



# WWR Evaluation Manual Responsibilities, Process and Certification

September 2023

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## *Contents*

Introduction.....	2
1. Skills.....	3
2. Pre-Tournament.....	4
3. Introduction and Clinic.....	4
4. Tournament Evaluation Process .....	5
5. Evaluator Team: Division of Labour .....	6
6. Tournament Summary .....	7
7. Referee Certification.....	8
Referee Candidate Certification.....	8
Evaluation of Certified Officials .....	9
Downgrading or Loss of WWR Certification .....	10
Loss of WWR Certification .....	10
Emeritus Referee.....	11
8. Evaluator Certification .....	11
Evaluator Trainee Requirements.....	11
Evaluator Training Process .....	12
Evaluator Observation and Support .....	12
9. Appendix A – WWR Evaluation Document.....	13
10. Appendix B – Sample 360 Evaluation.....	15

Note: An effort has been made to use official terms when referring to Official, Head Official, Evaluator or Technical Delegate. Where this was not possible the male gender has been used for practical purposes only.

## **Introduction**

The primary goal of this manual is to clearly outline the approved WWR process for evaluation and certification of officials, including techniques, roles, timelines and deliverables. The evaluations of all other roles at a tournament are addressed through the approved WWR 360 Evaluation process.

Additionally, this manual will cover the identification, training and certification of individuals who will serve in the role of evaluator for the WWR in the future.

Evaluators appointed by the WWR shall not interfere with the duties of the WWR Technical Delegate (TD), the delivery of competition, or with the activities of the Local Organizing Committee (LOC). Any issues arising during the tournament should be addressed to the Head Official (HO).

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## 1. Skills

WWR Evaluator's should possess the following skills to effectively manage this role;

- Sufficient verbal English language skills to communicate effectively with officiating crew, Head Official (HO), Technical Delegate (TD), and members of the Local Organizing Committee (LOC).
- Sufficient written English language skills to clearly express observations related to performance, using the WWR evaluation form.
- Sufficient computer skills to use Excel, Word, Power Point and e-mail.
- Ability to use video (YouTube or app based) when/where available and appropriate.
- Extensive rules and mechanics knowledge.
- Extensive knowledge of the chair check procedures, able to support the crew in managing the process.
- Ability to take effective notes that will inform the officials you evaluate and the reports you submit post tournament.
- Ability to identify and describe principals of advantage/disadvantage.
- Organized and detail oriented.
- The ability to diagnose performances, identify trends, provide solutions, and deliver feedback (both affirming and constructive).
- Ability to see the big picture as well as small details while observing the game, i.e., teams, officials, table officials and Game Commissioners (GC).
- Ability to be a charismatic and persuasive speaker to motivate the best performance possible from individual officials and the entire crew.
- Be an active listener.
- Able to deliver feedback that is thoughtful, concise, and specific (providing accurate accounts of specific game details when necessary).
- Able to remain professional when providing difficult feedback.
- Ability to manage difficult conversations and be a compassionate listener when appropriate.
- Ability to stay concentrated.
- Able to use multiple teaching methods to support the development of officials, including verbal, written, visual (draw or demo).
- Ability to collaborate with other Evaluators as well as HO, TD and LOC.
- Ability to use appropriate and specific terminology.

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## 2. Pre-Tournament

- Shortly after receiving notice of selection by the WWR, your tournament HO should contact you. This communication should be brief and outline items such as:
  - The evaluator(s) role within the senior team i.e., timelines, role in the assigning process etc.
  - Establish clinic goals and assign presentation topics or team building exercises for the evaluator team to deliver (the HO may request that you choose a topic or team building exercise).
  - Assign other duties, i.e., supervision of chair check.
- One month prior to the tournament the evaluator team should have a brief conference call to establish:
  - A pre-tournament ranking list of the officials on the crew – this is helpful to reflect on in the post tournament ranking and gives you a way to measure improvement.
  - Review clinic or team building topics to ensure you don't overlap.
  - Discuss and establish a shared understanding of referee expectations or goals for the tournament (should be tailored to the level of official and achievable).
  - Discuss candidates – if applicable.
  - Set goals for division of labor on reporting.

