In order for ACTJCL to build a strong future for female chess players it is considered essential that a greater effort be made to identify and motivate the many young girls in the ACT who enjoy playing “school” chess but have *never had the opportunity to learn to play well and never been encouraged to play at a competitive level.*

5. **Target Group** Girls aged 5-14 years. ACTJCL expects to offer places to 30-36 girls, several of whom will be well-known, established players (team leaders), others may play occasional or regular club chess without having had the benefit of structured coaching. The majority will have been identified through their participation in the Girls Primary & High School Championships.
6. **Community Benefit** In 1999, the International Olympic Committee granted FIDE (the International Chess Federation) the status of a recognised sporting federation under and by virtue of Article 29 of the Olympic Charter. This is the same status as the governing bodies for golf, rugby & orienteering have with the IOC. Chess is recognised as a sport broadly throughout the rest of the world.

Chess, as a sport, offers young girls opportunities at a school, club, state and national level and four young girls from the ACT represented Australia at the 2004 World Youth Chess Championship in Crete.

Should the “Chess Chicks” program succeed the ACT will experience a dramatic immediate increase in the number of capable and confident female players participating in events with a flow on in future years of increased participation amongst teenage girls and adults. In terms of broader community benefits, ACTJCL sees chess as a “clever sport” as it can “...enhance concentration, patience and perseverance, as well as develop creativity, intuition, memory, and most importantly, the ability to analyse and deduce from a set of general principles, learning to make tough decisions and solve problems flexibly.” (Dr Peter Dauvergne, July 2000).

There are also benefits, we believe, for all young players in just getting out and getting interested in something new! This program will be **Mind & Body Active!**

7. **Program Budget** ACTJCL has an existing venue and all equipment. We will need to engage coaches for the activity and wish to maintain a ratio of 1 coach for every 5-6 girls. We have budgeted \$100 per coach per day which is significantly less than the market rate for coaching in Sydney or Melbourne where such programs are managed by private chess businesses. We have a number of coaches who have confirmed their interest on that basis. (6 coaches @\$300 per coach for the program = \$1800)

We propose a \$30-\$50 fee for participants which will fund a souvenir shirt and a chess book for each of them.

8. **Evaluation process** ACTJCL proposes an exit survey of both player and coaching participants in the “Chess Chicks” program. ACTJCL will monitor ongoing participation by girls who have completed the program. ACTJCL will also approach parents of participants to determine if the selection of their daughter in the program has encouraged them to view chess as a valid and exciting sporting choice for her.

Attachment 2

2005 Canberra Chess Chicks – Financial Report

Description	Supporting Documents	Debit	Credit
2005 Women's Sport Grant – Sport & Recreation ACT	Submitted to Treasurer		\$1800
36 participants x \$50			\$1800
2 x participant (late cancellation & requested shirts) @ \$20ea	Kimberley Yeung & Natalie Gowor		\$40
TOTAL			\$3640
38 t-shirts @ \$14	Capital Trophies Invoice 7280	\$532	
Screen setup fee for shirts	As above	\$55	
Books (36 @ average price of \$22.31)	Aust Chess Enterprises Invoice 819	\$803.16	
6 x Hoyts Hot Cash for winning team @ \$8.75 ea	Hoyts receipt (M/c statement Libby)	\$52.50	
Wednesday Pizza Lunch 25 pizzas @ \$5 ea	Dominos receipt	\$125	
Wednesday Lunch 43 x soft drink @ average price of \$0.50	existing ACTJCL stock	\$21.50	
6 x coaches @ \$300 ea – Tor, Shervin, Brian, Shannon, Marija & Chris	ACTJCL chequebook	\$1800	
Trophies (Team, Championship, Lightning & Transfer)	Capital Trophies Invoice	\$103.80	
Tidyfiles (50 @ \$9.98) & 2x packs coloured card (@ \$7.77ea)	Big W receipt 7/7/05 (reimburse Libby)	\$25.52	
Reward Stickers (3 x \$2ea)	Homebase receipt 10/7 (Libby)	\$6.00	
Pencils (4 packs @ \$2ea)	Homebase receipt 10/7 (Libby)	\$8.00	
Afternoon Tea	Woolworths receipt 10/7 (Libby)	\$79.47	
Afternoon Tea	Woolworths receipt 11/7 (Libby)	\$25.57	
TOTAL		\$3637.52	

Attachment 3

CHES CHICKS SURVEY

The goals of our program were:

To improve the overall standard of play amongst participants.

