

# **MEETING REPORTS**

## **TECHNICAL MANAGER**

### **Part 1**

#### **Contents**

- 1. Protocol for Chief / Referee**
- 2. Generic Grades**
- 3. Technical Manager Guidance Notes for Assessment**
- 4. Guidance Notes for Completing Meeting Report**

**It is important that you complete your report form and assessments within two weeks of the meetings. Failure to do so may result in your position on the IOG / ICOG being reviewed.**

**Consistently late / non return of reports will be noted by the Peer Group and may affect future selections as Technical Manager.**

## **ASSESSING TECHNICAL OFFICIALS AT UKA AND EA MEETINGS**

### **Protocol for Chief/Referee**

*Before the meeting starts, brief the team about the assessment procedures being adopted:*

1. During the meeting, record evidence in the most appropriate way; for example using a **check-list** or **annotation** on the duty sheet.
2. If appropriate, delegate the recording of evidence to designated team leaders.
3. If there are severe problems, likely to lead to a grading of D , endeavour to discuss these with the official on the day; also inform the National Officials' Co-ordinator as a matter of urgency. If possible also discuss C grades on the day.
4. Inform team members of any grading below a B within **one week** of the meeting, providing appropriate evidence.
5. Invite officials to comment on matters of **fact**, not opinion, **within one week**; if necessary following up responses.
6. After the expiry of the aforementioned week, send meeting report and officials' gradings to NTD or AJC and JP.

## **A GRADING SYSTEM FOR THE USE OF REFEREES/CHIEFS IN ALL DISCIPLINES WHEN ASSESSING TECHNICAL OFFICIALS AT UKA AND EA MEETINGS, INCLUDING TELEVISED MEETINGS.**

***Please attach a copy of your duty sheet to your report.***

**A – EXCELLENT** – In addition to demonstrating excellent knowledge and application of rules and procedures, will have shown additional qualities e.g. :-

- The ability to deal quickly and appropriately with unforeseen or difficult circumstances
- Excellent leadership or organisational skills
- The official will have demonstrably exceeded the expectations of the 'B' grade.

*It is very important to recognise that in some disciplines, more standardised allocation of duties and a restricted number of events at Grand Prix meetings will significantly limit the opportunities to achieve this grade. This will be considered when officials' assessments, across the season, are reviewed*

**B – ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE** – Officials appointed to national/international meetings are expected to perform well. This grade should reflect this.

The official will have demonstrated that they e.g.:-

- Fully understand the rules and procedures relevant to their allocated duties, or responsibilities
- Have the ability to apply above in working to a consistently high standard throughout the event(s)
- Ability to work effectively as a member of a team or
- Ability to lead a team competently when required
- Ability to handle athletes or other event personnel well, as required by their duties/responsibilities

**C – MINOR PROBLEMS** – Whilst this official will have demonstrated overall competency, there will be areas where further improvement is desirable. e.g. -

- Their knowledge or interpretation of the rules
- Their ability to correctly apply these through procedured effectively
- Their relationship with others
- The speed and efficiency with which they work
- Other areas may be identified. If this is the case, specific advice should be given about how improvements can be achieved

**D – MAJOR PROBLEMS** – Some elements of the officials' performance will have given considerable cause for concern, and will not have met the expected standards. e.g.-

- Knowledge and interpretation of the rules
- Ability to apply these effectively through agreed procedures
- Relationship with others
- Speed, quality and efficiency of their work

Those making assessments should always ensure that anyone awarded a 'D' grade has access to advice and support from suitably qualified and experienced mentors to help them to improve their performance

The baseline performance expected of all technical officials at UKA and EA meetings is **GRADE B –STANDARD (ACCEPTABLE PERFORMANCE)**. The system works by establishing the baseline and then moving up or down from that. The competencies to be shown are given in two parts with the first section applying to all disciplines and the second section being discipline specific.

## **B STANDARD: (Baseline)**

### **GENERIC – APPLIES TO ALL DISCIPLINES**

- To arrive and check in/report to referee punctually.
- To attend all briefing meetings as requested.
- To receive duty sheet from Referee/Chief and check out anything they are unsure about. (It is not a weakness to check and ask questions at this stage, only common sense. If such questions are asked as the competition commences it becomes a weakness)
- To follow the instructions of the Referee/Chief as given on the duty sheet and at the briefing and be at each correct position in ample time.
- To subjugate own ego in the interests of the efficient working of the team.
- To show understanding of the need to negotiate with TV/press/ sponsors regarding positioning.
- To be alert and aware at all times whilst in the competition area both in relation to own duties and in relation to other events taking place (especially health and safety issues).
- To respond quickly and appropriately to unexpected situations e.g. Official missing from crucial position, injured athlete and equipment incorrectly set.
- To work as a team member, possibly team leader, helping to support and encourage each other, particularly those new to officiating at this level.
- To show a sense of urgency as appropriate without it appearing as panic.
- To move around the arena quickly and safely and sit/stand smartly as appropriate.
- To deal with athletes firmly, fairly and with understanding as needed.