## 3. Introduction and Clinic

- The HO should provide an opportunity for the evaluator(s) to introduce themselves to the crew. The evaluator(s) should cover the following:
  - Expectations you have set for the tournament (i.e., Focus for the crew – game management, pace of game, partner support etc.).
  - Explain the evaluation process to referees and trainees.
    - Active/Passive evaluation through pool play and semifinals.
    - Reports completed on the final day.
    - Exit interviews will be scheduled after their last assignment.
    - 360 evaluation of leadership team.
- Clinic process
  - Support the HO's goals for the clinic.
  - Deliver assigned clinic topic or one that aligns with the expectations you have established for the crew. This will reinforce key expectations in the evaluation process.
  - Each tournament should have some level of team building included.
    - Prepare one or two team building exercises for the clinic.
    - Tournaments with more veteran crews may have an increased emphasis on team building overrule and case discussion.

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## 4. Tournament Evaluation Process

- Observe the work of each active referee during the tournament.
- Provide each referee with an assessment of their performance after each game you observe.
- Make sure that the information provided includes constructive technical feedback as well as positive attributes.
- Feedback should pertain to the individual official as well as to the overall performance of the crew.
- Techniques for evaluating officials and delivering post-game evaluations:
  - An evaluator should keep a neutral face while taking notes – when something happens that you want to write pause first and watch the play.
  - Choose key items to highlight, build an overall impression (individual and crew), be able to describe the quality of teamwork and have a sense of general adaptability to the game.
  - Create an environment that has the feel of a conversation.
  - Ask questions that allow the official to gauge their own performance and that of the team.
  - Can start with either referee, although referee 1 is often a good place to start.
  - Providing comments in the order of: Positive Feedback/Constructive Feedback/Positive Feedback.
  - Observe the body language of the officials in the post-game. It will help answer your questions.
  - If you have specific examples of issues, use specific time stamps or specific detail in describing or teasing out issues or concerns.
  - Finish with a general overview.
- Assist the crew with any questions they have regarding rules or procedure.
- Evaluate the personality of the referees, their behavior, interaction with members of the crew and overall performance during the competition.
- During the competition, the evaluator will coordinate with the HO to organize daily meetings with the referees. The evaluator should discuss overall themes or trends, both positive and negative, observed throughout the day. The evaluator should also be prepared to discuss selected situations and provide an open forum for discussion with the crew.
- There may be instances when the evaluator, in agreement with the HO, should be prepared to schedule one-to-one discussion with members of the crew, when necessary.
- Observe the work of the GC and provide feedback throughout the tournament.
- Report any concerns regarding performance or conduct of a referee, GC or table official to the HO during a tournament.

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## 5. Evaluator Team: Division of Labour

- For each game there should be an Active and a Passive evaluator.
- Active Evaluator: Should be focused on the game, take detailed notes, and sit in an agreed upon location, free from distraction i.e., Penalty Box, to observe the game. This evaluator will also take the lead in the post-game.
- Passive Evaluator: Does not need to make the game their primary focus. The passive evaluator may be taking a break, filling in paperwork or sitting with the crew or the HO. The goal is to observe for general impression, engage in discussion with the crew and potentially see specific instances from a different point of view. Based on observations made, this evaluator may contribute to the post-game.
- Establishing who should be the active or passive evaluator: The HO should provide the evaluator team with a copy of assignments daily. As a team you should assign yourselves to games. Pay attention to the number of times you will see a particular referee. Try to be as balanced as possible with the number of times you are active or passive for a particular official.
- Daily reporting: It is good practice to add or subtract key trends for each official (positive or negative) into the reporting paperwork daily, so you are not overwhelmed for the last day. Set aside 30 – 45 min at the end of each day to meet with your co-evaluator. If the trends you add improve rapidly, you can remove them. If that trend stays from day to day or marginally improves, you should probably keep it. Take a few minutes to meet with your HO to get their impressions too or see what topics they want to discuss in the evening meeting.
- Contribution to assignments: After the first day of competition, the HO should consult with the evaluating team each day to discuss assignments. The evaluating team should provide insight into their feelings on the progress of officials as well as suggestions on pairings they would like to see. Evaluators should also weigh in on playoff assignments. Ultimately the final decision on assignments rests with the HO.
  - Final Day:
    - Finalize reports for each referee and schedule exit interviews.
    - Choose one evaluator to send reports to after the exit interview is over.
- Try to have a balance of key trends that each of you has observed as well as some specifics from each of your notes. This is especially important for trainees. This provides a balanced report.

