

## **Austin Basketball Officials Rating System**

The Austin Basketball Officials Rating System is designed to group officials with similar abilities relating to \*Game Management \*Court Presence \*Rules Knowledge and Application \*Mechanics and \*General Behavior. These are rating criteria components to help compare officials.

There will be 3 opportunities for possible rating changes during a season since we are on a 3 schedule season.

The rating of each official will be based upon the averages from the following input sources:

- a. Each member of the chapter board will rate each official for a total of 9 rankings (3 Presidents, 1 Secretary, Div Reps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)
- b. An evaluation committee, as appointed by the chapter board, made of internal members of the Austin Basketball Officials chapter (Training Committee, Asst. Secretary, District Rep., Treasurer)
- c. The previous years rating, as of the end of the season

\* Other sources of information will only be used to assist those who are ranking (coach input, game evaluators, etc.) Coaches will have input on trying to help each official improve based on the rating criteria. After a game, the coach will have the opportunity to indicate positive and non positive feedback on each official. The web based system will facilitate the process and format of category feedback. Again, this information is only to help look for trends.

The best rating system is not a snap shot, it is a movie. It is important to look at trends to understand direction. With this rating system, we will try to implement a process to discover officials that should move up, as well as discover experienced officials that need to “improve” on the qualities and basics that helped them become experienced. A good rating system helps the leaders put in place education for all those who have been rated. By adding more input sources on how officials fit amongst their peers, allows better information to look at trends and rate accordingly.

The rank of each official will be based on the overall rating criteria in the opinion of the ranking source, while keeping in perspective the **grouping** of similar type rated officials. Any rating system is subjective, so the first step for each rating source is to group officials they feel are at the same officiating level. The next step is to take each group and list the top official in the group on down to the last official in that group. The 3<sup>rd</sup> step is to assign a specific rating, in decimals, for each official in the group (it is possible that some of the officials would have the same rating). The last step is to make sure the overall list flows from group to group with the best official in Rank 1 rated between 1.0 to 1.4 and the next best officials in Rank 2 rated between 1.5 to 1.9, etc. etc. Not everyone can be in one group and it should be more of a bell curve to allow the scheduling system to work (just like most games are not the “top rank” or the “lower level rank” games, they fall somewhere in the middle) Remember that the rating of each rating source is averaged with the others.

\* Officials will be rated 1 through 5, (ratings may be in decimals, i.e. 1.5) with rating 1 being the highest and 5 the apprentice level. All the ratings, from each rating source, will be averaged together to get the final rating.

For scheduling purposes, officials rated in a certain range, will be grouped together in a **Rank** of 1-8 (see below).

Rank 1 – 1.0-1.4  
Rank 5 – 3.0-3.4

Rank 2 – 1.5-1.9  
Rank 6 – 3.5-3.9

Rank 3 – 2.0-2.4  
Rank 7 – 4.0-4.4

Rank 4 – 2.5-2.9  
Rank 8 – 4.5-5.0

Each rating source will base their rating with consideration of the factors of game management, court presence, rules knowledge and application, mechanics and general behavior keeping in perspective the **grouping** of similar type rated officials. Grouping is the key component.

- An official who is of Rank 1 (rating of 1.0 to 1.4) is capable of working the R (referee) position in any game the chapter assigns. This official excels at the top games in the factors of game management, court presence, rules knowledge and application, mechanics and represents the chapter well with overall general behavior and mature judgment.
- An official who is of Rank 8 is still learning the basics of mechanics and rules knowledge and application. This official is not strong in the areas of game management and whose court presence is in the beginning stages.