It is also expected that officials would turn out dressed as requested for each meeting but as this stage they would not be marked down for minor variations.

If an Official is consistently awarded Grades C and D it may prove necessary for them to be removed from the UKA list. Such action would only be taken on reviewing the evidence over a period of time

## **A GRADING SYSTEM FOR THE USE OF REFEREES/CHIEFS WHEN ASSESSING TECHNICAL OFFICIALS AT UKA AND EA MEETINGS, INCLUDING TELEVISED MEETINGS.**

### ***Clerks of Course Assessment***

**GRADE A** (Excellent)

**GRADE B** (Standard – acceptable performance)

**GRADE C** (Minor problems)

Compliance with the generic list while allowing a minor transgression compared with positive attributes (see Example Group X) or a maximum of one moderate deficiency (see Example Group Y) that did not materially affect the competition.

**GRADE D** (Poor – major problems)

Up to two moderate deficiencies (see Example Group Y) or one major deficiency (see Example group Z)

### ***Examples of behaviours***

These lists give some examples of the scales to be used when reporting on officials. They are purposely not intended to be exhaustive to allow reporting officials to use their experience and discretion.

- **Example Group X - Positive attributes**

- Created a momentum when preparing an event site and maintained a rhythm through the competition
- Good liaison with Technical Manager & team leader to ensure site set up to their satisfaction
- Ensured all equipment was available and satisfactory for start of competition and event site was tidy both before and immediately afterwards
- All implements correct and brought out sufficiently early for the warm-up and removed as soon as possible afterwards.
- Awareness of timetable and expected event timing
- Accurate interpretation and application of relevant rules
- Willingness to assist colleagues, especially in non-specialist roles (e.g. track specialist working on field events and vice versa).

- **Example Group Y - Moderate deficiencies**

- Minor mistake preparing one event eg by not providing runway markers or flags
- One flight of hurdles set with weights incorrect.
- As team leader; poor leadership skills, as team member, failure to work as team member and report back to team leader on progress.
- Sloppy approach to preparation and presentation of event site
- Lack of awareness of progress & completion of events, thus slowing preparation for next event on site.

- **Example Group Z - Unacceptable deficiencies**

- Major mistake in preparation of one event site eg several items not provided
- Minor mistakes at more than one event site
- One or more flights of hurdles set at incorrect height or position.
- Slow on more than one duty
- No awareness of timetable

### ***Recording of the Grades assigned***

A grade must be assigned to every official based on observed behaviour and recorded on the sheet attached. Any grade other than B must also have a written report giving factual evidence to support the grade. The evidence would include timekeeping, knowledge of rules related to event, duty, round, competitor, observed behaviour, etc. There should be enough detail in the evidence to help the official concerned to understand the reason for the grading.

### **Take into account and comment on the nature of the roles undertaken by members in the team**

#### **GUIDANCE NOTES FOR COMPLETING MEETING REPORT**

PLEASE complete this form in **black** ink and return this form, as soon as possible, to the **National Technical Delegate, Andrew Clatworthy and John Pickles** within two weeks of the meeting.

Where no NTD has been appointed to the **Meeting Manager, Andrew Clatworthy and John Pickles**

Andrew Clatworthy     [ajc.athletics@bopenworld.com](mailto:ajc.athletics@bopenworld.com)  
26 Columba Drive, Leighton Buzzard, Beds. LU7 3Y

John Pickles             [baldnbeautiful@btinternet.com](mailto:baldnbeautiful@btinternet.com)  
3 Regency Lodge, 69 Pitville Lawn, Cheltenham GL52 2BJ

either by post or E-mail so that any relevant comments can be acted on. For TV meetings, copies may be supplied to Fast Track for action.

### **ASSESSMENTS**

#### **Guidance Notes:**

Be as thorough as possible

It is essential to speak with an official if there are aspects of their officiating which are below expectations.

Give those who exceeded expectations 'a pat on the back!!'

Indicate, as appropriate, whether you feel the official should be considered for inclusion in/removal from IOG. (Grades must back up your decision) Peer groups need indicators of officials with potential.

Mark each of your officials **objectively**.

**Don't 'sit on the fence'**. Some officials must be worthy of more than 'just a B'. If you can justify higher grades then award them. The process must be effective in acknowledging the official's technical ability, so that the assessments are integral in an individual's development. Likewise with grades below a 'B'. Again it is all about development – areas to address to improve technical ability

**PLEASE NOTE:** + or - grade will NOT be accepted.

When submitting your report please make it clear within the file title who it is from and for which meeting. A suggested format would be:

**TM Aviva Grand Prix 210210**