



OBSERVATION FORM FOR L5-4 CANDIDATES (2019-20) - GUIDANCE

1. The form is a 'fillable' pdf.
2. For each of the 20 criteria and, based on the performance in the match he/she is observing, the observer should record in the 'score' column the most appropriate number in a range between 1 and 5 (please see table below). There is a 'drop down' menu and the total score will be automatically calculated.

Well below standard	Below standard	Standard expected	Above standard	Well above standard
1	2	3	4	5

3. If the referee has no opportunity to demonstrate a particular criterion, then the observer should record a '3'.
4. To help observers determine the appropriate score for each criterion, guidance is provided in **Appendix 1**.
5. Where a score of '3' is awarded, the observer is not required to add comments in the 'Strengths and/or Development Needed' sections. Where a score of 1 or 2 is awarded, the observer must provide timed evidence and a solution/s. Where a score of 4 or 5 is awarded, the observer must provide evidence.
6. Comments in the 'Strengths and/or Development Needed' sections are restricted to 400 characters (approximately 3.5 lines). This is intended to encourage observers to prioritise, and be concise with, their comments.
7. The font size in the 'Strengths and/or Development Needed' section is deliberately smaller than in other parts of the form to ensure that all comments can be read, should the form be printed after completion.
8. As part of the L5-4 promotion criteria, the scores of candidates' eligible observer reports must average a minimum of 70.

Appendix 1 – Descriptors

APPLICATION OF LAW					
Competency	Well below standard	Below standard	Standard	Above standard	Well above standard
	1	2	3	4	5
Recognised and penalised fouls correctly and consistently	Repeatedly failed to recognise and penalise Law 12 offences. Players always appeared confused and challenged referee's interpretations.	Often failed to recognise and penalise Law 12 offences. Players often appeared confused and challenged referee's interpretations.	Correctly recognised and penalised the majority of Law 12 offences. Players occasionally appeared confused and occasionally challenged referee's interpretations.	Correctly recognised and penalised all Law 12 offences. Players never appeared confused, nor challenged referee's interpretations.	Correctly recognised and penalised all Law 12 offences, including (potential) 'game changing' incidents. Players readily and visibly accepted all referee's interpretations
Issued correct sanctions, applying the 'stepped' approach appropriately	Repeatedly failed to give sanctions in accordance with Law and which met the needs of the game. Repeatedly failed to identify significant game impacting incidents.	Often failed to give sanctions in accordance with Law and which met the needs of the game. Often failed to identify significant game impacting incidents.	The majority of sanctions were given in accordance with Law and met the needs of the game. All significant game impacting incidents were correctly identified. Stepped approach was applied appropriately the majority of the time	All sanctions were given in accordance with Law and met the needs of the game. All significant game impacting incidents were correctly identified. Stepped approach was applied appropriately throughout .	All sanctions were given in accordance with Law and met the needs of the game. All significant game impacting incidents were correctly identified. Stepped approach was applied appropriately throughout . Players showed no dissent and readily accepted referee's decisions.
Applied advantage effectively and managed follow-up appropriately	Repeatedly failed to play advantage or played it at the wrong time and/or in the wrong areas. Repeatedly hindered the side in possession. Never followed up with players.	Often failed to play advantage or played it at the wrong time and/or in the wrong areas. Often hindered the side in possession. Often failed to follow up with players.	Played advantage at the correct time and in the correct areas the majority of the time. Rarely hindered the side in possession. Followed up with players when appropriate on the majority of occasions.	Played advantage at the correct time and in the correct areas all of the time. Never hindered the side in possession. Always followed up with players when appropriate.	Played advantage at the correct time and in the correct areas all of the time. Never hindered the side in possession. Always followed up with players when appropriate. Players always demonstrated respect for referee's handling of follow up
MATCH CONTROL					
Competency	Well below standard	Below standard	Standard	Above standard	Well above standard
	1	2	3	4	5
Had control of the match at every stage	Demonstrated no authority and allowed poor player behaviour (including dissent) throughout . Was repeatedly	Demonstrated little authority and often allowed poor player behaviour (including dissent). Was often indecisive.	Demonstrated authority throughout and never allowed poor player behaviour (including dissent). Was	Demonstrated authority throughout and never allowed poor player behaviour (including	Demonstrated a natural authority and never allowed poor player behaviour (including dissent). Was always

