

CSFOA Evaluation/Observation Committee Meeting
Wednesday, April 10, 2013 (5:30-7:30pm)

Members Present: Cecil Harrison, Richard Young, Clyde Thomas, Sheldon McGuire, Dan Cronin, Mark Bradley, (also present Dennis Wansor). Mark Bradley also sent out an E-mail to absent members to aid discussion. The following members provided E-mail discussion: Ron Hall, Cecil Harrison, Bill Huffor, Dan Cronin, Richard Young, Clyde Thomas.

The members discussed the following items:

1. Evaluation/observation rubrics

- In the January 16, 2013 committee meeting, members agreed to put together rubrics (either by position or for the entire crew) to aid evaluations/observations. Dan Cronin provided input for the Umpire position. Mark Bradley provided input for the Wing, Referee, Back Judge, and Crew positions. (Reference material: 2009 CFAA evaluation sheets, other associations' eval sheets, mechanics manual.)
- Discussion: Should the rubric sheets have a lot of detail or should the observer/official reference the mechanics manual for specific items? The "options" for the rubrics are:
 - a. Blank sheet (similar to RMAC evals).
 - b. Sheets with specific topics (little or no explanation) and some room for comments
 - c. Sheets with more specific explanations and some room for comments
- Mark Bradley will send out options for committee vote. We will not spend additional time creating sheets as the committee members had almost 3 months to complete.

2. New officials observation sheets

- The CSFOA board requested the committee address a new official observation sheet to help keep track of new official progress. Mark Bradley created an observation sheet for new and veteran officials based on a form used by the CSFOA crew chiefs in 2002. There was no disagreement with the form. The committee did not determine if end of season observations would be mandatory for the crew chiefs to accomplish. (This can be discussed at the next board meeting.)

3. How will the evaluation rubrics be used?

- This topic provided most of the evening's discussion.
 - a. Should the sheets be used for evaluations with consequences (such as playoff games and varsity games) based on evaluations? Most members do not like the idea of immediately implementing consequences. The consensus is we should "test drive" the sheets and see if they are an appropriate vehicle to provide feedback.
 - b. Eventually, the membership can decide if they want evaluations with positive and negative consequences. This will most likely be in following years.
 - c. The word "evaluation" carries a negative connotation. Should the sheets simply be called "Observation sheets?" The observations should not be threatening but should aid in crew member development.

- d. The rubric sheets must have “meaning.” This may eventually be tied to “consequences” in future years, but if there is no “meaning” attached, why do the observations in the first place? Many members stated the primary reason to have observations should be to help the officials get better. Crew members want feedback, and there is no consistency across crews. (Some members stated their crew chief had never provided personal feedback after games or after the conclusion of the season.) The observation sheets help provide details of game performance and by putting the observations in writing, the crew members can see areas for improvement.
- e. Clyde Thomas pointed out we currently have an “informal” eval system:
 - 1. Members are selected to crews in a particular order
 - 2. Games are assigned to specific crew members
 - 3. Playoff games are assigned to specific membersThis “informal ranking system” gives crew members insight into how they are perceived by their crew chiefs, but candidly, this has created some consternation (why am I not getting more varsity games?).
- f. The committee almost unanimously agreed an evaluation committee should not be allowed to “veto” crew chief selections. Crew chiefs are elected by the membership to lead the CSFOA (as board members and as crew leaders). Most committee members decided a separate committee should not have the authority to usurp crew chief decisions. CHSAA and the CFOA provide “checks and balances” for playoff crews.
- g. Making a certain number of observations “mandatory,” “recommended,” or “suggested” must be carefully considered. If a limited number of qualified observers exists, those members will most likely have games or will have dates blocked in Arbiter. Levying a “number of games observed in a season” requirement that is unobtainable makes “failure” of the system likely.
- h. As a result, the majority of committee members decided CSFOA can make the

4. Should the CSFOA develop an official rating scale (like other high school sports)? If so, who will provide the ratings and how will the ratings be used?

- The committee discussed how this would work and how it would be implemented. Many football officials are also basketball officials, so there is a familiarity with rating scales. The majority of committee members believe a rating scale should not be implemented this season. Crew Chiefs have the latitude to assign their crew members in whatever manner they choose. At this time, giving each official an official rating is not required.

5. Should we have formal evaluators? If so, how should evaluators be selected? How should evaluators be trained? How should evaluators be assigned (self-assign in Arbiter?) for a specific game or official?

- Observers/officials must be “credible.” The committee did not come to a conclusion on this topic. Since most decided CSFOA would not have formal evaluations this year, formal evaluators would not be required. However, if formal evaluations are still a concept to eventually choose or reject, the discussion is relevant for a future discussion. Options include:

- a. Invite retired officials and non-CSFOA officials to provide observations.
- b. Have crew chiefs “nominate” a certain numbers of officials on their crews to serve as observers. These observers would then be formally trained.

- c. Make the observations informal; crew members can request observations and can set up dates on their own.

6. Use of game film for official evaluations?

- Although High School game film is sometimes of less-than-desirable quality, the committee agreed game film is a useful tool to provide valuable feedback (especially because potential observers also work multiple varsity games and would often be unavailable to help with observations).

7. Expanding referee game report?

- Many members have stated they would like more feedback following games and seasons.

- a. Post game reports should be private for specific individuals
- b. Referees cannot/should not provide specific "position specific" live-ball feedback as they are watching their primary keys and aren't looking down/across field
- c. However, Referees can provide useful feedback on other position-specific observations and crew coordination observations.
- d. The committee would like crew chiefs to encourage/implement more comprehensive feedback.

8. How should officials be held accountable for rules knowledge? (Currently, we only take an open book, on-line exam.) Should closed-book quizzes be incorporated to ensure rules study/knowledge? What should be the consequence for low grades?

- The committee discussed the possibility of incorporating additional measurements to encourage/measure rules knowledge. Currently, members must take one test (open book) once per year. The committee acknowledged rules knowledge is a requirement and the perception is some veteran officials do not know the rules. The committee discussed this topic for a very short time and did not come up with recommendations. This will be a topic for future discussion.