

2019 SCBOA Ratings Focus Group

Presentation 9/24/2019

Ratings Definition Interpretation: It really does not matter what your rating is; it matters what your ranking is in relation to your fellow officials. For example - If you have a rating of 98.45 and are ranked 43rd on the list or if you have a rating of 92.50 and are ranked 43rd on the list – you will be in the same slot for game assignments





2019 Ratings Focus Group Committee Members

District 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• David Dendy• Tim Lindler	District 7 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Walter Williams• Stacey Franklin
District 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Patrick McDonnell• Len Scruggs	District 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sedric Webber• Tim Cahill
District 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Billy Dunlap• Fred Jordan	District 9 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Eric McKnight• James Slater
District 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Keith Goggins• Rick Polson	District 10 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Derrill Dilworth – Chair• Steve Wood
District 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Perry Ramicone• Zell Madison	District 11 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Taylor Poth• Joey Kerr
District 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rick Caffrey• Eugene Holmes	District 12 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lamaz Robinson• Patrick Guy• Pamela Williams

- As would be expected, even though each member initially expressed a desire to serve, not all members took part in all information exchanges, whether by email or conference call. Not all members returned votes on all requested questions. As we neared the imposed deadline necessary to finalize the items contained in this document for presentation, participation did start to dwindle.
- The items represented herein represent the majority of the members of this committee. Where the committee could not reach a decision on whether to include a proposal or not both options are presented.
- I wish to thank all of these individuals for their input, ideas, and participation.

The 2019 Ratings Focus Committee undertook the task of restructuring the current SCBOA rating system used to rank officials with the following goals in mind:

- Get the all-round best officials on the floor.
- Modify the ratings system so that an increased number of qualified officials are in position to be assigned to more advanced games.
- Modify the process so that there is more opportunity for officials to elevate their relative ranking more readily by putting more emphasis on the categories of the ratings that they can influence by their own actions.
- It is the hope of this committee that these changes, if adopted, would also aid in the retention of young officials by them recognizing the path for advancement is more readily available to them.

State Championship Eligibility:

It is the recommendation of the 2019 Ratings Focus Committee that eligibility to officiate a state championship contest should be modified from the current guidelines which state that an official may call two consecutive years and then must sit out a year, to read that an official that works a championship contest this year should then sit out the next year.

Upper State and Lower State Championship Eligibility:

The committee recommends that the guidelines for State Championships above be extended to apply to the Upper State and Lower State Championship games as well.

Required Items:

The committee recommends that Items that are absolute “requirements” not be included in the ratings calculations. They believe, and voted, that each of these items should be a deduction from the total if not satisfied.

Current Year:

Late Registration – 2 points

Late Exam – 2 points – (appeal to get points back as today)

No Exam – 10 points

Did not attend a state-sponsored rules clinics – 1 point

Previous Year:

Did not attend required number of meetings/scrimmages – 5 points max

Lack of Cooperation with SCHSL Officials – 5 points max

Lack of Cooperation with local District officers – 5 points max

Camp attendance – 5 points if not attended in last 3 years

Not submitted Peer Evaluations – one-tenth point per omission

Camp:

Camp should remain as a requirement once every 3 years

Ratings credit should be for camp attendance only as previously approved – no variable rating based on camp performance should be used.

Camp should remain a teaching/learning tool only.

Exams:

State Exam

- It was almost unanimously voted that the state exam in November be the one used for the ratings for the current season

National Federation Part I Exam

- The inclusion of a ratings category to give credit for the National Federation exam that is a requirement already was a topic of conversation.
- It was a tie vote by the committee on using the National Federation Exam as a ratings category.

Peer Evaluations:

The committee recommended changes to the Peer Evaluations are:

The top 2 and bottom 2 of all submitted ratings should be discarded as was the previous practice prior to Arbiter.

Peer ratings should **NOT** require a signature

It should be a requirement that partner ratings for an assignment must be submitted within 7 days of the contest. Failure to do so should result in a deduction of one-tenth of a point for each evaluation not entered.

