



C A B O



A C A B

# Post Play Express

Vol.6, No.5, January 2015

A VERY HAPPY  
AND SUCCESSFUL  
NEW YEAR TO ALL  
FOR 2015

# NATIONAL RULE EXAM REPORT

Submitted by Paul Deshaies, CABO National Interpreter

This was the 4<sup>th</sup> year of the national rule exam being administered on line. A total of 3,220 members wrote the exam out of the 5,295 listed candidates. This represents roughly 61% of the registered numbers.

CABO again owes a huge debt of gratitude to Martha Bradbury, interpreter of Manitoba, for accepting to set up and manage the exam. Martha spent countless hours helping people who were having difficulties logging on and solving various problems. Provincial interpreters also relentlessly contributed to guide members through the process. Again a vast number of people waited for the last few days preceding the December 15 deadline to write the exam. One can imagine the amount of traffic encountered over these few days. We will look into reducing the exam period since less than 20% of people completed the exam in the first 3 weeks that it was accessible.

This year we had a firm help us with the management of the exam, naturally for a fee. They provided each candidate with an individual password to access the exam. Since that expense had not been budgeted, the National Council members were informed of the project. Also, pursuant to the decision made at the AGM in September, we reverted back to the random ordering of the 50 questions.

Here are some comparative statistics:

## Compared percentages of officials having reached the minimum requirement at each certification level

		<u>2011-2012</u>	<u>2012-2013</u>	<u>2013-2014</u>	<u>2014-2015</u>
Level 3	86% & above	48%	43%	48%	43%
Level 2	80% to 84%	14%	13%	13%	16%
Level 1	70% to 78%	19%	19%	18%	21%
Unsuccessful	68% & under	19%	25%	21%	20%

Very small variations from year to year. Three provinces had more than 50% of their members who wrote the exam reaching the national passing mark of 86% for Level 3. They were Manitoba, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

Below are questions which were answered incorrectly by more than 25% of the candidates across the country. Percentage of incorrect answers appear in parentheses after each question. Answers are provided at the end of the newsletter. See how you do this time, if you first missed them!

## **EXAM QUESTIONS INCORRECTLY ANSWERED BY MORE THAN 25% OF PEOPLE**

- A) A1 has been dribbling in the backcourt for 5 seconds. A1's pass from the backcourt hits B1 who is straddling the mid-court line. The ball bounces back to A1 who catches the ball while still in the backcourt. Shall the official start a new 8-second count? (62%)
- B) A1 releases the ball on a try for goal. The 24-second signal sounds after which B1 legally touches the ball which is in its upward flight. The ball then enters the basket. Shall the basket count? (51%)
- C) A1 releases a 3-point try for goal. The signal sounds to end the period. The ball hits the ring. B1, in attempting to tap the ball off the ring, taps it into the basket. Shall the basket count for 3 points? (47%)
- D) B1 commits an unsportsmanlike foul on A1 who is in the act of shooting. The basket is successful. A1 is then assessed a technical foul. After reporting the fouls, the officials cancel the free throws and award Team B a throw-in from behind the endline in their backcourt. Is this correct? (41%)
- E) On a fast break, A1 ends his dribble at the free throw line, throws the ball against the backboard, continues his movement toward the basket, jumps, catches it again before it is touched by another player and dunks the ball. Is this a legal play? (35%)
- F) A1's makes a throw-in from the backcourt. A2 who has both feet completely in the frontcourt does not control the ball, but deflects it into Team A's backcourt. A3 is the first player to touch the ball after it has returned to the backcourt. Is this a violation for illegally returning the ball to the backcourt? (32%)
- G) A1's throw-in pass is deflected by defender B1 and bounces freely on the floor. Is Team A in control of the ball? (30%)
- H) Must the free throw awarded for a technical foul be attempted by a player who was on the floor when the foul was called? (28%)
- I) Does the first period begin when, during the jump ball, the ball is legally tapped by one of the jumpers? (27%)
- J) A4 is dribbling in the backcourt. A3 and B3 commit a double foul in Team A's frontcourt. Shall the ensuing Team A throw-in take place at the spot nearest to where the double foul occurred in Team A's frontcourt? (27%)

## **THE OUT OF BOUNDS CALL**

**Submitted by Bill Carr, Supervisor of Alberta**

Sometime over the course of a season, officials may find themselves discussing tough calls. This may occur in a clinic setting, often during the question-and-answer time allotted following a formal presentation. Or it may occur during a post-game discussion with your partners and perhaps even a game observer in the locker room. On occasion, however, the discussion will occur in a more casual setting, perhaps while enjoying an adult beverage with your partner(s) and other officials, following a game.