	indecisive.		decisive the majority of the time.	dissent). Was always decisive and always raised profile when necessary.	decisive and always raised profile when necessary. Players demonstrated respect for the referee throughout.
Reacted appropriately to changes in the 'temperature' of the match	Never recognised a rise in temperature in the match and therefore never changed approach to suit.	Often failed to recognise a rise in temperature in the match and change approach to suit	Changed approach every time the temperature of match changed.	Visibly and demonstrably changed approach every time the temperature of match changed. Displayed advanced management techniques and allowed no opportunity for conflict.	Visibly and demonstrably changed approach every time the temperature of match changed. Displayed advanced management techniques and allowed no opportunity for conflict. Players reacted positively to referee's changes in approach.
Was consistent, objective and not influenced by others	Repeatedly allowed players to adversely influence decision making. Players often challenged referee's authority.	Sometimes allowed players to adversely influence decision making. Players occasionally challenged referee's authority.	Never allowed players to adversely influence decision making. Players occasionally challenged referee's authority.	Never allowed players to adversely influence decision making. Players never challenged referee's authority and readily accepted all decisions.	Never allowed players to adversely influence decision making. Remained mentally alert at all times. Players engaged with the referee throughout and readily accepted all decisions.
Was firm, decisive, self-confident & self-assured	Repeatedly appeared unsure of own decisions and always lacked confidence in interactions with players. Never looked comfortable and was repeatedly adversely influenced by others.	Often appeared unsure of own decisions and often lacked confidence in interactions with players. Often looked uncomfortable and was often adversely influenced by others.	Appeared sure of own decisions the majority of the time. Displayed confidence when interacting with players the majority of the time. Was never adversely influenced by others.	Always appeared sure of own decisions. Always displayed confidence when interacting with players. Was never adversely influenced by others.	Demonstrated absolute self-belief in decision making with body language to suit. Was never adversely influenced by others. Players readily accepted all decisions throughout.
FITNESS, WORK RATE & POSITIONING					
Competency	Well below standard	Below standard	Standard	Above standard	Well above standard
	1	2	3	4	5
Was appropriately positioned to be able to make credible decisions	Was never in the correct position to make accurate decisions. If in a poor position, showed no effort to get into the correct position.	Was rarely in the correct position to make accurate decisions. If in a poor position, Showed little effort to get into the correct position.	Was in the correct position to make accurate decisions most of the time . If in a poor position, made an effort to get into the correct position on almost all occasions.	Was always in the correct position to make accurate decisions. If in a poor position, made an effort to get into the correct position on every occasion.	Was always in the correct position to make accurate decisions. Effortlessly adjusted position when required. Always read play appropriately to avoid being incorrectly positioned.
Was sufficiently close to play without interfering	Was repeatedly either in the way of players, causing frustration, or too far away to be able to make accurate	Was often either in the way of players, causing frustration, or too far away to be able to make accurate decisions.	Was occasionally either in the way of players, causing frustration, or too far away to be able to make accurate	Was never either in the way of players, causing frustration, or too far away to be able to make accurate	Was never either in the way of players, causing frustration, or too far away to be able to make accurate decisions. Was always