The Peer Category Definitions should be changed as follows:

Peer Evaluations – Current Definitions:

<u>Appearance/Physical</u>	<u>Professionalism</u>	<u>Attitude/Temperament</u>	<u>Rules Knowledge</u>	<u>Performance</u>	<u>Game/Court Presence</u>
10%	<u>Pre-game/Half-time/Post-game</u> 10%	20%	20%	<u>Mechanics</u> 20%	20%
Physically fit to call contest; has proper equipment for game; game equipment/uniform is prepared for game use upon arrival; displays mobility and is able to get in proper position for opportunity to make call(s); hustles in all situations; is physically able to work entire game (endurance); general physical condition and physical appearance: hair trimmed, shaven (men), clean, weight and height are proportional; does not begin a game when injured to the point of not being capable of performing duties properly.	On time for travel to pre-game site (if meeting others). On time for pre-game conference. Dresses before pre-game conference, not during; awake and attentive during pre-game & eliminates potential distractions; participates in discussions and adds meaningful constructive & clarifying input; stays focused on the topic at hand, listens to instructions and discussions; assists with coaches meeting, performs all assigned duties; proper posture for pledge, shows respect for school song/functions; discusses game situations appropriately in a private setting, positively participates in game critique at halftime and after game; leaves a clean dressing room.	Displays positive and good attitude toward players, coaches and fellow officials, courteous; displays desire to do best job possible; gives best possible effort; displays desire to work assigned game without complaint; neat clean professional appearance before, during and after game - shows pride in appearance and performance; first class uniform appearance: shined shoes, black pants, stripes on shirt; displays integrity in handling game situations; maintains control of game and game situations; is prompt in all situations before, during and after game. The partners do not repeatedly wait on this official. Conducts self in professional manner from arrival to departure; is open to suggestions for improvement from partners; represents SCBOA in a positive manner.	Knows the rules of the game. Applies rules consistently and decisively; works to apply the rules correctly as opposed to working to get a good rating; permits play in the spirit of the rules without over-officiating; does not make numerous and/or repetitive mistakes; identifies and corrects errors in a positive manner; displays integrity and common sense in application of penalties and clock management; helpful to crew on rules interpretation situations; shows good judgement.	Displays mobility and is in proper position for opportunity to make call(s); covers assigned duties, contributes to the effectiveness of the entire crew; gives good clear signals, using proper signals as defined in manual; appropriately communicates with partners; performs preventive officiating when appropriate; functions as team member in applying sound, approved mechanics; identifies and points out or corrects errors immediately; does not make numerous and/or repetitive mistakes.	Hustles in all situations; commands respect as an on court authority but keeps game fun and in perspective; approachable, yet authoritative; communicates with coach to give team info on player actions, fouls, and timeouts; communicates with players to encourage, correct, warn, and preventive officiate; communicates with officials during play to assure proper rules and mechanics application; does not make numerous and repetitive mistakes; able to consistently perform under pressure; displays courage to make tough call(s) correctly; understands significance of game situations and strategies.

Peer Evaluations – Proposed Definitions:

