



Post Play Express

Vol.3, No.7, March 2012

NOTES

Submitted by Markku Peuhkurinen, CABO's Secretary/Treasurer

Since this is my first article for the present basketball season, I wanted to start by talking about the loss of a friend and colleague, CABO Past-President, Don Cline. Don had been an Executive member for the past ten years. During such a long tenure one develops not only professional relationships but lasting friendships with the other Executive members. Don was a meticulous person during his officiating career and the same qualities which he brought to officiating were also exhibited as Vice-President, President and Past-President. I will certainly miss Don as a colleague and a friend. Dave Morphy has joined the CABO Executive as the Past-President and I look forward to working with him.

The CABO membership continues to be strong with over 4000 members. I'm happy to report that provinces are quite timely now in submitting their membership dues and lists. These lists are forwarded to Canada Basketball (CB) as all officials are now also members of CB through the \$5.00 fee paid annually. In the basketball hierarchy, CABO now enjoys the same status as the provincial basketball associations and is the only officials' organization in Canada enjoying such status while continuing as an autonomous entity. The working relationships with Canada Basketball and other basketball partners such as the CIS and CCAA are strong. The Executive are excited about the hiring of Tim Laurain as a manager for the development of officials jointly by Ontario Basketball Association and CB. Hopefully this will lead to an even stronger bond and cooperation between CB and CABO.

I am coordinating with Dave Werry and Warren Poncsak on the arrangements for AGM 2012 in Regina. After this AGM, CABO will have come 'full circle'. This means that somewhere along the line each province will have hosted the AGM. This will enhance CABO's profile as a truly national organization. Although it is not possible to host the AGM in all provinces on a rational basis because of the costs involved, at least regionally it is possible.

The Executive will meet in Halifax during the CIS Men's Basketball Championships. Each year the one face-to-face meeting of the Executive is conducted in conjunction with one of the national championship tournaments. This allows for an opportunity to observe the work of the top officials and to liaise with host organizations from the CIS and CCAA. Other than the AGM this is the only time that many lively discussions ensue about how to improve officiating and related aspects of the game.

Personally I'm anxiously waiting a vote by the Ontario Federation of School Athletic Associations (OFSAA) in April on whether or not to adopt FIBA rules for Ontario high schools with the season starting next September. A positive vote would finally bring all basketball in Canada under one set of rules. This would greatly simplify the task of learning the rules for officials in Ontario. Let's hope for the best.

OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT

Submitted by Charlie Taylor, Supervisor for New Brunswick

As the basketball season is coming to an end, we, in New Brunswick, had a successful year on the court. One of our main focuses was on developing officials at higher levels of our game. We all know how hard it is trying to keep officials on the floor. One thing that we have worked on as an executive is to promote and develop younger officials and promote and offer them an opportunity to officiate at a high end tournament when they have worked hard to develop their game.

This year, for the first time, we had 2 female officials officiate a high school provincial final championship. The two officials, Nancy Morrison of Saint John and Lauren Wood of Moncton, worked the 'A' Girls Final at Harbour Station in Saint John on Friday, February 25th.

Nancy Morrison has been a level 4 official for a number of years, working nationally at various levels on several occasions. She continues to work very hard at developing and improving her game. Lauren Wood has had her Level 3 rating for the past several years and she too continues to improve her game as she strives to reach the next level of officiating. These two officials have worked very hard at their games and deserved the opportunity to officiate at the Final 12 NBIAA Basketball Tournament this year.

This is the first time in history for the Officials Association in New Brunswick to supply two female officials for a High School Championship tournament and we are pleased that we were able to do so.

As we move forward with the development of officials in the future, we are hoping that we will be able to offer other new officials the opportunity to officiate at the next level of their game.



Left to Right: Lauren Wood, Nancy Morrison

WHO'S THE BEST?

Submitted by Bill Denney, Interpreter for British Columbia

How often has it been stated in reference to an outstanding official, that he/she does not know the rules, yet, he/she is one of the best. Is this true?

The avenue of least resistance is a preconceived philosophy of basketball officiating in which the official has determined that when a play happens within the guidelines of the philosophy, the resulting calls will always be made the same. Such a philosophy does not run afoul of the critics that might say the official is not being consistent or that preconception or anticipation is not in the best interest of the game. It seems in practice that many of the best officials do not reach the highest scores when tested on their knowledge of the rules. The only answer then appears to be that these officials make calls generally accepted by players, coaches and fans and over time have gained their respect.