To help them make new friends amongst other chess playing girls.

To show them opportunities in chess and foster an interest in playing more actively & competitively.

1. Program Inclusions. On the list of activities and inclusions please rate each one on a scale of 1-5.

1= Cool. I enjoyed this a lot. This was one of my favourite things.

2= OK. I thought this was pretty good.

3= Hmm. I didn't like this or dislike it. I really didn't think about it very much.

4= Yuck. I didn't really like this and would prefer something different.

5 = Aaargh!! I hated it. Never again.

Now rate-

Coaching Sessions 1 (38%) 2 (62%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Chess Chicks Shirt 1 (48%) 2 (38%) 3 (10%) 5 (4%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Chess Book 1 (66%) 2 (20%) 3 (4%) 4 (10%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Pizza Lunch 1 (48%) 2 (44%) 3 (4%) 4 (4%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Afternoon Teas 1 (52%) 2 (33%) 3 (15%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Stationary (scorebook, folder & pencil) 1 (48%) 2 (33%) 3 (15%) 4 (4%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Trophies (even if you didn't win them!) 1 (56%) 2 (29%) 3 (15%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Movie Ticket prizes (even if you didn't win them!) 1 (66%) 2 (25%) 3 (9%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Being part of a team 1 (76%) 2 (14%) **Assessed as pivotal to the program**

Chessboard relays 1 (52%) 2 (48%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Orange Relay 1 (29%) 2 (29%) 3 (14%) 4 (14%) 5 (14%) **Assessed as unsuccessful**

Egg & Spoon Relay 1 (57%) 2 (29%) 3 (9%) 5 (5%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Making the Coaches do the egg & spoon relay (heehee) – **just for fun but the kids loved it!**

Memory game (under the tablecloth) 1 (39%) 2 (48%) 3 (9%) 4 (5%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Puzzle competition 1 (25%) 2 (38%) 3 (29%) 4 (4%) 5 (4%) **Assessed as moderately successful & to be modified for future events**

Transfer Competition 1 (62%) 2 (33%) 3 (5%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Lightning Competition 1 (29%) 2 (48%) 3 (9%) 4 (9%) 5 (5%) **Assessed as moderately successful**

Championship Competition 1 (43%) 2 (24%) 3 (33%) **Assessed as highly successful**

Having your games analysed 1 (14%) 2 (62%) 3 (14%) 4 (5%) 5 (5%) **Assessed as moderately successful & requiring better communication/understanding between players & coaches for future events**

2. Coaching. Each coaching session was 90 mins long and the players spent time with each of the six coaches. It was very pleasing to see even our little and inexperienced players "hang-in" for the six long sessions. A little bit of tiredness was evident towards the end of the second day but the players seemed overall quite absorbed in the sessions run by our young coaches. On the third day, when players had to write down their moves, the coaches played through the games with the players afterwards to "analyse" their games.

Please delete those remarks which DO NOT apply and send back to me those statements which reflect the way you felt about our coaching & analysis. BE HONEST.

It was really boring - I knew all the stuff already. 1/21

I would like to do more coaching like this to improve my chess. 18/21

My group was really fun and everyone worked pretty well together. 19/21

I didn't understand a lot of the stuff the coaches were talking about. I was really confused.

1/21

The coaches made me think really hard about chess in a way I hadn't done before. 11/21

Analysis made me think I was doing everything wrong. 3/21

I have learned a lot of new things. 18/21

I never had the chance to ask any questions and ended up not really understanding some stuff. 2/21

I learned a few new things but mostly I knew it already. 5/21

I had done some things before but now I feel more confident I really understand how to use them in a game. 18/21

I don't really like chess very much and I wasn't very interested. 0/21

Everyone in my group was heaps better than me and I couldn't keep up. 2/21

The analysis was really helpful and I feel like I understand what I'm doing in my games.

