

TD WORKING GROUP TD CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

| NAME OF TD C | CANDIDATI | E: | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|-----|---------------|----|----------|------------------|--|
| ADDRESS: | | | | | | | |
| CITY:STATE: | | : | COUNTRY: ZIP: | | | | |
| TELEPHONE: (| LEPHONE: (WORK) | | | | (HOME) | | |
| (CELL): | | | | | | | |
| (FAX): | | | | | E-MAIL: | | |
| NAME OF EVA | LUATOR:_ | | | | | U.S. or FIS TD # | |
| ADDRESS: | | | | | | | |
| CITY:STATE: | | : | COUNTRY: ZIP: | | | | |
| TELEPHONE: (| (WORK) | | | | (HOME) | | |
| (CELL): | | | | | | | |
| (FAX): | | | | | E-MAIL: | | |
| SITE OF ASSIGNMENT: | | | | | COUNTRY: | | |
| GENDER: | Μ | _ L | | | | | |
| EVENT(S): | SL | GS | SG | DH | PL | DATE(S) | |

TO THE EVALUATOR OF THE ABOVE U.S. TECHNICAL DELEGATE CANDIDATE:

REVIEW THIS EVALUATION FORM BEFORE THE COMPETITION SO AS TO INSURE A FAIR EVALUATION OF EACH ITEM.

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS EVALUATION FORM AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AFTER THE COMPLETION OF THE COMPETITION (IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE EVENT IS SUGGESTED) SO THE INFORMATION IS STILL FRESH IN YOUR MIND.

PLEASE COMPLETE EACH SECTION AS COMPLETELY AS POSSIBLE. IF FOR SOME REASON YOU ARE NOT ABLE TO EVALUATE A CERTAIN ITEM, NOTE IT AS SUCH.

ONE COPY OF THIS COMPLETED EVALUATION FORM, ATTACHED TO THE CANDIDATE'S RACE RESULT PACKET, MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE APPLICABLE REGIONAL/DIVISIONAL/STATE ALPINE OFFICIALS' CHAIR.

EVALUATION AND CANDIDATE'S REPORTS ARE NOT TO BE SUBMITTED TO U.S. SKI AND SNOWBOARD.

| А. | PRE-EVENT COORDINATION WITH EVALUATOR: 1. INITIATED CONTACT WELL IN ADVANCE OF EVENT | YES | NO | |
|-------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| | 2. COMPLETED PRE-EVENT INSPECTION TRIP (DH/SG) | YES | NO | |
| | 3. ARRIVED AT EVENT SITE IN ADVANCE OF EVENT (DH/SG: 48 hours before the draw for the first training. In all other events: 24 hours before the draw for the event) U.S. Alpine Competition Regulations 2.1.4.4.3 | YES | NO | |
| | 4. ARRIVED PROPERLY PREPARED (FORMS, ETC.) | YES | NO | |
| | 5. PROVIDED NOTICE TO CHIEF OF RACE OF ASSIGNMENT ARRIVAL INFORMATION, ETC. | YES | NO | |
| IF ANY ITEN | IS ARE MARKED "NO", PLEASE EXPLAIN: | | | |
| | | | | |
| | E MEETS REQUIREMENTS: CANDIDATE DOES NOT ME | | | |
| EV | ALUATION SCALE FOR RATING A TD CANDIDAT | E'S PERF | ORMANCE | |
| 1. EXCELLE | ENT 2. PROFICIENTLY 3. ADEQUATELY 4. NEEDS MORE EXPE | ERIENCE 5. | NOT EVALUATED |) |
| B. | <u>CANDIDATE'S ON - HILL PERFORMANCE</u> 1. CONSIDERING ALL ASPECTS OF TERRAIN AND SNOW CONDI SKIING ABILITY IS COMMENSURATE WITH REQUIREMENTS O (<i>TD Candidates need not be racers. They should, however be</i> <i>ability to ski all types of course terrain well enough that they n</i> <i>coaches and race organizers.</i>) | OF THE EVEN able to demo | T (Instrate the | _) tors |
| | 2. CANDIDATE HAS THE ABILITY TO PERFORM KNOWLEDGEAB | LE COURSE | INSPECTION (| _) |
| | 3. CANDIDATE HAS KNOWLEDGE OF PROPER TECHNIQUES OF | COURSE PR | EPARATION (| _) |
| | 4. CANDIDATE HAS KNOWLEDGE OF PROPER / TIMELY USE OF | CHEMICALS | (| _) |
| | 5. CANDIDATE HAS THE ABILITY TO RECOGNIZE COMPETITOR PROBLEMS THAT MAY RESULT FROM COURSE SETTING | ON-HILL SEC | URITY (| _) |
| | 6. CANDIDATE HAS THE ABILITY TO RECOGNIZE PROBLEMS TH NATURAL OBSTACLES | IAT MAY RES | SULT FROM | _) |
| | 7. CANDIDATE HAS THE ABILITY TO MAKE SUGGESTIONS TO R | ESOLVE PRO | DBLEMS (| _) |
| | 8. CANDIDATE HAS CREDIBILITY WITH JURY, COACHES AND CO | OURSE PERS | ONNEL (| _) |
| IF NECESSA | ARY, JUSTIFY RESPONSE. ITEMS MARKED "NOT EVALUATED" MU | ST BE JUSTI | FIED: | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | _ |
| | | | | |

