



Post Play Express

Vol.2, No. 5, January 2011

NATIONAL EXAM RESULTS

For national recognition, the National Official Certification Program (NOCP) requires that the following four components be assessed: rule knowledge, floor mechanics, game management and court presence. The rule exam constitutes the theoretical part of the assessment of rule knowledge. For the results of the exam to be recognized nationally, the exam must be written in a closed-book supervised environment. Not all the officials across Canada write the exam in the environment prescribed for national recognition. The results reported below do not distinguish those who wrote the exam closed-book and supervised from those who wrote it open-book, in group settings or as a take home. With this in mind, let's look at some of this year's results as submitted by the provincial interpreters.

The following are based on the responses from 2797 candidates in 9 provinces.

Table. Percentage of respondents meeting the minimum requirement on the written exam at each level of certification (70% for Level 1, 80% for Level 2, 86% for Level 3 and higher)

| | Not passing | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 and above |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Newfoundland/Labrador | 15,50% | 16,90% | 16,90% | 50,70% |
| Prince Edward Island | 5,55% | 27,78% | 13,89% | 52,78% |
| Nova Scotia | 7,65% | 14,75% | 19,68% | 57,92% |
| New Brunswick | 17,09% | 25,12% | 24,62% | 33,17% |
| Québec | 31,14% | 26,89% | 17,79% | 24,18% |
| Ontario | 21,11% | 32,51% | 16,18% | 30,20% |
| Manitoba | 19,14% | 24,07% | 15,43% | 41,36% |
| Alberta | 18,13% | 33,17% | 21,84% | 26,86% |
| British Columbia | 10,48% | 17,56% | 11,90% | 60,06% |
| Global | 19,27% | 26,96% | 17,91% | 35,86% |

Practically 80% of the officials reach a passing mark at one level of accreditation or another. However, there cannot be too much emphasis put on the need to promote rule knowledge among our ranks. In the next few weeks, there should be a first version of a virtual casebook available on line. This will be a long awaited learning tool for our members. The tool itself will be worthless without a serious effort in studying it.

There were six questions in the exam with a rate of incorrect answers higher than 40% (rate in parentheses):

- Question 10 (60%)

A2 has control of the ball in Team A's frontcourt, when B4 taps the ball out of A2's hands and the ball rolls into Team A's backcourt. Shall the 8-second count start as soon as any Team A player touches the ball?

The correct answer is **NO**. For the 8-second count to begin, a player must **gain control** of the live ball on the playing court in his backcourt. The only exception is during a **throw-in** where the mere touching of the ball by any player on the court causes the count to start.

- Question 14 (51,3%)

Team A executes a throw-in from the end line of their backcourt. With the ball still in Team A's backcourt, the official notices that the 24 second clock has not started. The official blows his whistle and resumes play at the nearest point out of bounds with a new 24 second clock and a new 8 second count for Team A. Is the official correct?

The correct answer is **YES**. In Article 28.1.3, there are **five reasons not to grant** a new 8-second count. Stopping the play for a technical reason (as in this case) is **not one of the five**. Also, Article 29.2.1 states: "*If the game is stopped by an official: ...for **any valid reason not connected with either team** (as in this case), possession of the ball shall be awarded to the same team that previously had control of the ball. If the throw-in is administered in the backcourt, the twenty-four (24) second clock shall be reset to twenty-four (24) seconds*".

- Question 18 (54,1%)

While A1 is in the act of shooting, A2 and B2 commit a double foul. A1, in a continuous motion, releases the try for goal and the ball enters the basket. Shall the basket count?

The correct answer is **NO**. While a player is in the act of shooting, if a **teammate** of the shooter commits an infraction **before the ball is released**, the ball becomes dead immediately and no points can be scored.

- Question 28 (42,9%)

At the beginning of the game, jumper A1 taps the ball directly out of bounds and Team B is awarded a throw-in. On the throw-in by B2, A2 is the first player to gain possession of the live ball on the playing surface. Shall the possession arrow now favour Team B?

