





# THEREF

THE REFEREES' WEBSITE

## REFEREE ASSESSMENT REPORT 2015/16








### Match Details

FIXTURE	 Chelsea	1-2	Crystal Palace	
COMPETITION	Barclays Premier League			
DATE (KICK OFF TIME)	29/08/2015 (15:00)			
VENUE	Stamford Bridge, London			



### Appointed Officials

		MARK	BAND
	REFEREE PAWSON, Craig	7.9	SATISFACTORY
	ASSISTANT REFEREE 1 BROOKS, John	8.2	GOOD
	ASSISTANT REFEREE 2 LEDGER, Scott	7.9	SATISFACTORY
	4 <sup>TH</sup> OFFICIAL LININGTON, James	8.2	GOOD
	ASSESSOR NICOLE		



## 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	<b>X</b> SATISFACTORY	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	<b>7.9</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 majority of the referee's calls regarding foul challenges were both accurate and consistent. He did a good job throughout the game. For example, in the 14th minute, there was a bit of falling down from both players, but the referee accurately recognized that no foul had been committed and allowed play to continue. Again, in the 14th minute, the referee appropriately called a foul against Chelsea as the player hit him with his body while they were challenging for an aerial ball. However, in the 21st minute the referee missed a foul against Crystal Palace. During the corner kick, a player from both teams jumped into the air to receive the ball, however the crystal palace player pulled on the jersey of the Chelsea player, causing them to fall to the ground and miss the ball. This would have been a penalty kick, thus it influenced the outcome of the match. The referee's consistency also dropped slightly after this, as he did not call every foul, or he called a few fouls that were not worth calling. For					

	example in the 70th minute he did not call a foul against Chelsea, which, to be fair, was very hard to see properly, considering his position and etc.
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## 2 | POSITIONING & MOVEMENT

<b>READING OF THE GAME</b> The referee's ability to see play developing & adjust positioning & movement accordingly.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>POSITIONAL AWARENESS</b> The referee's awareness of his surroundings, including position of the players & the ball.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.1 GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	The referee appeared to be constantly moving throughout the game, except for a few occasions where he was just walking. He anticipated play fairly well and kept up with play for the majority of the match. He also had the appropriate position during all restarts and etc.					

## 3 | MAN MANAGEMENT

<b>TECHNIQUES</b> The methods used by the referee to manage situations and cooperate with the players.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b> The success of the methods used by the referee to manage players & situations.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.3 GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	The referee did not appear to have many disputes or issues with the players or team officials, thus it was evident that he acted in an authoritative manner. This meant that the players respected him and as a result, he did not have any major problems with any of them. Although the players did seem to be getting slightly heated towards each other starting in the 22nd minute. After this the players' performance became more physical a well.					

## 4 | DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS

<b>ACCURACY</b> The accuracy of the referee's identification of cautionable and dismissable offenses.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>CONSISTENCY</b> The referee's consistency in identifying cautionable and dismissable offenses.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.2 GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	The referee did not give cautions when they were supposed to be given, for example in the 61st minute, the Crystal Palace player made a foul and then delayed the restart by purposely trying to kick the ball away. Delaying a restart is an offence worthy of a caution. In the 71st minute, however, he correctly gave a caution to Chelsea after a late and reckless tackle, using his leg to hit the Crystal Palace player in the groin area. He was correct in not issuing a red card, since even though the foul was reckless, it did not use excessive force, or in other words, the Chelsea player did not try to injure the Crystal Palace player deliberately. He also correctly gave the Crystal Palace player a caution during the 73rd minute, even though he let play continue due to the advantage.					

## 5 | FITNESS

<b>OVERALL MARK</b>	SATISFACTORY	<b>8.2</b>	EXCELLENT	
<b>COMMENTS</b>	Although the referee did run for most of the game, he was caught walking around the field a few times, rather than jogging and there were a few cases where he could have sprinted. Nothing too major though.			

## 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>	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	SATISFACTORY	<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	<b>8.3</b>	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	The referee appropriately called infringements and etc and applied the advantage when necessary, exemplified in the 9th minute after Crystal Palace lost possession after being fouled. The game was managed quite well, without very many obvious issues appearing. All signals and whistles were properly and professionally executed, which added to the referees credibility.					

## 7 | OVERALL MARK

CATEGORY	MARK	BAND
1	7.9	SATISFACTORY
2	8.1	GOOD
3	8.3	GOOD
4	8.2	GOOD
5	8.2	GOOD
6	8.3	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>SATISFACTORY</b>	<b>7.9</b>



## SECTION B – THE ASSISTANT REFEREES

### 1 | OFFSIDE ACCURACY

<b>ASSISTANT REFEREE 1</b>	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b>	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>ASSISTANT REFEREE 2</b>	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	<b>X</b>	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b>	Both referees made consistent and accurate offside calls throughout the game. Although it appeared that AR2 was slightly behind on a few occasions, thus a few potential offside offences may have been inaccurately judged.					

## 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 assistant referees made eye contact before raising their flags and communicated very well with the referee. No conflicting calls were made and all member of the referee team were working as a team.					

## 3 | OVERALL MARKS

ASSISTANT REFEREE 1	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.3 GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
ASSISTANT REFEREE 2	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.3 GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS	As mentioned, AR 2 was slightly behind on a few occasions, thus hindering his ability to make the correct offside call 100% of the time. A few times, AR 2 was also noticed to be watching the play rather than watching the offside line, which again caused him to be late in his position along the touchline.					



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

### 1 | CONTRIBUTION TO THE TEAM

OVERALL MARK	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.2 GOOD	
COMMENTS	The fourth official did perform his duties appropriately, although he could have controlled the Chelsea bench a little bit better. there were multiple times when the manager could be seen outside of the technical area, in obvious (and very vocal) disagreement to whatever call was being made, exemplified in the 21st minute when a potential foul was made nearby the Chelsea bench.			