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## 6. Tournament Summary

- The evaluator(s) must provide a post tournament ranking of all officials to the HO for the tournament and the WWR Head of Technical. The report should include.
  - Ranking in numerical order from highest to lowest.
  - The level of each referee evaluated (World, Zone or pass/fail for candidates).
- In the final report for each referee, the evaluator(s) should include:
  - Exam score (if applicable).
  - Fitness test result (if applicable).
  - Rank of Zone (80-89) World (90-100) – see certification for requirements.
  - Recommendations for each official's career trajectory, including rationale for the specific level of event a referee should be considered to attend in the future, strengths, and weaknesses.
  - If the referee being evaluated shows great potential to move to higher levels of competition quickly, please identify them as Fast Track.
- The evaluator(s) must provide a copy of the evaluation, in English, to the following people, immediately following the exit interview or within 15 days:
  - Referee and Game Commissioner being evaluated.
  - WWR Head of Technical.
  - Technical contact responsible for the official.
  - Head Official of the country for that official.
- Provide feedback for GCs through the 360-evaluation process and the exit interview if time permits.
- If necessary, you may request access to old reports for an official. This may help with your report summary. It may also guide decisions related to moving officials up or down in level.
- Provide feedback regarding partner evaluator, if applicable, through the 360-evaluation process.

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## 7. Referee Certification

### Referee Candidate Certification

- WWR Candidates will be evaluated and certified at non sanctioned events ONLY, however the event must be of a suitable standard and approved by the Technical Working Group (TWG). This is to ensure that the appropriate level of skill is assessed for certification.
  - See the Candidate Application Process for examples of approved events. The TWG has the right to approve additional events that qualify based on a high level of competition and National team representation.
- WWR Referee Candidates are required to confirm the following, prior to attending an event.
  - Complete the application form in its entirety. Use the following link for the application:  
<https://forms.office.com/e/Yjg59j5QZy>
  - Demonstrate that they can effectively conduct a chair check.
  - Obtain support of the application from two of the following three representatives: Country Head Official, a Certified WWR Evaluator, a WWR TWG Zone Representative.
  - Provide supportive proof of passing the WWR fitness test:  
[WWR-Guidelines-for-conducting-the-Yo-Yo-Intermittent-Recovery-Test.pdf \(worldwheelchair.rugby\)](#)
  - Provide supportive proof of passing a written exam, either online or in person, within 3-6 months of application. If the candidate has not had an opportunity to take an exam, a link will be provided on the application to complete the written test. The candidate must pass with a minimum grade of 80%.
  - Provide supportive proof of being involved in a chair check process.
- Candidates selected to move forward for evaluation will be required to:
  - Provide a \$100 USD evaluation fee to the certified Evaluator.
  - Pass a WWR floor test after being assessed in a minimum of two games with a score of 80.
- If the candidate is successful in obtaining their license, they will be granted 18 months to attend a licensed WWR event to ratify their certification. Once the candidate is ratified, they will be a fully certified WWR referee.
- If the candidate is not successful in their ratification, the evaluator will inform them they have failed. Detailed advice on where to improve will be provided, which will be shared with the initial evaluator. The candidate will be allowed to re-apply in 8-12 months.

Candidate Ratification at an event includes:

- Complete a chair check.
- Pass the WWR fitness test with the crew.
- Pass a closed book exam in English with a score of 80.
- Pass the WWR floor exam with a score of 80.