The game of basketball must be refereed with a judicious philosophy of applying the rules, considering at all times their spirit and intent while seeking to achieve a common sense approach. It is essential, in dealing with modern day coaches, administrators and players, for the official to possess a thorough knowledge of the rules and, more importantly, of their application as outlined in the casebook. Constant study and use of floor mechanics enable the official to be in position to see what actually happens and make the correct call. Authorized signals as prescribed by rule will add professionalism to the official and will aid in the selling of the call. A personality strong in common sense is essential. Good personal mannerism and appearance tend to influence in a favourable manner which leads to acceptance and respect. The ability to deal with people in a businesslike, polite but firm manner is extremely important.

How often does one observe officials who seem to be going nowhere and, out of necessity, referee the game from a highly technical viewpoint, exhibiting little or no judgment about what needs to be called and what doesn't. Antagonism is created and the referee who attempts to call everything by the book ends up being labelled « too technical ».

Officials who are attempting to fulfill their goals, whatever they might be, who are mostly respected and who are receiving the envied assignments, all have something in common. For the most part, they are successful in their personal lives and have been able to transfer their individual personalities in their officiating. They have been able to overcome criticism by being consistent and employing a philosophy of calling many plays by taking the line of least resistance. In discussing their approach to the game, great emphasis is always placed on refereeing the game as it was intended to be played, keeping in mind current coaching trends and points of emphasis, players' abilities and even fan interest.

To take this approach, is not to be categorized as a politician, but is in an effort to do an impossible job in a professional and common sense manner. To be an official requires to be perfect right at the beginning and then, as the game proceeds, to get better. In addition, there is the challenge of being a 'good guy' to one team and the 'bad guy' to the other on many decisions, as hostile situations obviously exist in which one's ability and integrity are often questioned.

Anyone with a reasonable knowledge of the rules and a feel for the game, upon seeing a play from beginning to end, should be able to call it correctly a vast percentage of the time. What distinguishes officiating basketball from most other sports is that many of the calls must be made when the official has not seen the entire play and lacks some facts or information. It is true that a call must be made in many instances when the official has not seen the whole play. Many have been taught to use the practice of 'no calling' such plays. When bodies are flying all over the floor with severe contact not intended by rule, to 'no call' such plays results in loss of control of the game as well as an advantage or disadvantage. In such cases, one must make a call. If you don't know for sure who the foul is on, pick a logical candidate. This is important to both game control and one's ultimate survival.

Since many calls must be made without seeing the entire situation, obviously officiating leads itself to criticism for lack of consistency. What will distinguish the talented official from the average one is the ability to master the art of making the in-between calls, those they do not see from start to finish, the gray area calls, in an acceptable manner rather than merely exercising guess work. There are plays during the course of the game that are quite obvious to all. These must be observed and called correctly if the official is going to maintain respect and achieve acceptance. Traveling in which a player gains an advantage and scores, obvious goal tending and basket interference, illegal dribbles in the open court, clear block/charge plays are examples of obvious calls that must be made when they happen. These plays are often missed by officials who have poor backgrounds in use of floor mechanics. They have placed themselves out of position and, therefore, are unable to make calls that are obvious to all.

Finally, officials just need to do what's right for the game of basketball, in rules, mechanics and philosophy and not just make up as they go. It takes dedication and commitment.

NATIONAL INTERPRETER'S CORNER

Paul Deshaies, CABO's National Interpreter

Our webmaster, Matthew Koivisto has completed the analysis of the results of the national exam. His report is posted on the CABO website at www.cabocanada.org. The link to the report is on the home page. Look for the title [2011 Exam Analysis](#) .

Here are a few comments on some of the questions that were missed by over 500 respondents.

QUESTION

While A1 is holding the ball for an alternating possession throw-in, a double foul is committed. The official charges the fouls and awards a throw-in to Team A. A2 completes the throw-in to A3. Shall the possession arrow still favour Team A?

ANSWER: YES. Article 12.5.6. In this situation, Team A is awarded a throw-in as a result of the double foul while they were in control of the ball. It is no longer an alternating possession throw-in. Therefore, Team A does not lose the right to the next arrow.

QUESTION

A1 releases the ball on a try for goal. While the ball is in the air, the 24 second clock sounds. B2 then fouls A4. The ball misses the ring. This is Team B's 3rd foul of the period. Shall a throw-in be awarded to Team A?

ANSWER : NO. This is a 24-second violation by Team A. Throw-in to Team B. Article 29 Interpretations page 15, Statement 1, Example 3. If the 24-second signal sounds while the ball is in the air on a try for goal and the ball eventually does not enter the basket or touches the ring, a 24-second violation has occurred. Any foul committed after the horn has sounded is ignored unless it is a technical, unsportsmanlike, or disqualifying foul.