15/21

I was bored because everyone in my group was taking too long to work things out. 0/21

We kept doing the same stuff over and over again. 3/21

The coaches explained most things really well. 20/21

I don't understand why we had to go over our moves with the coaches. 2/21

I was able to ask questions and the answers were really helpful. 18/21

Do YOU feel you are

BETTER 81%

WORSE 0%

ABOUT THE SAME 19%

as a chess player after participating in the coaching program?

In your games on Wednesday, and when they were analysed, did YOU feel you were able to use ideas you had learned in the program to help you play better moves or understand your position?

YES 62%

NO 4%

NOT SURE 33%

Are you likely to play MORE tournaments or participate in MORE activities BECAUSE you have improved and learned some new things?

YES 82%

NO 9%

NOT SURE 9%

3. Playing more chess & having fun. Selection for this program was based on participation patterns, not skill. We tried to select girls who love to play chess, irrespective of ability. You can teach girls to play a better game of chess but you can't teach people to be interested in something they don't like.

When you decide whether you or not you will enter a tournament - which factors are most important? Rank them 1 = most important to 5 = least important.

My Mum/Dad want me to play. Registered mostly 3-5

I think I might win a trophy. *Registered mostly 3-5*
I look forward to seeing my friends. *Registered mostly 1*
I enjoy playing & improving my chess. *Registered mostly 1-2*
This is a sport I play seriously, no matter what. *Cross-section from 1-5*
Other (please specify)

One of the aims of our program was to help you make new friends who also play chess.

Have you met many of the participants before at previous chess activities?

YES 86%
NO 5%
NOT SURE 9%

Have you been discouraged at previous chess activities because you didn't know other players?

YES 9%
NO 86%
NOT SURE 5%

There are (almost) always a lot more boys than girls at chess activities and a number of the girls invited have almost exclusively attended our "Girls-Only" activities.

Does seeing mostly boys at our activities affect your decision to participate?

YES
NO 100%
NOT SURE

Did you make new friends at the Chess Chicks Program?

YES 91%
NO
NOT SURE 9%

Are you likely to play MORE tournaments or participate in MORE activities BECAUSE you may meet up with your "Chess Chicks Friends" at these activities?

YES 33%
NO 14%
NOT SURE 5%
NO DIFFERENCE 48%

Are you likely to play MORE of our OPEN (boys & girls) tournaments BECAUSE you may meet up with your "Chess Chicks Friends" at these activities?

YES 43%
NO 14%
NOT SURE 5%
NO DIFFERENCE 38%

Attachment 4

Chess Chicks Transfer

Standings

Place	Name	Feder	Rtg	Loc	Score	M-Buch.	Buch.	Progr.
1-2	Kayleigh/Holly, Wendy/Rose,			5	15.0	21.0	18.0	
				5	13.0	19.0	15.0	
3-7	Megan/Grace, Joanne/Savannah, Natalie/Abiah, Emma/Caitlin, Alana/Lucinda,			4	16.0	23.0	18.0	
				4	15.0	23.0	15.0	
				4	15.0	22.0	15.0	
				4	14.0	21.0	14.0	
				4	12.0	18.0	12.0	
8-11	AmyFr/Yi-Jing, Simone/Priya, Alice/AmyN, Carys/Gala,			3	13.0	18.0	11.0	
				3	12.0	18.0	11.0	
				3	10.0	16.0	8.0	
				3	9.0	14.0	8.0	
12-16	AmyFl/Kelly, Karen/Beth, Yi-Ying/Danica, Bronte/Rebecca, Sophie/Jennifer,			2	14.0	20.0	7.0	
				2	13.0	19.0	11.0	
				2	11.0	16.0	8.0	
				2	10.0	16.0	4.0	
				2	9.0	14.0	9.0	
17-18	Courtney/Alison, EmmaD/Jerushah,			1	9.0	13.0	4.0	
				1	9.0	13.0	1.0	