	decisions.		decisions.	decisions. Was always close enough to be able to communicate effectively and preventatively.	close enough to be able to communicate effectively and preventatively. Always read patterns of play and penetrated all four corners of the field of play.
Displayed good stamina and sprint speed throughout the match	Demonstrable lack of effort throughout . Displayed inappropriate running patterns (took 'short cuts') throughout and transitions were repeatedly ineffective.	Demonstrated minimal effort throughout . Displayed inappropriate running patterns (took 'short cuts') most of the time and transitions were often ineffective.	Demonstrated satisfactory effort throughout . Displayed appropriate running patterns most of the time and transitions were mostly effective.	'Kept going' for the entire match. Always displayed appropriate running patterns transitions were always effective. No reduction in sprint speed from first to last minute.	Demonstrated high levels of work rate from start to finish . Fitness levels clearly exceeded the demands of the match. No reduction in sprint speed from first to last minute. Always moved seamlessly and effortlessly effectively from one phase of play to the next.
MANAGEMENT OF STOPPAGES & TECHNICAL OFFENCES					
Competency	Well below standard	Below standard	Standard	Above standard	Well above standard
	1	2	3	4	5
Managed penalty kicks and attacking free-kicks effectively (including free-kicks near the penalty area)	Had no control of when and where free kicks were taken. Players often not back the required distance. Was never alert to the quick free-kick. No management of the defensive wall.	Had little control of when and where free kicks were taken. Players rarely back the required distance. Was often not alert to the quick free-kick. Little management of the defensive wall.	Had control of when and where free kicks were taken most of the time . Players almost always back the required distance. Was generally alert to the quick free-kick. Defensive wall was generally well managed.	Always had control of when and where free kicks were taken. Players always back the required distance. Was always alert to the quick free-kick. Defensive wall was always well managed.	Worked with players to ensure they were always at the required distance and that free-kicks were always taken from the correct place. Allowed play to re-start quickly if necessary. Always took up highly effective viewing positions.
Managed other re-starts correctly (goal-kicks, corner-kicks, throw-ins, & kick-offs)	Restarts repeatedly taken from wrong place. Players never at the required distance. Repeatedly failed to recognise players in incorrect half at kick-off. No natural authority or management of restarts.	Restarts often taken from wrong place. Players often not at the required distance. Often failed to recognise players in incorrect half at kick-off. Little natural authority or management of restarts.	Restarts occasionally taken from wrong place. Players generally at the required distance. Always ensured players were in correct half at kick off. Displayed natural authority and managed most restarts well.	Restarts always taken from wrong place. Players always at the required distance. Always ensured players were in correct half at kick off. Displayed natural authority and managed all restarts well.	Worked with players throughout to ensure they were always at the required distance and that re-starts were taken from the correct place. Remained alert at re-starts throughout . Demonstrated highly effective management and communication techniques at all times .
GAME UNDERSTANDING					
Competency	Well below standard	Below standard	Standard	Above standard	Well above standard
	1	2	3	4	5

Anticipated what was going to happen next	Was always reactive . Failed to read the game and the players' intentions throughout . Never recognised changing patterns of play or tactics.	Was mostly reactive . Rarely read the game and the players' intentions. Rarely recognised changing patterns of play or tactics.	Was generally proactive . Generally read the game and the players' intentions well. Generally recognised changing patterns of play and tactics.	Was always proactive . Always read the game and the players' intentions well. Always recognised changing patterns of play and tactics.	Was always proactive . Read the game and the players' intentions impeccably throughout . Always recognised changing patterns of play and tactics. Was never 'caught out' by even the most subtle player tactics and actions.
Prevented incidents escalating by recognising early potential threats	Repeatedly failed to deal with players' frustrations. Never identified when an incident had the potential to escalate.	Often failed to deal with players' frustrations. Often failed to identify when an incident had the potential to escalate.	Dealt with players' frustrations on most occasions. Generally identified when an incident had the potential to escalate and dealt with it satisfactorily.	Dealt with players' frustrations on all occasions. Always identified when an incident had the potential to escalate and dealt with it well.	Always took preventative action to ensure isolated incidents and player frustrations did not escalate unnecessarily. Players respected the way in which potential threats were handled.
Managed player intentions and game situations in an empathetic manner	Showed no appreciation for what players were trying to achieve. Was never on the same wavelength as the players. Demonstrated no game empathy.	Showed little appreciation for what players were trying to achieve. Was rarely on the same wavelength as the players. Demonstrated little game empathy.	Showed sound appreciation for what players were trying to achieve. Was generally on the same wavelength as the players. Demonstrated sound game empathy.	Showed real appreciation for what players were trying to achieve. Was always on the same wavelength as the players. Demonstrated advanced game empathy.	Showed recognition throughout of what players were trying to achieve, technically and tactically. Worked with players throughout. Demonstrated an understanding of team tactics and allowed players to express themselves.

