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Abstract
Coaches’ achievement is commonly evaluated by competition results or winning percentages. Teams with high winning percentages, rankings, or outstanding competition results are not only contributed by coaches, but also efforts of athletes and other stakeholders. The Standard 40 of the National Standards for Sport Coaches (2006) is to “utilize an objective and effective process for evaluation of self and staff,” which requires coaches to have the knowledge, abilities, and skills (KASs) to “collect direct feedback from athletes and identify ways to improve techniques and coaching style” and being able to perform “self-evaluation for professional growth and development” (NASPE, 2006, p. 23). The benchmarks of Standard 40 include input that should be collected from all stakeholders, such as athletes, parents, guardians, athletic administrators, and other coaches (NASPE, 2006). An effective program requires a coach to have effective communication skills, inter- and intra-personal interaction skills, leadership, and administrative skills, be able to provide positive and corrective feedback to athletes, and have the KASs to coach a sport in a selected competitive level. Evaluation methods are categorized into self-evaluation and evaluation by others, which include journals/dairies, video-analyses, checklists, surveys, and meetings/discussions. The advantages of journals/diaries are short and easy to write, and easy to retrieve and re-read, but coaches may not spend time to re-read them again. Video analyses are a great tool to allow multiple evaluators to observe coaching performance without time limit. Videos can be replayed, played in slow motion, placed online, and emailed to other evaluators to save travel time and cost. However, video analyses are time consuming to watch. It also requires video-taping equipments and skills. Checklists and surveys are easy to use, and can be used with a large number of participants, but they require specific skills to develop valid and reliable instruments. The response rate may be low unless the stakeholders are mandated to complete and return the checklists and surveys. Meetings and discussions allow direct feedback collection and conversations, but they could be redundant unless concise meeting agenda and discussion questions are designed.