Professionalism		Performance			
<u>Appearance/Preparation</u>	<u>Pre-game/Half-time/Post-game</u>	<u>Attitude/Temperament</u>	<u>Rules Knowledge</u>	<u>Mechanics/Physical</u>	<u>Game/Court Presence</u>
10%	10%	15%	25%	25%	15%
Hair trimmed, clean shaven (men), weight and height are proportional. Has proper equipment/uniform for game that is prepared for game use upon arrival, neat clean professional appearance before, during, and after game - shows pride in appearance and performance; first class uniform appearance: shined shoes, black pants, stripes on shirt	On time for travel to pre-game site (if meeting others). On time for pre-game conference. Dresses before pre-game conference, not during; attentive during pre-game & eliminates potential distractions; participates in discussions and adds meaningful constructive & clarifying input; stays focused on the topic at hand, listens to instructions and discussions; assists with coaches meeting, performs all assigned duties; proper posture for pledge, shows respect for school song/functions; discusses game situations appropriately in a private setting, positively participates in game critique at halftime and after game; leaves a clean dressing room.	Displays positive and good attitude toward players, coaches and fellow officials, courteous; displays desire to do best job possible; gives best possible effort; displays desire to work assigned game without complaint; displays integrity in handling game situations; is prompt in all situations before, during and after game. The partners do not repeatedly wait on this official. Conducts self in professional manner from arrival to departure; is open to suggestions for improvement from partners; represents SCBOA in a positive manner.	Knows the rules of the game. Applies rules consistently and decisively; works to apply the rules correctly as opposed to working to get a good rating; permits play in the spirit of the rules without over-officiating; does not make numerous and/or repetitive mistakes; identifies and corrects errors in a positive manner; displays integrity and common sense in application of penalties and clock management; helpful to crew on rules interpretation situations; shows good judgement.	Physically fit to call contest; displays mobility and is in proper position for opportunity to make call(s); hustles in all situations; is physically able to work entire game (endurance); does not begin a game when injured to the point of not being capable of performing duties properly; covers assigned duties, contributes to the effectiveness of the entire crew; gives good clear signals, using proper signals as defined in manual; appropriately communicates with partners; performs preventive officiating when appropriate; functions as team member in applying sound, approved mechanics; identifies and points out or corrects errors immediately; does not make numerous and/or repetitive mistakes.	Commands respect as an on court authority but keeps game fun and in perspective; approachable, yet authoritative; communicates with coach to give team info on player actions, fouls, and timeouts; communicates with players to encourage, correct, warn, and preventive officiate; maintains control of game and game situations; communicates with officials during play to assure proper rules and mechanics application; able to consistently perform under pressure; displays courage to make tough call(s) correctly; understands significance of game situations and strategies.

Peer Evaluations:

2

Peer rating category ratings scale should be on a scale of 1 to 5

Exceptional	5	
Above Average	4	
Average	3	
Below Average	2	
Unacceptable	1	Requires comment

Peer Evaluations:

3

New Peer Rating Calculations		Rating Levels		
Note: the 2 highest and 2 lowest are to be discarded.		Exceptional	5	
		Above Average	4	
		Average	3	
		Below Average	2	
		Unacceptable	1	Requires comment
Rating Category	5	Appearance/Preparation	10%	10
	5	Pre-game/Half-time/Post-game	10%	10
	5	Attitude/Temperament	15%	15
	5	Rules Knowledge	25%	25
	5	Mechanics/Physical	25%	25
	5	Game/Court Presence	15%	15
			100%	100

Calculation:

- Entered rating for each category is divided by the max possible rating (5)
- Result is then multiplied by the percentage of the total for that category
- Result is then multiplied by 100 to get the category total pointsSum category point totals and multiply by the category percentage of the rating

Physical Requirement:

It was a tie vote when the committee voted on whether or not a physical requirement should be instituted and be administered by each district.

If it is to be instituted, the committee favored a timed mile run. For example, if the category is worth 5 points (or 5%) of the total rating the calculation would be:

Under the required time = 100% of ratings points	10:00 or less = 5 points
Grouping 2 = 80% of ratings points	10:01 to 12:29 = 4 points
Grouping 3 = 60% of ratings points	12:30 to 14:59 = 3 points
Grouping 5 = 20% of ratings points	17:30 to 20:00 = 1 point
Over Max = 0% of ratings points	Over 20:00 = 0 points

The BMI Index should NOT ever be considered as a rating possibility.

District Evaluation:

The committee feels that the district leadership knows the capabilities of their own personnel much better than anyone else, due to their interaction both during the season and during classroom and on-court training sessions.

The committee therefore, recommends that a category for this should be added to the ratings calculations.

The method of evaluations used in the camps should be used by the district director or a committee of his choosing that would be submitted prior to the season based on the previous season.

