

# EVALUATIONS

## 1 – ROLE OF AN EVALUATOR

The evaluator must concern him/herself with the improvement of the quality of officiating, and the development of consistency within the province. He/she should be prepared to spend time with each official evaluated, discuss their performance, and make suggestions for improvement.

The evaluator must realize the importance of complete and detailed “reports”. These are important tools by which associations, and the National Officials Certification Program (NOCP) can evaluate and rate their staff.

In order to be effective, an evaluator must develop and encourage a positive relationship with the official. He/she must explain to the referees that he/she is at the game to assist them with respect to uniformity of rule interpretation, theory and techniques of positioning, judgment in calling infractions, and other related aspects of officiating.

The improvement of officiating is directly related to the effectiveness of the evaluator. The person who has accepted the responsibility of analyzing the performance of officials must also be able to communicate this information to the officials in a positive manner. The evaluator has been selected, because of his past experience so that young officials may benefit from his/her knowledge of the game.

## 2 – DUTIES OF AN EVALUATOR

There are many roles and duties for which the evaluator must be responsible such as:

- Attending required meetings
- Providing input on any required topics
- Evaluating officials
- Promoting the NOCP
- Meeting with the Referees-in-Chief in the region
- Submitting rule change suggestions
- Discussing rule interpretations
- Refereeing when required (optional)

## 3 – WHEN AND HOW TO TALK TO OFFICIALS

Should the evaluator talk to the official(s) before or during a game?

The answer depends on the game, the officials involved, and why that particular game is being supervised.

If the officials are experienced, and the presence of the evaluator in the room before a game will not upset them, this is the most desirable and honest approach in the evaluation process. If the officials are inexperienced, the evaluator may wish to go into the room and let them know that he/she is in the arena. At this time, the evaluator should stress that he/she is there to help the officials and not to “spy on” them.

It should also be made clear that should the officials have any questions or problems regarding the game or the rules, the evaluator is there to assist them.

If the evaluator has been sent to the game to “check out” an official because of some adverse report, it is recommended that he/she not go near the referee’s room prior to or during the game. In this case, the evaluator should stay as inconspicuous as possible, and determine the capabilities and conduct of the official in a “natural” situation. Incidents during the game must be discussed with the official after the game. Findings should be reported to the Officiating Committee for any action required.

When talking to the officials, either before a game or between periods, the evaluator should be careful not to be overly critical or “tear a strip” off of them. This would only change the game pattern, and could severely upset their confidence, possibly leading to problems in the game. Any severe criticism should be left until after the game. Any comments made before a game, or between periods, should be minor points (e.g. suggestions to improve positioning or correct signals).

When talking to the officials, both should be addressed at the same time, providing neither objects. This encourages them to work as a team.

The evaluator should always be honest, *objective* and constructive when talking to officials. Officials should never be told one thing in person, and have something contradictory indicated in their game report. A method or solution with which they may correct or improve themselves should be provided by the evaluator with each criticism.

The evaluator should never, at any time, be openly critical of a game official or the league he/she represents. Spectators and players are a strange breed, and are always quick to believe negative rather than positive comments about an official. In short, the actions and comments of an evaluator must be above reproach at all times.

## **4 – GENERAL OBSERVATIONS**

What does an evaluator look for when attending a game? When evaluating a new or prospective official, probably the first question the evaluator asks him/herself is, “Does the individual look and act like an official? We all know that “initial impression” has a very lasting and influential effect.

The following is a list of features that the evaluator will observe during the course of the evaluation:

1. Does the official look and act like an official on the floor?
2. Is the official neat, clean, well-groomed, clean sweater, white laces, pants pressed?
3. Is the official strong, have good speed, good balance, and agility?
4. Does the official have good natural positioning, or is he/she continually out of position?  
What is the reason for being out of position? Is it due to lack of experience, or lack of hustle?  
Does he/she miss rule infractions as a result of poor positioning?
5. Does the official appear to be in good physical condition?
6. Is he/she in control of him/herself and the game?
7. What kind of relationship does the official have with the players and coaches? Does he/she have the respect of the players and coaches?
8. Does he/she have a thorough knowledge of required duties before, during and after a game?
9. Does the official display enthusiasm, hustle, and an interest in the game?

## **5 – SUPERVISOR’S EVALUATION FORMS**

The Supervisor’s Evaluation Form has been divided into three (3) areas: A. Personal Characteristics; B. Official’s Competence; C. Comments.

For evaluators, we advocate the use of the sliding box. Each scale point on the evaluation form (Needs Improvement, Satisfactory, Excellent) is broken into three finite sections (i.e. low, average, high) in order to rate an official.