Cross Table

No	Name	Feder	Rtg	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Kayleigh/Holly,			12:W	9:W	5:W	3:L	6:W	4:W
2	Wendy/Rose,			6:L	15:W	12:W	10:W	5:W	3:W
3	Megan/Grace,			8:W	6:W	13:W	1:W	4:L	2:L
4	Joanne/Savannah,			7:W	5:L	10:W	8:W	3:W	1:L
5	Natalie/Abiah,			15:W	4:W	1:L	7:W	2:L	12:W
6	Emma/Caitlin,			2:W	3:L	14:W	13:W	1:L	9:W
7	Alana/Lucinda,			4:L	14:W	16:W	5:L	11:W	8:W
8	AmyFr/Yi-Jing,			3:L	18:W	9:W	4:L	13:W	7:L
9	Simone/Priya,			11:W	1:L	8:L	17:W	16:W	6:L
10	Alice/AmyN,			13:L	17:W	4:L	2:L	15:W	14:W
11	Carys/Gala,			9:L	12:L	18:W	14:W	7:L	13:W
12	AmyFl/Kelly,			1:L	11:W	2:L	16:L	18:W	5:L
13	Karen/Beth,			10:W	16:W	3:L	6:L	8:L	11:L
14	Yi-Ying/Danica,			18:W	7:L	6:L	11:L	17:W	10:L
15	Bronte/Rebecca,			5:L	2:L	17:L	18:W	10:L	16:W
16	Sophie/Jennifer,			17:W	13:L	7:L	12:W	9:L	15:L
17	Courtney/Alison,			16:L	10:L	15:W	9:L	14:L	18:L
18	EmmaD/Jerushah,			14:L	8:L	11:L	15:L	12:L	17:W

by Swiss Perfect (TM) www.swissperfect.com

Chess Chicks Lightning - Round 8

Standings

Place	Name	Feder	Rtg	Loc	Score	M-Buch.	Buch.	Progr.
1	Smith, Kayleigh	Kay	1091		7.5	30.0	39.0	34.0
2-5	Guo, Emma	Emma	1007		6	31.5	39.0	29.0
	Setiabudi, Megan	Mega	473		6	30.5	41.0	32.0
	Khoo, Karen	Emma	651		6	30.5	40.0	25.0
	McGuirk, Savannah	Sav	569		6	29.0	38.0	28.0
6	Chibnall, Alana	Alan	649		5.5	29.5	41.0	28.0
7-12	Kristofferson, Alice	Alic	613		5	31.0	40.0	26.0
	Huang, Grace	Mega	603		5	29.5	38.5	26.0
	Davey, Rebecca	Kay	356		5	24.5	33.5	21.0
	Flood, Lucinda	Alan	298		5	24.0	33.0	20.0
	Davey, Simone	Kay			5	22.5	30.5	19.0
	Zeng, Yi-Ying	Sav			5	18.5	23.0	15.0
13-15	Chak, Wendy	Sav			4.5	28.5	38.5	21.5
	Nuttall, Rose	Sav	426		4.5	21.0	28.5	17.5
	Nuttall, Beth	Emma	209		4.5	20.0	28.5	16.0
16-22	Williams, Jennifer	Mega			4	29.0	36.5	23.0
	Murray, Alison	Emma	262		4	25.5	34.0	19.0
	Shadwell, Natalie	Alic	609		4	25.5	33.0	21.0
	Huang, Gala	Mega	224		4	25.0	33.0	20.0
	Spitaler, Danica	Sav	222		4	25.0	32.0	21.0
	Bull, Jerushah	Alan			4	24.5	31.5	19.0
	Frost, Amy	Alic	325		4	23.5	32.0	18.0
23-25	Trigger, Sophie	Mega			3.5	25.0	32.0	16.0
	Johnson, Holly	Kay			3.5	25.0	32.0	15.5
	Bull, Abiah	Alic			3.5	19.5	27.5	14.5
26-31	Flood, Amy	Alan	374		3	26.0	34.5	17.0
	Gakhar, Priya	Kay			3	24.0	31.5	13.0
	Evans-Turner, Courtney	Emma	253		3	21.0	27.0	11.0
	Lokan, Kelly	Alan			3	20.5	26.5	9.0
	Trowell, Carys	Mega			3	18.5	22.5	11.0
	Cameron, Caitlin	Emma			3	17.5	22.5	11.0
32	Nicholson, Amy	Alic			2.5	18.0	23.0	9.5
33	Zeng, Yi-Jing	Alic			2	21.0	27.0	10.0
34	Dunstone, Emma	Alan			1.5	19.0	25.0	5.5
35	Lee, Joanne	Sav			1	21.0	28.0	6.0
36	Bell, Bronte	kay			0	21.5	29.0	0.0