So, what is the toughest call? When asked, many officials will quickly reply BLOCK/ CHARGE and there is significant evidence to support this. Other tough calls often mentioned include GOALTENDING and BASKET INTERFERENCE, and here again, there is evidence to support these positions. But it's not very often that the opinion offered up will be the OUT OF BOUNDS call. Yet I believe this is one of the toughest calls that we regularly make and it is one that, when called incorrectly, can lead to an otherwise well officiated game going off the rails and causing embarrassment for the game officials.

As points of reference, I offer the following. A few years ago, I attended a clinic and, when asked about the toughest call, Hugh Evans of NBA fame, without hesitation, said OUT OF BOUNDS. In 2011, at our provincial clinic held in Edmonton, Benny Adams and Violet Palmer, also two well known NBA officials, explained that the OUT OF BOUNDS calls had only a 93% success rate and that this was the benchmark officials were measured against. Putting this in perspective, if you make 10 OUT OF BOUNDS calls in a game and get one call incorrect, you are below the benchmark grade.

For clarity, I'm not saying that the OUT OF BOUNDS call is the toughest; what I am saying is that the OUT OF BOUNDS call is a definite candidate for one of the toughest and consequently, officials need to give this commonly made call a bit more respect. And quite often, it may not be the call itself that creates the problems, but rather the often questionable and poor mechanics used by the officials to make the call, and the ensuing procedures adopted for putting the ball back into play. So let's begin.

Since Post Play Express reaches all CABO officials, from those at the grassroots level to our well known seasoned officials, I'll focus my comments and situations for games officiated with a two person crew. Officials working three person games should be able to make the appropriate adjustments. One last point - rather than using "his/her" and "he/she" in this text, I'll stay with "his" and "he" for the convenience of readers.

#### **THE PERFECT WORLD - NO PROBLEM**

The first situation we'll look at is where the ball goes Out Of Bounds on the end line in the front court. The official responsible for the end line is the LEAD, who correctly sounds his whistle while simultaneously giving the Stop Clock signal. After a very brief pause, the LEAD, with an assertive voice, will indicate the COLOUR of the Team who will be awarded the ensuing Throw-In and simultaneously give the signal for the direction of play for the ensuing Throw-In. No problem, this call is made many times over the course of a game regardless of the level of play.

#### **SOLICITING HELP FROM A PARTNER**

In this situation, the ball again goes Out Of Bounds on the end line in the front court, and the LEAD sounds his whistle while simultaneously giving the appropriate Stop Clock signal. However, the LEAD is uncertain as to who last touched the ball and needs some help. No COLOUR has been given by the official nor has a direction of play signal. The LEAD turns to his partner, the TRAIL, for assistance - he SOLICITS HELP FROM HIS PARTNER. By soliciting help from his partner, the LEAD is effectively turning the call over to the TRAIL to be completed. The TRAIL accepts the request in one of two ways.

1. With absolute certainty and using a strong, firm voice, he will call out the COLOUR of the team who will be awarded the ball for the ensuing Throw In and will simultaneously give a strong direction of play signal. In most situations, no whistle is required as the TRAIL is completing the call initiated by the LEAD. However, depending on the circumstances, such as in a closely contested game near the end of a period or in a very noisy venue, a firm and authoritative whistle is a great asset in getting the attention of all involved, prior to communicating how play will be resumed. Good communication is very often the key attribute of a well officiated game, but that's perhaps the topic of another article.
2. If the TRAIL is uncertain as to who last touched the ball before it went OUT OF BOUNDS, he will give the HELD BALL signal and play will be resumed with an Alternate Possession Throw-In. Remember, the LEAD has effectively turned the call over to the TRAIL to be completed, so the responsibility to complete the call becomes that of the TRAIL. As above, no whistle is necessary as the TRAIL is completing a call initiated

by the LEAD. However, the use of the whistle as a communications aid before completing the call is acceptable. Completing the call means verbalizing the COLOUR of the team who will be awarded the Throw-In while simultaneously giving the direction of play signal.