CANDIDATE MEETS REQUIREMENTS: _____ CANDIDATE DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS: _____

| C. | DECISION - MAKING AND JUDGEMENT ABILITIES 1. CANDIDATE HAS THE ABILITY TO MAKE TIMELY AND INFORMED DECISIONS | | | | | |
|-----------|--|----|--|--|--|--|
| | 2. CANDIDATE HAS THE ABILITY TO ANTICIPATE SITUATIONS AND HEAD OFF THE DEVELOPMENT OF POTENTIAL PROBLEMS | () | | | | |
| | 3. CANDIDATE'S JUDGEMENT REFLECTS A SOLID BACKGROUND OF EXPERIENCE | () | | | | |
| | 4. CANDIDATE HAS THE ABILITY TO DEMONSTRATE SOUND JUDGEMENT REGARDING COURSE SETTING AND PREPARATION | () | | | | |
| | 5. CANDIDATE HAS THE ABILITY TO GATHER AND SOLICIT OPINIONS FROM OTHERS | () | | | | |
| IF NECES | SARY, JUSTIFY RESPONSE. ITEMS MARKED "NOT EVALUATED" MUST BE JUSTIFIED: | | | | | |
| | E MEETS REQUIREMENTS: CANDIDATE DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| D. | <u>PERSONAL CONDUCT</u> 1. CANDIDATE'S AVAILABILITY DURING SPAN OF COMPETITION | () | | | | |
| | 2. CANDIDATE'S OVERALL PERSONAL APPEARANCE | () | | | | |
| | 3. CANDIDATE'S CONDUCT AT JURY AND TEAM CAPTAINS' MEETINGS | () | | | | |
| | 4. CANDIDATE'S DEGREE OF ENTHUSIASM AND INVOLVEMENT IN EVENT | () | | | | |
| | 5. CANDIDATE'S RESPECT FOR JURY, TEAM CAPTAINS, RACE SECRETARIAT | () | | | | |
| IF NECESS | SARY, JUSTIFY RESPONSE. ITEMS MARKED "NOT EVALUATED" MUST BE JUSTIFIED: | | | | | |
| | E MEETS REQUIREMENTS: CANDIDATE DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS: | | | | | |
| E. | <u>KNOWLEDGE AND APPLICATION OF RULES</u> 1. CANDIDATE DEMONSTRATES KNOWLEDGE OF RULES FOR THE ASSIGNED EVENT(S | | | | | |
| | 2. CANDIDATE UNDERSTANDS THE GENERAL WORKING AND FUNCTION OF THE RACE JURY AND THE SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS OF EACH JURY MEMBER | () | | | | |
| | 3. CANDIDATE KNOWS THE PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING PROTESTS | | | | | |
| IF NECES | SARY, JUSTIFY RESPONSE. ITEMS MARKED "NOT EVALUATED" MUST BE JUSTIFIED: | | | | | |
| CANDIDAT | E MEETS REQUIREMENTS: CANDIDATE DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS: | | | | | |

| F. | ADMINISTRATIVE PERFORMANCE 1. CANDIDATE DEMONSTRATES / UNDERSTANDS PROPER USE OF ALL FORMS / DOCUMENTS | YES | NO |
|----|--|-----|----|
| | 2. CANDIDATE IS FAMILIAR WITH COMPUTER SCORING CAPABILITIES | YES | NO |
| | 3. CANDIDATE PROPERLY CALCULATED RACE POINTS FOR TOP 10 RACERS | YES | NO |
| | 4. CANDIDATE PROPERLY CALCULATED U.S. RACE PENALTY | YES | NO |
| | 5. CANDIDATE PROPERLY COMPLETED CANDIDATE TD REPORT | YES | NO |
| | 6. CANDIDATE REVIEWED TD REPORT AND RESULTS WITH EVALUATOR | YES | NO |
| | 7. CANDIDATE WORKED CONSTRUCTIVELY WITH RACE SECRETARIAT | YES | NO |

IF NECESSARY, JUSTIFY RESPONSE. ITEMS MARKED "NOT EVALUATED" MUST BE JUSTIFIED:

CANDIDATE MEETS REQUIREMENTS: CANDIDATE DOES NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS:

EVALUATOR'S RECOMMENDATION:

CANDIDATE HAS SUCCESSFULLY MET ALL REQUIREMENTS:

CANDIDATE MUST BE RE-EVALUATED ON THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS:

EVALUATOR'S GENERAL COMMENTS ON CANDIDATE'S PERFORMANCE OR JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDING RE-EVALUATION:

DATE:______ U.S./FIS TECHNICAL DELEGATE EVALUATOR:______

PLEASE FORWARD THIS FORM ATTACHED TO A U.S. RACE RESULT PACKET THAT HAS BEEN ASSEMBLED BY THE CANDIDATE TO THE CANDIDATE'S APPLICABLE REGIONAL/DIVISIONAL/STATE ALPINE OFFICIALS CHAIRMAN.

#_____