

# 2022 Judge Evaluation Example

## 1. Meet Protocol (6 questions)

Did the Judge complete and return contract & travel arrangements in a timely manner? *(Yes / No)*

Did the judge follow meet protocol for open scoring(flash start values and score simultaneously)? *(Yes / No)*

Did the judge fill out routine summaries correctly(in long hand/fully)? *(Yes / No)*

Did the judge fill out inquiries correctly(in long hand/fully)? *(Yes / No)*

Did the judge conduct the meet with confidence and in a timely manner? *(Yes / No)*

Would you recommend this judge for NCAA Post season officiating? *(Yes / No)*

## 2. NCAA Rules & Modifications

### a) Correct Rules Application (Scale 1 through 5, 1 being the best)

Please note; if you select a 3, 4, or 5 on the scale you will be required to write comments and/or upload any routine inquiry or summary if necessary.

Do you feel the judge correctly applied the NCAA rules modifications **(for your team only)**? *(Select 1 - 5)*

1 - Judge correctly evaluated SV, UTL and/or difficulty value - any dispute in SV/UTL. was a subjective judgment, i.e., if connection/bonus not given was a subjective call.

2 - Judge had 1 - 2 incorrect SV, UTL and/or difficulty value errors, but were corrected after conference or inquiry submission, i.e., mistakenly did not apply bonus correctly - this is not for subjective skill/bonus credit.

3 - Judge had multiple (3 or more) SV, UTL and/or difficulty value errors. Mistakes were corrected after inquiry submission, but time taken for conferences/inquires/corrections caused slight disruption to the flow of the meet.

4 - Judge had multiple (3 or more) SV, UTL and/or difficulty value errors. Some or all mistakes were not corrected, time taken for conferences/inquires/corrections caused medium disruption to the flow of the meet.

5 - Judge did not know the NCAA modifications. Errors were made on 50% or MORE of routines on SV, UTL or difficulty value; time taken for conferences/inquires/corrections caused great disruption to the flow of the meet.

### b) Execution/Composition Deductions (Scale 1 through 5, 1 being the best)

Please note; if you select a 3, 4, or 5 on the scale you will be required to write comments and/or upload any routine inquiry or summary if necessary.

Do you feel the judge correctly applied execution/composition deductions **(for your team only)**? *(Select 1 - 5)*

1 - Judge was consistent from routine to routine applying execution and composition deductions; the judge stayed within the range of deductions from the JO code, i.e., bent knees is an up to .3 in JO code, no bent knee deduction taken was greater than .3.

2 - Based off feedback from inquiry/routine summary - execution and/or composition deductions did not appear to be applied properly, but were minor and subjective in nature - dynamics/rhythm/amplitude.

3 - Based off feedback from inquiry/routine summary - execution and/or composition deductions did not appear to be applied properly, but were major and less subjective in nature - OR the inquiries/routine summaries were not filled out properly, i.e., deductions written did not equal deductions taken.

4 - Based off feedback from multiple Inquiries/routine summaries - execution and/or composition deductions were applied incorrectly or inconsistently OR they were not filled out properly. Other issues taken into consideration - inquiry process or video review process not completed properly, i.e., video review adjusted due to SV mistake but score not adjusted due to "new" execution taken.

5 - Based off feedback from inquiry/routine summary - execution and/or composition deductions seemed completely out of line. Deductions taken were either extreme or inconsistent

**c) Bias (Scale 1 through 5, 1 being the best)**

Please note; if you select a 3, 4, or 5 on the scale you will be required to write comments and/or upload any routine inquiry or summary if necessary.

Do you feel the entirety of the meet was judged without bias, taking all teams into consideration?  
(Select 1 - 5)

1 - Judge was consistent in evaluating SV, UTL, difficulty value and taking deductions. Routines from all teams had proper execution taken when necessary.

2 - Taking the entire meet into consideration 1-2 scores seemed out of line with the scoring at competition. The remainder of the judgments seemed appropriate.

3 - Taking the entire meet into consideration - judge inconsistently applied execution, connections, rhythm, and landing deductions. In the comment section please list specific examples from your score sheet, i.e., judge 1 was .6 higher on team A and .3 low on team B for beam compared to judge 2.

4 - Taking the entire meet into consideration; judge inconsistently applied execution, connections, rhythm and landing deductions more towards specific individuals than towards a team. In the comment section please list specific examples from your score sheet, e.g., Judge 1 was .15 higher than judge 2, on both events for athlete A.

5 - Taking the entire meet into consideration - judge showed complete bias to one team. Please explain using specific examples from your score sheet, e.g., judge 1 was higher on 100% of scores for team A and lower on 80% of scores for team B.

## **Meet Referee Questions**

1 - Conducted pre-meet duties with coaches (introduced self to Head Coach, informed coach where MR could be found, asked if any unusual skills).

2 - Treated coaches with respect (listened to comments, provided feedback, explained procedures, answered questions when possible).

3 - Processed inquiries in a timely manner.

4 - Clearly communicated the panel's decision when returning inquiry forms.

5 - Returned Routine Summary forms in proper format (e.g., no shorthand, deductions totaled score, other).

6 - Overall Rating of Meet Referee Performance.

7 - Monitored judges to ensure Open Scoring protocols were followed.

8 - Made efforts to keep the meeting moving in a timely manner (monitored conferences, tv holds, substitutions, score changes).

9 - Notated routines when not handling inquiries or other procedural matters.

**Any positive comments?** *(About this judge)*