#### **OFFERING ASSISTANCE TO A PARTNER**

Let's now go back to the Perfect World scenario. The TRAIL is absolutely certain that his partner, the LEAD, has made an incorrect Out of Bounds call. He sounds his whistle which lets his partner know he has something to offer. The LEAD must accept this offer and the two officials should come together and meet for a very brief (a few seconds maximum) conference. This is still the LEAD's call and in the vast majority of situations he will accept the assistance offered by his partner. Following the very brief conference, the LEAD will sound his whistle and change his call, indicating with a strong voice the COLOUR of the team to be awarded the ensuing Throw-In and signalling the direction of play. A whistle is needed here, as the final decision for the call has been reversed by the LEAD as opposed to simply being completed by the TRAIL. The important point to remember here is this - you are offering assistance to a partner (the LEAD) who has made a call. It's still the LEAD's call and therefore the responsibility remains with the LEAD to complete the call.

#### **SO, WHAT CAN GO WRONG?**

In the interest of simplicity, I've focussed on the most common OUT OF BOUNDS problem area which is on the end line in the front court. However, the same principles should be adopted for side line calls and in situations where the ball travels a significant distance across the floor and goes Out Of Bounds in a partner's Primary. Be prepared to offer assistance.

1. When verbalizing an Out Of Bounds call, give only the COLOUR. Avoid comments such as "Off Blue" or "Hit the Knee". These comments are unnecessary and can lead to confusion, as some players or coaches may only hear the words "Blue" or "Knee" and incorrectly infer who will get the ball or assume that a foul has been called. Keep it simple and don't give the players, coaches, benches and fans an opportunity to be confused or uncertain as to how play will be resumed.
2. Do not make an Out Of Bounds call in your partner's Primary. This can result in the Out Of Bounds equivalent of a "BLARGE", where the LEAD is pointing in one direction and the TRAIL is pointing in the opposite direction. Both officials will look anything but professional should this occur. Unlike other tough calls, Out Of Bounds calls are the Primary of Only One on floor official. If your partner wants your help, he will ask for it. Agree in your pre-game conference who will take the call that goes Out Of Bounds in a corner.
3. When offering assistance to a partner when solicited, be firm and decisive. You either know or you don't know. An unnecessary delay here makes you and your partner look bad.
4. For ensuing Throw-Ins, make sure the ball is put back into play at the correct spot on the floor. Should a time out be called, which is often the case when the ball is being returned to the team last on offence and shot clock time is at a premium, make sure that both teams know where that correct spot is. No surprises when play is to be resumed.
5. Also, for ensuing Throw-Ins, make sure that the shot clock shows the correct time, particularly when the ball is being returned to the team last in control. Ensure that the shot clock has not been inadvertently reset. This often occurs when a missed field goal attempt fails to strike the ring and subsequently goes Out

Of Bounds off a player who was on defence. This correct shot clock time must be determined before the ball is allowed to be put back into play and may require input from your partner and the table officials.