Cross Table

No	Name	Feder	Rtg	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Smith, Kayleigh	Kay		19:W	11:W	6:W	8:W	9:D	34:W	2:W	4:W
2.	Guo, Emma	Emma		20:W	13:W	5:W	9:L	4:W	8:W	1:L	7:W
3.	Khoo, Karen	Emma		21:W	12:W	8:L	4:L	14:W	25:W	34:W	9:W
4.	Chibnall, Alana	Alan		22:W	15:W	7:D	3:W	2:L	17:W	24:W	1:L
5.	Kristofferson, Alice	Alic		23:W	14:W	2:L	7:W	17:W	9:L	12:W	8:L
6.	Shadwell, Natalie	Alic		24:W	17:W	1:L	15:W	34:L	7:L	18:L	20:W
7.	Huang, Grace	Mega		25:W	18:W	4:D	5:L	11:W	6:W	9:D	2:L
8.	McGuirk, Savannah	Sav		26:W	28:W	3:W	1:L	24:W	2:L	22:W	5:W
9.	Setiabudi, Megan	Mega		27:W	34:W	10:W	2:W	1:D	5:W	7:D	3:L
10.	Nuttall, Rose	Sav		28:L	26:W	9:L	27:W	22:L	36:W	15:W	24:D
11.	Flood, Amy	Alan		29:W	1:L	22:W	17:L	7:L	21:W	25:L	19:L
12.	Davey, Rebecca	Kay		30:W	3:L	24:L	32:W	28:W	15:W	5:L	34:W
13.	Frost, Amy	Alic		31:W	2:L	21:W	18:L	25:L	23:W	35:L	27:W
14.	Flood, Lucinda	Alan		32:W	5:L	27:W	34:L	3:L	28:W	17:W	22:W
15.	Murray, Alison	Emma		33:W	4:L	25:W	6:L	18:W	12:L	10:L	23:W
16.	Evans-Turner, Courtney	Emma		34:L	27:L	30:W	28:L	19:W	35:L	33:L	29:W
17.	Huang, Gala	Mega		35:W	6:L	31:W	11:W	5:L	4:L	14:L	33:W
18.	Spitaler, Danica	Sav		36:W	7:L	28:W	13:W	15:L	24:L	6:W	25:L
19.	Nuttall, Beth	Emma		1:L	29:W	32:D	24:L	16:L	27:W	30:W	11:W
20.	Bell, Bronte	kay		2:L	31:L	34:L	35:L	26:L	33:L	23:L	6:L
21.	Bull, Abiah	Alic		3:L	30:W	13:L	36:W	32:L	11:L	31:W	28:D
22.	Bull, Jerushah	Alan		4:L	33:W	11:L	29:W	10:W	32:W	8:L	14:L
23.	Cameron, Caitlin	Emma		5:L	32:L	36:L	26:W	31:W	13:L	20:W	15:L
24.	Chak, Wendy	Sav		6:L	35:W	12:W	19:W	8:L	18:W	4:L	10:D

