# MEMBER'S EVALUATION OF MHJA RECOGNIZED COMPETITIONS

This evaluation will be considered ONLY if competed by an ACTIVE MHJA MEMBER. **Unsigned evaluations, or evaluations lacking member information will not be considered.** You may attach additional pages if necessary.

| Member Name (print) |                     |         | MHJA # |  |  |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------|--------|--|--|
| Complete A          | Address             |         |        |  |  |
| Member P            | osition:            |         |        |  |  |
| Judge               | Owner/Parent        | Trainer |        |  |  |
| Groom               | Spectator           | Rider   |        |  |  |
| Other:              |                     |         |        |  |  |
|                     |                     |         |        |  |  |
|                     | ignature            |         |        |  |  |
| Parent Signature    |                     |         |        |  |  |
| (If MHJA M          | lember is under 18) |         |        |  |  |
| Competition         | on 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 website, 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: 4915 Granger Road, Oxford, MI 48371.

## **EVALUATION OF FACILITIES**

Please rate the following 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 stab adequately covered?) | oling, parking, competition, and spe | ctator areas |
|      | 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 (Accessi                     | bility)                              |              |

| $\sim$ | $\sim$ |    |     | 1    |
|--------|--------|----|-----|------|
| G.     | Coi    | mm | ıen | ITS: |

| IV. | AR | ΕN | AΙ | S: |
|-----|----|----|----|----|
|-----|----|----|----|----|

| A. Competition Arena(s)         |  |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Size:                           |  |
| Footing Quality:                |  |
| Dust Control:                   |  |
| Jumps:                          |  |
| Lighting (Indoor Only):         |  |
| B. Comments:                    |  |
|                                 |  |
| C Schooling Arena(s)            |  |
| Distance to show arena:         |  |
| Size:                           |  |
| Footing Quality:                |  |
| Dust Control:                   |  |
| Quality of Fencing:             |  |
| Suitability of Practice Fences: |  |
| D Comments:                     |  |

Any further comments or concerns about the show facilities:

# **EVALUATION OF SHOW SCHEDULE**

Please Explain:

| 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 show, 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 |

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 Officious Disinterested

Comments:

Was the name(s) of the Rules, Standards, and Grievances (RSG) representative(s) published in the prize list?

YES NO

Was the RSG representative(s) accessible, visible, and open to exhibitor's questions and concerns?

YES NO

The RSG representative(s) knowledge of the rules was:

Excellent Good Satisfactory Poor

The RSG representive(s) handling of problems and questions was:

Helpful Officious Disinterested

Comments:

| Was the sho | ow secretary accessible, visible, and open to exhibitor questions and |
|-------------|---|
| concerns?   |   |
| YES         | NO  |

The show secretary's handling of problems was:

Helpful Officious Disinterested

Comments:

Any additional comments or concerns about the Show Management:

### **EVALUATION OF COURSE DESIGN**

Appropriateness of course for the level of competitor:

Excellent Good Satisfactory Poor

Comments (Please give specific examples):