6. When offering assistance to a partner, be absolutely certain that your assistance will be welcomed and beneficial to the game. The calling official, in all of the above cases, the LEAD, may have chosen to rule that rebounding contact between opponents was marginal as opposed to calling a foul, and return the ball to the team that was last on offence, even though a player on that team may have been the last to touch it. This is often referred to as a “Give Back”. Believe me, the last thing you want to be a part of in a highly competitive game is offering assistance to your partner and learning that his decision to return the ball to the team last on offence was a Give Back. I’m now wondering if the editors will allow this statement to be included in this article. But, a part of the FIBA philosophy is Happy Outcomes and on second thought, I believe this comment will pass the test.
7. Also, when offering assistance, only do so as a result of your own personal observations. Do not let the players, the team bench areas or the crowd influence you. This often occurs in a Give Back situation where the last player to have touched the ball appears obvious and it is the only factor being considered by the players, the team bench areas or the crowd. Ever heard of the phrase “Trust Your Partner”?
8. On occasion, the official responsible for making an Out Of Bounds may have just a touch of doubt as to who last touched the ball. This is another advantage of having a slight pause following the sounding of the whistle & giving the Stop Clock signal. If players remain in the front court without hesitation, they expect a front court Throw- In, but if they retreat to the opposite end, they are expecting a back court Throw-In. Their actions or body language are assisting you in completing your call. You then have the opportunity to complete your call with a strong direction of play signal while simultaneously giving the COLOUR of the team to be awarded the ensuing Throw- In.
9. Last, as noted above, the Out Of Bounds call mechanics for many officials can be significantly improved with something as simple as a patient whistle and a slight pause before giving the COLOUR and signalling the direction of play. Try it - it works.

Hopefully, you will find the above comments beneficial in improving upon one of the most common calls in the game, the OUT OF BOUNDS call. And maybe, you will find your games running more smoothly and with less controversy in the future. And just maybe, that city, zone, provincial or national championship assignment you’ve been yearning for will come your way.

## **PREPARATION AND PERFORMANCE**

Submitted by Mike McPhee, Ontario Interpreter

With Christmas and New Year’s Day over, the task of regularly scheduled officiating resumes. For those officials who work in Ontario, it’s the time of year when the switching back and forth between rule sets is at its peak. It is critical then, to make sure that we are fully prepared when we take the floor. Even for those Canadian officials who don’t operate with differing rule sets, that need for preparation is very important.

The CABO exam period has ended and Interpreters have analysis of the results available so that we can see where our weaknesses are as provincial bodies. Not surprisingly, for Ontario officials, the most errors occurred with questions that concern the differences between NFHS and FIBA rules. For the country as a whole, two of the top 10

errors concerned rule changes, two involved rarely occurring events, but the other 6 were standard parts of the game of which 2 happen every game. So, for the 61% of CABO members who wrote the exam, basic rules were misinterpreted. What does that say about the rule knowledge of the 39% who didn't write at all?

Misapplication of rules is detrimental to the game. The study for and writing of the exam is our best preparation tool for application of rules on the floor. Our errors show us the holes in our knowledge. The follow up search for why we made the mistakes helps us ensure that we don't make it on the floor. So if we don't go through that step, then how are we serving the game and its participants?

It isn't only rule knowledge that is an issue of preparation, however. Another area of concern is that, too frequently, officials misapply "philosophy" as well. University and College basketball isn't the same as High School basketball, which also isn't the same as "youth" basketball at its various levels. Each one emphasizes things that are particular to the level of play. The effect that contact can have at different skill levels, for example, needs to be understood and applied correctly to the level of game that we officiate on any given day.

Nowhere, however, do we set rules aside. The concepts of "You can't call that, in a game like this", or "Let them play", should not be part of an official's approach to the game. Nor should we base our performance on any given day, upon what one might rule "at the next level", whatever that phrase is supposed to mean. If there are specifications in the rules that tell us what decisions are to be made in a given situation, then we must rule according to those specifications and not how we "think" something should be done. In the NFHS rules (used in Ontario H.S. Games), there were 5 "must be fouls" added this year. Feedback shows that we were not prepared to make those rulings. In our U-12 and lower levels of play, there were new parameters put in place by the governing body. Feedback shows that we were not prepared to make those rulings either.

So for a New Year's resolution, I encourage all 5,300 CABO members to ensure that we are prepared and to perform our duties on the court accordingly.

## **ANSWERS TO THE RULE QUESTIONS**

- A) Yes. Articles 28.1.1, 28.1.2
- B) No. Articles 16.1.1 and 10.3
- C) Yes. Articles 31.2.5 and 31.3.2
- D) Yes. Articles 37.2.2, 36.4.2, 42.2.2, and 42.2.7
- E) No. FIBA Interpretations 24-3
- F) No. Articles 30.1.1 and 30.1.2
- G) Yes. Article 14
- H) No. Articles 36.4.2 and 7.9
- I) No. Article 9.1
- J) Yes. Article 35.2