# WWR Evaluation Manual

## Evaluation of Certified Officials

- The evaluator(s) at a WWR tournament will provide a written report to each official using the approved WWR Evaluation Form.
- Reports should contain feedback based on observations discussed during the post-game conference. Each report should also contain a certification level of Zone or World. Candidates will receive a pass (Zone) or fail.
  - Zone – score between 80 and 89 points
    - If a Zone official consistently receives high evaluation scores early in their career, demonstrates a quick, consistent progression in skills, rapid implementation of feedback and command of advanced officiating concepts, accounting for the level of competition, the Evaluator may indicate 'Fast Track' in the notes. This indicates to the TWG that they should provide increased opportunity to a Zone official with this tag.
    - Zone officials should also receive a score of 80% or better on WWR written exam and pass the WWR fitness test.
  - World – score of 90+
    - To increase certification from Zone to World referees must demonstrate a consistently high level of excellence and an ability to improve beyond the minimum standard of 90. A referee must receive a score of 90+ on 3 out of 5 evaluations, and achieve an average score of 90.2, or higher, using the most recent 5 evaluations. At least 2 of the 3, 90+, evaluations must be sequential. Intensity of the teams competing, game quality and level of play should be considered.
    - A World level referee must be able to referee elite competition with a high level of consistency, including: consistent ability to sell calls with confidence, confident management of special situations, strong sense of adaptability to the game, comfort with a high pace of play, calm management of bench and player decorum, demonstrate strong game management skills, build player/coach rapport and bring out the best in their partner when placed in a leadership role, i.e. Referee 1.
    - The Evaluator providing the upgrade should ensure that officials demonstrate the above characteristics, consult previous reports, and have confidence in their decision.
    - A World level referee must also consistently score 90%, or better, on the WWR written exam to be eligible for upgrade. A World level referee must easily meet, and preferably exceed, the minimum standard set for the WWR fitness test on a consistent basis.

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## Downgrading or Loss of WWR Certification

- Downgrading of referees from World to Zone should be managed carefully. There should be a consistent pattern of evaluations below the score of 90. The 3rd consecutive evaluation below the score of 90 will result in a downgrade to a Zone license.

The following steps should be taken prior to downgrading an official:

- The first evaluation below 90 should be noted in the evaluation form.
- The second evaluation below 90 should be noted in the evaluation and discussed in the exit interview, with clear strategies provided to improve.
- The third evaluation below 90 will result in downgrading to Zone – The HO and WWR Head of Technical will be notified by email.
- If a World official is not able to pass the fitness test, they will be ineligible to officiate at sanctioned events until they can demonstrate the ability to pass.

## Loss of WWR Certification

- After initial certification, a referee who receives a 3rd evaluation, at or below the score of 80, will require recertification.
- The following steps should be taken prior to removing the license of a WWR official.
  - The first evaluation of 80, or below, should be noted in the evaluation form.
  - The second evaluation of 80, or below, should be noted in the evaluation and discussed in the exit interview, with clear strategies to support improvement.
  - The third evaluation of 80, or below, will result in loss of license – The HO and WWR Head of Technical will be notified by email.
  - If a Zone official is not able to pass the fitness test after 2 attempts, they will require recertification prior to reinstatement as a WWR referee. If a World official is not able to pass the fitness test, they will be required to pass the fitness test before they will be selected for the next sanction event.
- A referee who does not receive an evaluation score over a period of 3 years will be required to recertify prior to reinstatement as an WWR referee.
- A referee can provide retirement notice to WWR Technical Working Group at any time. This will move from active official to off court official. At that time the TWG will confirm the overall exit of the referee or transition to other off court roles. Referee retirements must be noted on their final on court evaluation.