25. Davey, Simone	Kay	7:L 36:W 15:L 31:W 13:W 3:L 11:W 18:W
26. Dunstone, Emma	Alan	8:L 10:L 33:L 23:L 20:W 31:D 27:L 30:L
27. Gakhar, Priya	Kay	9:L 16:W 14:L 10:L 33:W 19:L 26:W 13:L
28. Johnson, Holly	Kay	10:W 8:L 18:L 16:W 12:L 14:L 29:W 21:D
29. Lee, Joanne	Sav	11:L 19:L 35:W 22:L 36:L 30:L 28:L 16:L
30. Lokan, Kelly	Alan	12:L 21:L 16:L 33:W 35:L 29:W 19:L 26:W
31. Nicholson, Amy	Alic	13:L 20:W 17:L 25:L 23:L 26:D 21:L 36:W
32. Trigger, Sophie	Mega	14:L 23:W 19:D 12:L 21:W 22:L 36:W 35:L
33. Trowell, Carys	Mega	15:L 22:L 26:W 30:L 27:L 20:W 16:W 17:L
34. Williams, Jennifer	Mega	16:W 9:L 20:W 14:W 6:W 1:L 3:L 12:L
35. Zeng, Yi-Ying	Sav	17:L 24:L 29:L 20:W 30:W 16:W 13:W 32:W
36. Zeng, Yi-Jing	Alic	18:L 25:L 23:W 21:L 29:W 10:L 32:L 31:L

by Swiss Perfect (TM) www.swissperfect.com

Chess Chicks Championship - Round 7

Standings

Place	Name	Feder	Rtg	Loc	Score	M-Buch.	Buch.	Progr.
1	Guo, Emma	emma	1007	7	24.0	33.5	28.0	
2	Smith, Kayleigh	kay	1091	6	22.5	32.0	24.0	
3-7	Setiabudi, Megan	mega	473	5	23.0	33.0	21.0	
	Huang, Grace	mega	603	5	19.5	28.5	19.0	
	Shadwell, Natalie	alic	609	5	19.0	26.0	21.0	
	Kristofferson, Alice	alic	613	5	17.5	26.5	20.0	
	Davey, Rebecca	kay	356	5	16.5	24.5	19.0	
8-9	McGuirk, Savannah	sav	569	4.5	22.0	32.0	21.5	
	Chibnall, Alana	alan	649	4.5	19.5	28.0	21.0	
10-14	Khoo, Karen	emma	651	4	23.0	28.0	19.5	
	Murray, Alison	emma	262	4	21.5	29.5	17.0	
	Huang, Gala	mega	224	4	19.5	27.5	17.0	
	Spitaler, Danica	sav	222	4	17.0	25.0	16.0	
	Bull, Jerushah	alan		4	17.0	23.0	14.0	
15-19	Flood, Amy	alan	374	3.5	19.0	26.5	14.5	
	Nuttall, Rose	sav	426	3.5	17.5	26.5	15.5	
	Trigger, Sophie	mega		3.5	17.0	26.5	14.0	
	Lee, Joanne	sav		3.5	16.0	20.0	11.0	
	Evans-Turner, Courtney	emma	253	3.5	15.0	19.5	10.5	
20-29	Flood, Lucinda	alan	298	3	20.5	28.5	15.0	
	Williams, Jennifer	mega		3	19.0	26.0	15.0	
	Frost, Amy	alic	325	3	18.5	25.5	15.0	
	Davey, Simone	kay		3	17.5	24.5	11.0	
	Johnson, Holly	kay		3	16.5	24.0	13.0	
	Chak, Wendy	sav		3	16.0	23.0	13.0	
	Trowell, Carys	mega		3	15.0	21.5	10.0	
	Gakhar, Priya	kay		3	15.0	20.0	10.5	
	Zeng, Yi-Ying	sav		3	14.5	21.0	9.5	
	Lokan, Kelly	alan		3	14.0	20.0	10.5	
30-31	Nuttall, Beth	emma	209	2.5	15.0	22.5	9.0	
	Cameron, Caitlin	emma		2.5	11.5	15.0	8.0	
32-33	Bull, Abiah	alic	2	2	15.5	21.5	8.0	
	Zeng, Yi-Jing	alic	2	2	13.0	18.0	5.0	
34	Dunstone, Emma	alan		1.5	14.0	18.5	5.0	
35	Bell, Bronte	Kay		1	14.0	19.0	3.0	
36	Nicholson, Amy	alic		0	12.5	17.5	0.0	