The correct answer is **YES**. "*The team that **does not obtain control of a live ball on the playing court after the jump ball** at the beginning of the game will be awarded the ball for a throw-in at the place nearest to where the next jump ball situation occurs.*" (Interpretations, Article 12, Statement 1)

- Question 40 (41,5%)

Near Team B's basket, A2 attempts a pass to A4, but the ball is deflected by B1. The ball then hits the ring. Shall the shot clock be reset?

The correct answer is **YES**. Article 50.2 says: "...the twenty-four (24) second clock shall be: ...**stopped and reset** to twenty-four (24) seconds, with no display visible, when: ...**the ball touches the ring of the opponents' basket** (unless the ball lodges between the ring and the backboard).

- Question 42 (45,7%)

On a last free throw, if the free thrower violates and there is no disconcertion, shall violations by the opponents be disregarded?

The correct answer is **NO**. In Article 43, the provision that a violation by the free thrower should take precedence over any other violation **has been deleted**. So a violation by the free thrower and one by an opponent create a jump ball situation.

Lessons from the Police Athletic League

By Sarwar Qureshi



The Police Athletic League (PAL) is a program that runs in conjunction with the Boys and Girls Club to provide opportunities for youth to take part in organized sports. The Boys and Girls Club of Ottawa has a basketball division of the PAL and on Saturday September 18th, an all-star team was selected from players within the league to play against the Ottawa police in what is the finale to a busy summer of basketball. Murray Shoup and I from OVBABO (Ottawa Valley Board of Approved Basketball Officials) were invited to officiate the game as well as stay for the dinner and awards banquet.

The game was extremely competitive and highly skilled – overtime with a final score of 110 – 106! The dinner was quite bountiful and delicious – Lone Star takeout complimented with homemade Somali cooking. And the banquet was quite dazzling – numerous awards and speeches along with Murray and I presenting the sportsmanship award to very deserving individuals. I was especially touched by the underlying reason of having the PAL, which is the reason for the article all together.

In talking with some of the police officers at dinner one of the goals of the league is to build friendships between law enforcement officers and children with the view that positive attitudes can be developed by the youth towards police officers. This was evident over the course of the entire afternoon and evening as I observed interactions between the two groups on the basketball court and socially afterwards. An officer went on to explain that if an individual respects an officer on the court, they are more likely to respect the rules an officer enforces off the court. At the banquet a powerful presentation was delivered by one of the officers about the perils facing youth today and many examples were given of people falling into various traps which got them into trouble with the law. I am certain the youth took the message better because of the respect they developed for the officer through the PAL.

Overall Murray and I felt very appreciative of being invited to such an event. As representatives of OVBABO, OABO, CABO, and officials in general we realized that our interactions on and especially off the court with the youth helped foster their respect for officials similar to the concepts described above with officers. While this is far secondary in importance to developing respect for law enforcement, I feel as officials we should take part in such events whenever the opportunity arises. By doing so, it helps us appear more personable, friendly, and human which in turn will help our future interactions with the same coaches, players, and spectators involved. Not to mention that you can also learn something from the youth – which is worth another article altogether.

ANSWERS TO THE RULE QUESTIONS IN THE DECEMBER 2010 ISSUE

1. Here is what Article 28.1.2 says about the ball hitting an official relatively to the ball achieving front court status:

“The team has caused the ball to go into its frontcourt whenever: ... the ball touches an official who has part of his body in the frontcourt of the team in control of the ball”.

So, the ball controlled by Team A went in their frontcourt and returned to their backcourt and was last touched and first touched by a Team A player. Therefore, violation.

2. A twenty-four (24) second violation has occurred. B2's foul shall be disregarded unless technical, unsportsmanlike or disqualifying.
3. When Team B is scored upon, they automatically get a new 24-second, because it is a new control for them. When they get the throw-in in the front court after the time-out, they have whatever is left on the shot clock, as long as it is 14 or more. Therefore, 24 seconds.
4. (a) The player shall be replaced without any sanction by one of the five players who were to start the game. (b) The error is ignored and the game continues.
5. Yes. Team A must then make the throw-in in their frontcourt.