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## Emeritus Referee

- Provided to an official who meets the following criteria.
  - Is no longer an active World or Zone official based on the criteria listed in the manual and has identified that they are retired as an active on court official.
  - Is currently and remains in good standing with the WWR.
  - Has been an active certified WWR World or Zone official for a minimum of 7 years.
  - Has attended a World Championship or Paralympic Games as an Official.
  - Has taken on leadership roles in the WWR while active or in retirement from active officiating.
- Nomination
  - Any person in the WWR has the right to nominate a candidate for the title of “WWR Emeritus Referee” from amongst the group of former WWR officials.
  - The nomination of the candidate will be reviewed by the Technical Working Group for approval.
- Jurisdiction
  - Emeritus WWR referees may still hold the certification to act in the role of Game Commissioner, Head Official and/or Evaluator at any event.

## 8. Evaluator Certification

### Evaluator Trainee Requirements

- In addition to the items covered under the Skills section of this manual, an evaluator trainee should be:
  - WWR certified for a minimum of 5 years or have extensive evaluating experience from another sport along with detailed knowledge of WWR rules and mechanics.
  - Have worked as a WWR referee outside of their zone at the WWR major championship level (European Zone A, America Zone, Asia/Oceania Zone or World Championships and Paralympics).
  - Have worked as an evaluator within their own country at the highest level of competition.
  - Receive recommendation from their Zone Regional Commissioner, a WWR Technical Working Group member or certified WWR Evaluator.

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## Evaluator Training Process

- Senior evaluator should review this document and set reasonable strategies and timelines for the trainee evaluator.
- Senior evaluator should take the lead as the active evaluator for the first evaluation of the tournament. When possible, the first active evaluation should be done as a pair. This allows the trainee evaluator to get a feel for the style of notes, key observations and analysis that the senior evaluator looks for.
- The senior evaluator should also take the lead in the initial post-game.
  - After the initial post-game, the senior evaluator should debrief the trainee evaluator. Take the time to review strategies around positive and negative feedback, conversational evaluation, self-evaluations, and inquisitive evaluation.
  - It is also important to provide strategies that emphasize concise language, read body language, and complete evaluations with a positive summary statement.

## Evaluator Observation and Support

- The senior evaluator should take the time to observe the trainee evaluator while acting in the passive evaluator role.
  - Connecting with the trainee evaluator at half time and prior to entering the post-game meeting, over the course of their first few evaluations, to review and compare notes and answer any questions that come up in the observation process.
  - The senior evaluator should support the first few post-game interviews with observations and/or questions, if necessary.
  - After each post-game the senior evaluator should provide any feedback necessary to improve post-game delivery for the trainee.

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## 9. Appendix A – WWR Evaluation Document

 World Wheelchair Rugby	<b>OFFICIATING</b> <b>INTERNATIONAL WHEELCHAIR RUGBY</b> (Evaluation Form)
---	--

**OFFICIAL:** \_\_\_\_\_

**PARTNER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**EVALUATOR:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Tournament:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Intensity:** High: \_\_\_\_\_ Medium: \_\_\_\_\_ Low: \_\_\_\_\_

### INTERNATIONAL RANKS OBTAINABLE

level 1 - World	90+ on theory & 90+ on practical	
level 2 - Zonal	80+ on theory & 80+ on practical	

**Note:** 1 point will be removed for each occurrence in Parts A & B; and  
2 points will be removed for each occurrence in Parts C & D

Part A: IMAGE (Personal & Professional)		COMMENTS	score	
1) appearance: grooming, uniform, conditioning				/5
2) attitude: punctuality, courtesy, concentration, intensity				
PART B: MECHANICS:		COMMENTS	score	
<b>coverage:</b> <i>(angle/distance relative to the play and to partner)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lead/trail</li> <li>- press</li> <li>- off-ball</li> <li>- dead ball</li> </ul>				/15
<b>signals:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- correct use</li> <li>- sequence</li> <li>- clarity</li> </ul>				
<b>procedures:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- tip-off</li> <li>- violation</li> <li>- foul</li> <li>- throw-in</li> <li>- time-out</li> <li>- substitution</li> </ul>				