Cross Table

No	Name	Feder	Rtg	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Smith, Kayleigh	kay		19:W	10:W	6:W	2:L	8:W	4:W	9:W
2.	Guo, Emma	emma		20:W	9:W	7:W	1:W	4:W	5:W	8:W
3.	Khoo, Karen	emma		21:W	12:W	8:D	4:D	6:L	17:W	7:L
4.	Chibnall, Alana	alan		22:W	13:W	14:W	3:D	2:L	1:L	10:W
5.	Kristofferson, Alice	alic		23:W	14:L	11:W	13:W	17:W	2:L	15:W
6.	Shadwell, Natalie	alic		24:W	15:W	1:L	14:W	3:W	9:L	34:W
7.	Huang, Grace	mega		25:W	18:W	2:L	8:L	26:W	33:W	3:W
8.	McGuirk, Savannah	sav		26:W	17:W	3:D	7:W	1:L	13:W	2:L

9.	Setiabudi, Megan	mega	27:W	2:L	29:W	15:W	12:W	6:W	1:L
10.	Nuttall, Rose	sav	28:W	1:L	26:W	17:L	34:D	29:W	4:L
11.	Flood, Amy	alan	29:D	16:W	5:L	18:L	31:W	20:W	12:L
12.	Davey, Rebecca	kay	30:W	3:L	28:W	32:W	9:L	34:W	11:W
13.	Frost, Amy	alic	31:W	4:L	25:W	5:L	32:W	8:L	33:L
14.	Flood, Lucinda	alan	32:W	5:W	4:L	6:L	33:L	26:W	18:L
15.	Murray, Alison	emma	33:W	6:L	30:W	9:L	35:W	18:W	5:L
16.	Evans-Turner, Courtney	emma	34:L	11:L	24:W	35:L	25:W	36:W	20:D
17.	Huang, Gala	mega	35:W	8:L	33:W	10:W	5:L	3:L	32:W
18.	Spitaler, Danica	sav	36:W	7:L	34:D	11:W	20:D	15:L	14:W
19.	Nuttall, Beth	emma	1:L	28:L	22:W	36:D	29:L	31:W	35:L
20.	Trigger, Sophie	mega	2:L	27:D	31:W	29:W	18:D	11:L	16:D
21.	Nicholson, Amy	alic	3:L	30:L	35:L	31:L	24:L	22:L	23:L
22.	Dunstone, Emma	alan	4:L	31:D	19:L	27:L	30:L	21:W	28:L
23.	Zeng, Yi-Jing	alic	5:L	32:L	36:L	24:W	28:L	27:L	21:W
24.	Bell, Bronte	Kay	6:L	33:L	16:L	23:L	21:W	25:L	31:L
25.	Bull, Abiah	alic	7:L	36:W	13:L	34:L	16:L	24:W	26:L
26.	Davey, Simone	kay	8:L	35:W	10:L	30:W	7:L	14:L	25:W
27.	Zeng, Yi-Ying	sav	9:L	20:D	32:L	22:W	36:L	23:W	29:D
28.	Trowell, Carys	mega	10:L	19:W	12:L	33:L	23:W	32:L	22:W
29.	Johnson, Holly	kay	11:D	34:W	9:L	20:L	19:W	10:L	27:D
30.	Gakhar, Priya	kay	12:L	21:W	15:L	26:L	22:W	35:D	36:D
31.	Cameron, Caitlin	emma	13:L	22:D	20:L	21:W	11:L	19:L	24:W
32.	Chak, Wendy	sav	14:L	23:W	27:W	12:L	13:L	28:W	17:L
33.	Bull, Jerushah	alan	15:L	24:W	17:L	28:W	14:W	7:L	13:W
34.	Williams, Jennifer	mega	16:W	29:L	18:D	25:W	10:D	12:L	6:L
35.	Lee, Joanne	sav	17:L	26:L	21:W	16:W	15:L	30:D	19:W
36.	Lokan, Kelly	alan	18:L	25:L	23:W	19:D	27:W	16:L	30:D

by Swiss Perfect (TM) www.swissperfect.com