





# THEREF

THE REFEREES' WEBSITE

## REFEREE ASSESSMENT REPORT 2015/16



### Match Details

FIXTURE	 Everton	2-2	Watford	
COMPETITION	Barclays Premier League			
DATE (KICK OFF TIME)	08/08/15 (15:00)			
VENUE	Goodison Park, Liverpool			



### Appointed Officials

			MARK	BAND
	REFEREE	JONES, Michael	7.9	SATISFACTORY
	ASSISTANT REFEREE 1	SCHOLES, Mark	8.4	GOOD
	ASSISTANT REFEREE 2	EATON, Derek	8.4	GOOD
	4 <sup>TH</sup> OFFICIAL	TAYLOR, Anthony	8.4	GOOD
	ASSESSOR	ADAM		



## SECTION A – THE REFEREE

### 1 | IDENTIFICATION OF FOUL CHALLENGES

<b>ACCURACY</b> The referee's ability to accurately distinguish between fair and foul challenges.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>CONSISTENCY</b> The referee's consistency in identification & penalising of foul challenges.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>8.2</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	Jones generally did well in his identification of legal and illegal challenges in what was a tough match to referee. Watford in particular approached the match physically, grappling at set pieces and committing themselves to strong challenges. The referee attempted to give the game a chance in the early stages but was forced to up his involvement after the first goal, with the crowd becoming increasingly hostile and the match more physical and competitive. Jones did miss a few free kicks, notably on 48 minutes when a Watford player was brought down on the edge of the penalty area which should have been awarded. Watford also felt they should have had a free kick in the build up to Everton's first goal, but the referee was well placed and replays were inconclusive.					

## 2 | POSITIONING & MOVEMENT

<b>READING OF THE GAME</b> The referee's ability to see play developing & adjust positioning & movement accordingly.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	<b>X</b> SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>POSITIONAL AWARENESS</b> The referee's awareness of his surroundings, including position of the players & the ball.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>8.0</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	The referee's reading of the game could have been significantly better and this would have allowed him to negotiate into better positions to judge key match incidents. In the 28 <sup>th</sup> minute the referee got in the way of play and was also in danger of the same happening in minutes 11 and 46. On both occasions the referee was far too close to play and this was often the result of a pass or player movement that caught Jones off guard. However, aside from the above isolated incidents, the referee's movement and positioning at set pieces and in fluid play was at the expected level, with clear thought in terms of movement and in deciding when to jog, sprint, or sidestep etc.					

## 3 | MAN MANAGEMENT

<b>TECHNIQUES</b> The methods used by the referee to manage situations and cooperate with the players.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	<b>X</b> EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b> The success of the methods used by the referee to manage players & situations.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	<b>X</b> EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	<b>8.6</b> EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	It was clear from the start that Jones approached the game seeking to manage situations and keep the cards in his pocket. Just 5 minutes in the referee delayed a corner kick in order to speak to players guilty of holding and grappling in the penalty area, making it clear to all players that he wouldn't allow it to go unpunished. The referee demonstrated excellent man-management skills on 51 minutes when he effectively diffused a minor conflict between two players following a foul, with Jones splitting the two players up and having a quiet word in their ear. In a very physical game, Jones did extremely well to only show 3 yellow cards, opting to speak to players, warn them about their conduct and calm them down rather than resorting to showing cards. This was perhaps a wise approach given that both the players and crowd were agitated for large parts of the game and showing unnecessary cards could have had an adverse effect on the game.					

## 4 | DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS

<b>ACCURACY</b> The accuracy of the referee's identification of cautionable and dismissable offenses.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	<b>X</b> SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>CONSISTENCY</b> The referee's consistency in identifying cautionable and dismissable offenses.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	<b>7.7</b> SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	The referee issued 3 yellow cards during the course of the match. Those issued to Everton's Coleman (for cynically breaking up a promising attack) and Watford's Holebas (for delaying the restart of play at a throw in) were correct, with the referee having little option on both occasions. However, the caution for Watford's Troy Deeney on 42 minutes should have been a dismissal. The player was evidently not in control when he forcefully committed to a challenge with his studs showing in the Everton penalty area. There was a serious chance that the player on the receiving end could have been badly injured. This must be deemed a major error by the referee.					

## 5 | FITNESS

<b>OVERALL MARK</b>	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	<b>8.7</b> EXCELLENT
<b>COMMENTS</b>	The referee demonstrated an excellent level of fitness and was fully capable of keeping up with play up throughout the game.		

## 6 | OVERALL GAME MANAGEMENT & APPLICATION OF THE L.O.T.G

<b>GAME MANAGEMENT</b> The referee's overall management of the occasion and handling of the match.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>APPLICATION OF THE L.O.T.G</b> The referee's knowledge and accurate implementation of the L.O.T.G throughout.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	<b>X</b> SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>8.0</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	Jones deserved some praise for approaching the game sensibly and attempting to manage the occasion and players. It is possible that with a different, perhaps stricter approach, this match could have seen several more cautions and possibly dismissals. The referee deserves some praise in this sense for contributing to an enjoyable game of football. However, the L.O.T.G suggests the only outcome for the challenge on 43 minutes could have been a dismissal, which was not issued by Jones. This aside, the referee implemented the L.O.T.G to the standard expected and, in particular, made use of the advantage law to good effect.					

## 7 | OVERALL MARK

CATEGORY	MARK	BAND
1	8.2	GOOD
2	8.0	GOOD
3	8.6	EXCELLENT
4	7.7	SATISFACTORY
5	8.7	EXCELLENT
6	8.0	GOOD
<b>OVERALL</b> Add the above marks together and divide by 6. Round up or down to the first decimal place. In instances where the referee has made 1 or more major errors, this mark is limited to 7.9.	<b>7.9</b> (due to major error)	<b>SATISFACTORY</b>



## SECTION B – THE ASSISTANT REFEREES

### 1 | OFFSIDE ACCURACY

<b>ASSISTANT REFEREE 1</b>	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>ASSISTANT REFEREE 2</b>	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b>	Assistant referee 2, Derek Eaton, was the busier of the two assistants, accurately calling a few offsides in the first half against Everton. Assistant 1 had relatively little to do in this department but was always appropriately positioned to call offsides.					

## 2 | TEAMWORK & COMMUNICATION

ASSISTANT REFEREE 1	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
ASSISTANT REFEREE 2	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS	Both assistants contributed well to the officiating team, with assistant 1 flagging for an offense in the second half when better placed than the referee. Jones could have perhaps had some input from his assistant for the incident on 43 minutes, depending on the view the assistant had of the incident.					

## 3 | OVERALL MARKS

ASSISTANT REFEREE 1	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.4 GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
ASSISTANT REFEREE 2	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.4 GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS	Both assistants performed to the expected level, although neither were challenged.					



## SECTION C – THE 4<sup>TH</sup> OFFICIAL

### 1 | CONTRIBUTION TO THE TEAM

OVERALL MARK	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.4 GOOD	
COMMENTS	Anthony Taylor was an effective member of the officiating team and was seen explaining decisions to the managers. He performed his duties as expected.			