# WWR Evaluation Manual

COMMENTS		score	
<b>"letter of the law"</b> <b>(knowledge of the rules)</b> - text - IWRF interpretation			/40
<b>"spirit of the law"</b> <b>(judgement)</b> - fair play - common sense - consistency			
<b>"application of the law"</b> <b>(call selection)</b> - adaptation to the game - maintain flow/tempo			
<b>PART D: GAME MANAGEMENT</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>score</b>	
1) relating with players/coaches: 2) teamwork (partner & table officials) 3) maintaining flow/tempo of game 4) handling special situations 5) choice/timing of intervention			/40
<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>0 /100</b>	
<b>RANK OBTAINED:</b>			
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>			
<b>AREAS OF STRENGTH</b>		<b>AREAS NEEDING IMPROVEMENT</b>	

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## 10. Appendix B – Sample 360 Evaluation



### TEMPLATE for 360 Feedback

Section 1

...

Thank You for your recent participation in a WWR licensed tournament.

To complete your involvement in this recent tournament can you please complete this survey providing your feedback on the performance of the Head Official and their support team in providing you the opportunity to succeed against your goals for the tournament

Section 2

...

#### Head Official (HO) and Assistant Head Official (AHO) Feedback

This section is seeking feedback on the performance of Head Official (HO)

1. This person communicated all required and necessary information in a timely manner

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

2. What were this persons strengths in the HO role ?

Enter your answer

3. Comments for Question 1

Enter your answer

# WWR Evaluation Manual

4. In what area(s) can the HO improve?

Enter your answer

5. This person encouraged and inspired teamwork among all team members?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

6. Comments for Question 5

Enter your answer

7. This person was open to providing and receiving both positive and negative feedback with all staff members

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

8. Comments for Question 8.

Enter your answer



# WWR Evaluation Manual

9. This HO, in coordination with the evaluators, balanced my assignments well in regard to various partners and teams.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

10. Comments for Question 10.

Enter your answer

11. This person adapted well to issues that occurred at this event.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

12. Comments for Question 12

Enter your answer

# WWR Evaluation Manual

13. This person arranged and organized an appropriate time for the fitness test, written test and chair check?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

14. Comments for Question 14.

Enter your answer

15. How did the HO communicate amongst the team on a daily basis?

Enter your answer

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## Evaluator Feedback

This section is seeking feedback on the performance of the Evaluators

31. This person provided a clear understanding of their expectations for this event.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

32. Comments for Question 33

Enter your answer

33. What were this persons strengths in the Evaluator role ?

Enter your answer

34. In what area(s) can the Evaluator improve?

Enter your answer

# WWR Evaluation Manual

35. This person communicated in a way that was clear and understandable?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

36. Comments for Question 37

Enter your answer

37. How did the evaluator contribute to the overall success of the officiating team?

Enter your answer

38. Provide an example(s) of how the evaluator encouraged teamwork amongst team members.

Enter your answer

39. This person had a good understanding of the rules and refereeing mechanics.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

# WWR Evaluation Manual

40. Comments for Question 41.

Enter your answer

41. This person addressed areas of concern and conflict in an appropriate matter.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

42. Comments for Question 43.

Enter your answer

43. How did this evaluator support the HO/AHO at this event?

Enter your answer

# WWR Evaluation Manual

## Game Commissioner Feedback

This section is seeking feedback on the performance of the Game Commissioners

44. This person communicated effectively with all team members.

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

45. Comments for Question 47

Enter your answer

46. In what area(s) can the Game Commissioner improve?

Enter your answer

47. This person communicated in a way that was clear and understandable?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

# WWR Evaluation Manual

48. Comments for Question 51

Enter your answer

49. This person provided input in the pre/post-game discussions?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

50. Comments for Question 53.

Enter your answer

51. This GC took an active role in developing a good teamwork environment amongst the team?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

52. Comments for Question 55.

Enter your answer

# WWR Evaluation Manual

53. What are three strengths you would use to describe this GC?

Enter your answer

54. How did this person support the referees at this event?

Enter your answer

55. This person had a good understanding of the rules and refereeing mechanics?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

56. Comments for Question 59.

Enter your answer

57. This person was open to receiving positive and negative feedback?

- ☐ Strongly agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Somewhat agree
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly disagree

58. Comments for Question 61.

Enter your answer