

Proposal to 2020 NAVHDA national annual meeting submitted by Willamette Valley chapter:

Whereas NAVHDA has a unique judge development program that emphasizes consistency in evaluation of dogs tested across a wide diversity of locations across the U.S. and Canada, and

Whereas the judge apprentice program endeavors to train prospective judges in both the NAVHDA test rules and in their ability to assess dog test performance, and

Whereas the responsible committees within NAVHDA make concerted efforts via annual judges' seminars to keep judges current on their judging skills, and

Whereas despite the best intentions and efforts of NAVHDA to produce and maintain a cadre of first-rate judges, every NAVHDA chapter probably has a 'don't use' list of one or more judges whose performance has been considered sub-par when they judged a local test, and

Whereas feedback from chapters – the actual users of the system – may reveal problems with individual judges,

It is therefore proposed that a judge evaluation system be established whereby at the conclusion of each test the chapter test secretary has the option of submitting to The Director of Judge Development and the Director of Testing an evaluation of the judging team (and individual judges) that participated in judging the test

Rationale: This is an avenue whereby chapters have a means of expressing to the Directors of Testing and Judge Development their satisfaction/dissatisfaction with individual judges. This may be especially useful for assisting newly-appointed judges who are still developing their judging skills. As emphasized in the accompanying evaluation example, it is important that any significant criticism of a particular judge be accompanied by explicit issues contributing to the poor evaluation. However, it is also an avenue by which judge marginal performance, e.g. inattention, abrasiveness, physical limitations affecting effective observation, can be brought to the attention of the respective Directors.

It is intended that the evaluation would be based on the consensus of chapter leaders including the test secretary, NOT based on the opinion of a single member. The evaluation is intended to pertain to both the judging team and to individual judges including apprentices. This is not intended to critique everything the judges are scoring

While the scores are team consensus, the judging is done by three independent individuals. Hence one suggested question included on the evaluation is 'would you be willing to invite this judge again? - if not, give explicit reasons.'

It has been suggested that such an evaluation system might lead to judges becoming overly lenient in their test scoring so as to influence the evaluation of their own performance; however, it can be argued that any judge who is uncomfortable or unable to defend the scores he/she assigns in a test should not be judging.

Emphasis should be on both identifying and helping judges who are doing poorly and on recognizing those who are doing very well. Remember - Just because the customer doesn't complain doesn't mean he/she is satisfied.

Judging Evaluation Form

Date: _____ Chapter submitting Form _____
 Test Secretary: _____ Chapter President: _____
 Senior Judge name: _____
 Apprentice: _____
 Judge name: _____ Apprentice: _____
 Judge name: _____

(Note: When completing this form, please provide as much *specific detail* as possible.)

1. Overall, was there a specific judge or activity that was particularly noteworthy? Please describe what happened and how it helped the handler or the chapter.

2. Overall, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being best, how would you rate this judging team's efforts to help your chapter continue to grow and develop?

| score | Chapter score | |
|-------|---------------|--|
| 5 | | Judges worked hard to provide advice and suggestions to benefit chapter, very professional |
| 4 | | Judges were professional , some advice and suggestions offered |
| 3 | | Judges performed duties satisfactorily |
| 2* | | Judges were satisfactory but could have been more involved and responsive to handlers |
| 1* | | Judges did not answer questions or appeared to not know or have clear Aims based answers |

(*If the Team was rated as a 1 or 2, please provide information as to WHY and if that information was communicated to one or more members of the judging team.)

3. Was there a judge or an action by the judging team that particularly enhanced the NAVHDA goal of conservation by hunting with a trained dog?

4. Was there a judging decision that appeared to violate or be inconsistent with NAVHDA rules?

YES
NO

 - a. If YES, please describe the situation and how it was relayed to the handler or the chapter. *Please be as specific as possible and use page and paragraph references from the NAVHDA AIMS/RULES book.*

5. Did a judge or the judging team provide especially practical and useful training guidance or insights?

6. Did a judge or the judging team work especially hard to help new or youth handlers?

7. Were the Judges consistent with all dogs in applying NAVHDA rules?

YES
NO

 - a. If NO, please describe the situation and how the inconsistency was apparent. *Be specific.*

8. Was there a scoring anomaly that handlers believed was incorrect or unfair?

YES

NO

- a. Note: if the answer to this evaluation question is YES, there must be multiple handlers who experienced the scoring anomaly. The scoring anomaly should be described *specifically* and explained with references to the NAVHDA Aims/Rules.

9. Did the judging team take adequate time to discuss scores and to completely answer questions regarding how a particular score was reached referencing the AIMS?

YES

NO

- a. If the answer to this question is NO, please describe *specifically* how the scoring was not adequately or properly explained.

10. Did the judging team present themselves professionally; were they good representatives of NAVHDA?

YES

NO

(What did your chapter particularly like about a judge or this judging team?)

11. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the best, how would you rate this judging team?

| Chapter score | |
|---------------|---|
| 5 | Excellent, above average in knowledge, VERY helpful and willing to help handlers and chapter |
| 4 | Good. Solid knowledge, well organized and efficient |
| 3 | Average to Good. Organization was OK |
| 2* | Below average. At times seemed unsure which led to some disorganization and confusion for chapter |
| 1* | Below average. Would not invite these judges or this team to judge again. |

(*If the Team was rated as a 1 or 2, please provide information as to WHY and if that information was communicated to one or more members of the judging team.)

12. In order to help NAVHDA leadership better understand a judge's or the judging team's performance, is there an observation or comment not covered in this evaluation that should be noted.

Test start time: _____ Test scores read at time: _____

Number of dogs tested: NA _____ UPT _____ UT _____