

MEMBER'S EVALUATION OF MHJA RECOGNIZED COMPETITIONS

This evaluation will be considered only if completed by an active MHJA. Unsigned evaluations, or evaluations lacking member information will not be considered. You may attach additional pages if necessary.

Member Name (print) _____ MHJA Number _____

Complete Address _____

Member Position: Judge Steward/Official Owner/Parent Trainer Rider
Groom Spectator Other: _____

Member Signature _____

Parent Signature (if MHJA member is under 18 years) _____

Competition Name _____ Date _____

Location _____

Member's Evaluation forms for MHJA recognized competitions are provided as a way for members to comment on the show quality of MHJA events. This form is available on the MHJA web site, at show secretary stands, and at the MHJA Office. It is hoped that exhibitors will use this form to inform the MHJA of both *positive and negative* comments. Return the form within ten (10) days of the competition to the MHJA Office: 1500 Ormond Rd, White Lake, MI 48383

EVALUATION OF FACILITIES

Please rate the following items using the terms: EXCELLENT, GOOD, AVERAGE, FAIR, POOR.

I. Stabling:

- A. Stalls (General Condition) _____
- B. Stalls (Size) _____
- C. Lighting _____
- D. Availability _____
- E. Water Supply _____
- F. Wash Rack/Bathing Facilities _____
- G. Restrooms (Cleanliness) _____
- H. Restrooms (Location/Quantity) _____
- I. Comments:

II. PA System

- A. Clarity _____
- B. Volume _____
- C. Speaker Placement (Were stabling, parking, competition, and spectator areas Adequately covered? _____
- D. Comments:

III. Parking

- A. Trailers (Size of Area) _____
- B. Trailers (Quality of Surface) _____
- C. Trailers (Accessibility) _____
- D. Spectator/Competitor (Size of Area) _____
- E. Spectator/Competitor (Quality of Surface) _____
- F. Spectator/Competitor (Accessibility) _____
- G. Comments:

IV. Arenas

- A. Competition Arena(s) (Size) _____
- B. Competition Arena(s) (Quality of Footing) _____
- C. Competition Arena(s) (Dust Control) _____
- D. Competition Arena(s) (Quality of Show Jumps) _____
- E. Competition Arena(s) (Lighting-indoors only) _____
- F. Comments:
- G. Schooling Arena(s) (Distance to show arena) _____
- H. Schooling Arena(s) (Size) _____
- I. Schooling Arena(s) (Quality of Footing) _____
- J. Schooling Arena(s) (Dust Control) _____
- K. Schooling Arena(s) (Quality of Fencing) _____
- L. Schooling Arena(s) (Suitability of Practice fences) _____
- M. Comments:

Any further comments or concerns about the show facilities:

EVALUATION OF SHOW SCHEDULE

Did the competition follow the schedule of classes as described in the published prize list?

Yes No

If not, were the changes adequately made public? **Yes No**

If not, please explain:

Did the show start at the published start time? **Yes No**

If not, was the starting time change made public the previous day? **Yes No**

If not, please explain:

Was the show ring(s) empty for extended periods (other than in the case of accident, injury, or jump replacement)? **Yes No**

Was the show management actively trying to get competitors to come to the ring?

Yes No

Please explain:

In the case of multiple ring horse shows, were the classes scheduled in such a way as to minimize conflicts? **Yes No**

In the case of conflicts, was show management able to satisfy trainer/competitors when given ample notice of the conflict? **Yes No**

Please explain:

Were course changes carried out in a prompt, professional manner? **Yes No**

Was there sufficient daylight to complete the scheduled classes without deviating from the published show bill? **Yes No**

Any further comments or concerns about the show schedule:

EVALUATION OF SHOW MANAGEMENT

Was the show manager accessible, visible, and open to exhibitors' questions and concerns?

Yes No

The show manager's handling of problems and questions was:

Helpful Official Disinterested

Comments:

Was the name(s) of the Rules and Standards and Grievances representative(s) published in the prize list? **Yes No**

Was the Rules and Standards and Grievances representative(s) accessible, visible, and open to exhibitors' questions and concerns? **Yes No**

The Rules and Standards and Grievances representative(s) knowledge of the rules was:

Excellent Good Satisfactory Poor

The Rules and Standards and Grievances representative(s) handling of problems and questions was: **Helpful Official Disinterested**

Comments:

Was the show secretary accessible, visible, and open to exhibitor questions and concerns?

Yes No

The show secretary's handling of problems was: **Helpful Official Disinterested**

Comments:

The gate steward(s) ability to present horses in their posted order was:

Excellent Good Satisfactory Poor

The gate steward(s) handling of problems and questions was:

Helpful Official Disinterested

Comments:

Any additional comments or concerns about the Show Management:

EVALUATION OF COURSE DESIGN

Name of course designer _____

Appropriateness of course for level of competitor: **Excellent Good Satisfactory Poor**

Comments (please give specific examples):