District Evaluation		Rating Levels	
Rating to be entered by District Director based on personal observation and feedback	Exceptional	5	
	Above Average	4	
	Average	3	
	Below Average	2	
	Unacceptable	1	
Rate 5-1			
5	Signals	20%	20
5	Mechanics	20%	20
5	Rules Knowledge	20%	20
5	Professionalism	20%	20
5	Judgement/Game Mgmt	20%	20
		100%	100

Paid Observers:

The Focus Group believes that the SCBOA Board of Directors should work diligently to move to include a system of uniformly trained, compensated observers that would use a standardized process of in-person game observations to evaluate each and every varsity game official multiple times during the season.

This should apply to each official that would be qualified (using current selection criteria) to work any play-off game past the first round.

This observer evaluation rating should replace the District Evaluation category rating for those selected officials in their rating calculation for the play-offs in the current year should that District Evaluation be a component of the Official Ratings

The committee further believes that this should be established to go into effect no later than the 2025-2026 season.

Possible Ratings Configurations:

Below are the 4 possibilities based on all the proposals presented above. The examples all have the same deduction calculations so the deduction number is constant. Since the committee vote was a tie on including both the Fitness Requirement and the National Federation Exam, options for each of the possibilities is presented. The State Exam, Seniority, and Peer Rating are included as well as the new recommended District Rating category.

Option 1:

- Does not include National Federation Exam
- Does not include a Fitness Rating component

Deductions								
Camp Credit	Missed Meetings	Missed Clinic	Missed Peer Evals	SCHSL Cooperation	District Cooperation	No Exam	Late Exam	Late Registration
-5.00	-2.00	-1.00	-0.20	-1.00	-1.00	-10.00	-2.00	-2.00
State Exam	Seniority	Peer Rating	District Rating	Net Total	Total Deductions	Final Rating		
25%	25%	25%	25%	100%	-24.20	70.05		
23.50	23.75	22.00	25.00	94.25				

Option 2:

- Includes the National Federation Exam
- Does not include a Fitness Rating component

Deductions								
Camp Credit	Missed Meetings	Missed Clinic	Missed Peer Evals	SCHSL Cooperation	District Cooperation	No Exam	Late Exam	Late Registration
-5.00	-2.00	-1.00	-0.20	-1.00	-1.00	-10.00	-2.00	-2.00
National Federation Exam	State Exam	Seniority	Peer Rating	District Rating	Net Total	Total Deductions	Final Rating	
15%	25%	20%	25%	15%	100%	-24.20	69.85	
14.55	23.50	19.00	22.00	15.00	94.05			

Option 3:

- Does not include the National Federation Exam
- Includes a Fitness Rating component

Deductions								
Camp Credit	Missed Meetings	Missed Clinic	Missed Peer Evals	SCHSL Cooperation	District Cooperation	No Exam	Late Exam	Late Registration
-5.00	-2.00	-1.00	-0.20	-1.00	-1.00	-10.00	-2.00	-2.00
National Federation Exam				District Rating	Fitness Rating	Net Total	Total Deductions	Final Rating
10%	25%	20%	25%	10%	10%	100%	-24.20	68.00
9.70	23.50	19.00	22.00	10.00	8.00	92.20		

Option 4:

- Includes the National Federation Exam
- Includes a Fitness Rating component

Deductions								
Camp Credit	Missed Meetings	Missed Clinic	Missed Peer Evals	SCHSL Cooperation	District Cooperation	No Exam	Late Exam	Late Registration
-5.00	-2.00	-1.00	-0.20	-1.00	-1.00	-10.00	-2.00	-2.00
State Exam	Seniority	Peer Rating	District Rating	Fitness Rating	Net Total	Total Deductions	Final Rating	
25%	20%	25%	20%	10%	100%	-24.20	68.30	
23.50	19.00	22.00	20.00	8.00	92.50			

I wish to thank the SCBOA Board of Directors for the opportunity to undertake this task.

For many years we have heard complaints about our ranking (rating) system and have never undertaken a review of this magnitude. Hopefully some of these suggestions can be implemented in an effort to improve our system.

Not every member of our committee is in agreement with the items presented here. Some may even not vote for some of these items if and when they might be presented to the membership for a vote. Some wanted more drastic proposals, even to the extent of scraping the rating system completely and assigning all games at the District Director level. But the majority ruled.