Needs Improvement			Satisfactory			Excellent		

If an “X” is placed in the middle of the “Satisfactory” box, it means that the official is satisfactory. If an “X” is placed nearer to the “Needs Improvement” box, it means that the official is satisfactory, but is very close to needing improvement. If the “X” is placed nearer to the “Excellent” box, it means that the official is satisfactory, but does not quite merit an excellent rating. The “X” must always fall within the confines of a particular box.

## 6 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

Evaluation of an official’s performance on the floor provides the official with the feedback necessary to improve the techniques involved in officiating. To do this, an evaluation form has been developed for use by officiating evaluators.

The objectives of effective evaluation are to:

- Improve the quality of officiating.
- Develop consistency in terms of the evaluation and assessment of officials.
- Provide a necessary instructional follow-up which reinforces the information presented at various Clinics within the NOCP.
- Develop consistency of officiating techniques with reference to rule interpretation, positioning, signaling, and penalty infractions.

## 7 – LEVEL 2 AND LEVEL 3 EVALUATION STANDARDS

The NOCP recognizes the critical nature of sound evaluation techniques. To that end, a complete Evaluators’ Clinic program has been prepared to train individuals in the art of evaluating officials.

The Evaluators’ Clinic deals in detail with all aspects of officials’ evaluations, including the procedure involved in delivering the information to an individual. All areas of the long and short evaluation form are discussed and explained, including the correct conversion of on-floor performance to an appropriate rank.

What follows is a brief outline of the components on the supervisor’s evaluation short form, indicating the *minimum requirements* for recommending a given level. For a more detailed investigation of this area, it is suggested the evaluator arrange to attend a Canadian Lacrosse Association Evaluators’ Clinic.

### Appearance

For both Levels 2 and 3, ratings should be mid-satisfactory or higher.

### Pre-game Duties

The official must ensure complete checks of all areas, as outlined in the clinic manuals. He/she must score at least mid-satisfactory or higher in this area.

## Positioning

For both Levels 2 & 3, the official must be in position the majority of the time (for that game) and rate high satisfactory or above.

## Mechanics

This includes the on-floor patterns and positioning for play, penalties and goal reporting. Ratings of mid-satisfactory or higher are required for both Levels 2 and 3.

## Teamwork

A mid-satisfactory rating or higher is expected for both Level 2 and Level 3.

## Rule Application

This item includes the subjective assessment of judgment and consistency. Each is described separately.

## Judgment

LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Advantage gained by illegal acts must be considered.  A few minor errors in judgment will be allowed at this level.  Evaluations must be mid-satisfactory or higher for Level 2.	Same as Level 2, except fewer errors will be expected, and a more philosophical approach to judgment calls will also be expected.  Evaluations must be high-satisfactory or above for Level 3.

## Consistency

The entire certification program is based on trying to develop consistency regionally, provincially/territorially and nationally. Hence, consistency cannot be over-stressed.

LEVEL 2	LEVEL 3
Similar situations must be handled in the same way each time they happen. Calls must also be considered with the interpretations of the certification program.  Consistency must be at least mid-satisfactory for Level 2 recommendation.	Must show a greater degree of consistency pertinent to the level of play.  Few mistakes, if any, should be evident for recommendation to Level 3.  A minimum rating of high-satisfactory is required.

## Penalties

Penalty and violation signals are considered in this section of the evaluation form.

All signals will be rated for:

- 1) Clarity
- 2) Crispness
- 3) Communication
- 4) Effectiveness

Ratings for violation and penalty signals must be at least mid-satisfactory for both Level 2 and Level 3.

### **Attitude**

The official should display the proper attitude (i.e. interest, enthusiasm, firmness and so on).

A rating of mid-satisfactory or higher is required for both Levels 2 & 3.

### **Composure**

Composure is something that must be visually assessed. The official must transmit the confidence that he/she is capable of handling a difficult game at a recommended level of certification.

A mid-satisfactory rating or higher is expected for composure if the official is to be ranked at Level 2, while for Level 3, a high-satisfactory rating is required.

### **Game Control**

<b>LEVEL 2</b>	<b>LEVEL 3</b>
Game control requires good teamwork.  Ratings at mid-satisfactory or higher are required for Level 2.	Loss of game control should seldom occur at this level.  Ratings of high-satisfactory or above are required for Level 3.

### **COMMENTS**

The final section of the evaluation form is the most important. This section allows the evaluator to expand on any points made in the previous section. Any ratings in the “Needs Improvement” column are to be justified in the Comments section.

It is recommended that the evaluator use a pad of paper on which to make rough notes and diagrams. With this, the evaluator can discuss points without making them “official” comments.