TEAMWORK

Competency	Well below standard	Below standard	Standard	Above standard	Well above standard
	1	2	3	4	5
Gave effective pre-match instructions to assistant referees (ARs)	Failed to offer any pre-match instructions. If they were given, they were unclear and hindered the ARs.	Offered unclear and unhelpful pre-match instructions.	Pre-match instructions were generally clear and helpful.	Pre-match instructions were clear and helpful. Invited questions, provided clarification and ARs demonstrated a clear understanding of what was expected of them.	Pre-match instructions were clear and helpful. Invited questions, provided clarification and ARs demonstrated a clear understanding of what was expected of them. ARs demonstrated that they were inspired to perform.
Acted correctly and communicated well when offences were indicated by the ARs	Never responded to, or acknowledged, the ARs when offences were signalled.	Often failed to respond to, or acknowledge, the ARs when offences were signalled.	Generally responded to, or acknowledged, the ARs when offences were signalled.	Always responded to, or acknowledged, the ARs when offences were signalled. Always acted appropriately	Always responded to, or acknowledged, the ARs when offences were signalled. Always acted appropriately on

				on advice.	advice. Engaged in face to face discussion when appropriate. Acknowledged input, displayed effective visual contact and was the obvious leader of the team. Was seen to support the ARs when they were under pressure.
COMMUNICATION					
Competency	Well below standard	Below standard	Standard	Above standard	Well above standard
	1	2	3	4	5
Signalled effectively and with confidence	Repeatedly failed to signal at all. Arms were often 'weak' and players were frequently unclear as to the decision given.	Sometimes failed to signal at all. Arms were sometimes 'weak' and players were sometimes unclear as to the decision given.	Signals were generally correct and arms were generally 'strong'. Players were always clear as to the decision given.	Signals were always correct and arms were always 'strong'. Players were always clear as to the decision given.	Signals were always correct and arms were always 'strong'. Players were always clear as to the decision given. Signals were always in harmony with the ARs'. Signals demonstrated a natural authority.
Used the whistle effectively (including varying the tone appropriately)	No differentiation in whistle tone throughout . Whistle was always inaudible. Players were always unclear as to the severity and nature of offences.	Little differentiation in whistle tone throughout . Whistle was sometimes inaudible. Players were sometimes unclear as to the severity and nature of offences.	Clear differentiation in whistle tone throughout . Whistle was always audible. Players were generally clear as to the severity and nature of offences.	Clear differentiation in whistle tone throughout . Whistle was always audible. Players were always clear as to the severity and nature of offences.	Clear differentiation in whistle tone throughout . Whistle was always audible. Players, managers and spectators were always clear as to the severity and nature of offences. Always used the whistle effectively to manage players and situations.
Displayed positive body language, especially when under pressure	Lacked authority throughout . Appeared withdrawn throughout and never seemed to be concentrating. Always allowed players to dictate during interactions.	Lacked authority for much of the game. Often appeared withdrawn and often seemed not to be concentrating. Often allowed players to dictate during interactions.	Displayed authority for much of the game. Generally appeared confident and positive. Seemed to be concentrating throughout. Did not allow players to dictate during interactions.	Displayed authority throughout the game. Always appeared confident and positive and was clearly concentrating throughout. Never allow players to dictate during interactions.	Displayed authority throughout the game. Always appeared confident and positive and was clearly mentally alert throughout. Never allow players to dictate during interactions. Was naturally authoritative.