QUESTION

A5 is dribbling the ball in Team A's frontcourt. B3 deflects the ball into Team A's backcourt. In the backcourt, A4 then taps the ball to A3 who is also in the backcourt. The official began an 8 second count when A4 tapped the ball. Was the official correct?

ANSWER : NO Article: 28.1.1. Only on a throw-in does the 8-second count start as soon as the ball touches or is touched by any player. In this case, the 8-second count starts WHEN A TEAM A PLAYER gains control of the ball.

QUESTION

During the initial jump ball, jumper A1 taps the ball directly out-of-bounds. B1's throw-in is then grabbed simultaneously by A3 and B3 and a held ball is called. Shall a throw-in be awarded to Team A according to the alternating possession?

ANSWER : NO. The team next entitled to the next possession has not yet been determined since neither team gained control of a live ball on the playing court. New jump ball between A3 and B3. Interpretations page 4 Article 12, Statement 1

QUESTION

The 24-second signal sounds just after A3 releases a try for goal. The ball lodges between the ring and the backboard. Is the referee correct in ruling a 24 second violation?

ANSWER : YES Article 50.2 The shot clock shall be stopped and reset to 24 seconds when the ball touches the ring of the opponents' basket (UNLESS THE BALL LODGES BETWEEN THE RING AND THE BACKBOARD).

QUESTION

B1 has established a legal guarding position on A1. A1 jumps in the air, releases the ball on a try for goal and collides with B1 before returning to the floor. The official calls a foul on A1. This is Team A's 5th foul of the quarter. Shall B1 be awarded 2 free throws as a result of A1's foul?

ANSWER: YES Article 41.2.1. Team control ended when the ball was released on the try by A1. This is therefore a normal foul committed by A1. Since it is the 5th team foul in the period, two free throws are awarded to B1.

QUESTION

A2 releases the ball on a try for goal. While the ball is on its upward flight, and partly below the level of the ring, it touches the backboard and is immediately touched by B4. Has B4 committed goaltending?

ANSWER: NO. Article 31.2.1. For goaltending to occur, the ball must be completely above the level of the ring, even after touching the backboard.

In terms of officials reaching the minimal score on the exam to qualify for the NOCP levels 1, 2 and 3, here are the national percentages. For Level 3, the minimum score is 86%, for Level 2, it is 80% and for Level 1, 70% :

<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Unsuccessful</u>
48%	14%	19%	19%

You can consult the results by province in the report posted on the website.

AS National Interpreter, I receive questions regularly about rule interpretations. Here are a few which came by me recently.

QUESTION

Two simultaneous whistles for two fouls occur. Both fouls by the defense on different players. Neither foul is unsportsmanlike or disqualifying. They are the fifth and sixth team fouls in the period by the defense. What is the ruling?

ANSWER : The officials should quickly determine which foul occurred first. The other foul should be ignored since it was neither unsportsmanlike nor disqualifying. The principle is as follows: When the ball is dead and contact occurs, it shall be ignored unless it is an unsportsmanlike or disqualifying foul.

QUESTION

After a basket scored by B3, A1 inbounds the ball. The ball is deflected by B1, bounces freely on the floor and goes out-of-bounds after 2 seconds have elapsed. A throw-in is awarded to Team A in the backcourt. Shall the shot clock show 24 seconds for the throw-in by Team A?

ANSWER : No. On a throw-in, the shot clock starts as soon as the ball touches or is touched by any player on the playing surface. In this case, the shot clock started when the ball was deflected by B1. When play is stopped for the ball going out-of-bounds and the same team that had control is awarded a throw-in, there is no reset of the shot clock. Therefore, the shot clock should display 22 seconds.

QUESTION

The following example appears In the FIBA interpretations document, under Article 17 :

Example 6:

Team A has been in control in its backcourt for five (5) seconds when A4 and B4 are involved in a fighting situation. A4 and B4 are disqualified, the foul penalties cancel each other and a throw-in is awarded to Team A at the centre line extended opposite the scorer's table. Before the throw-in is administered, coach A is granted a time-out. Where shall the throw-in be administered to resume the game?

Interpretation:

The throw-in shall always be administered at the centre line extended opposite the scorer's table and always with the time remaining on the twenty-four (24) second clock, in this case with nineteen (19) seconds.

As this play involves two players and the penalties cancel each other out, why wouldn't the throw-in occur nearest the spot of the infractions rather than at centre. Just for interest sake, if there were 2:00 minutes or less remaining in the 4th quarter would the throw-in be moved to the frontcourt throw-in spot?

ANSWER :

In the same interpretation document, Statement 5, example B reads as follows:

Statement 5 : There are additional situations to those listed in Art. 17.2.3 in which the subsequent throw-in shall be administered from the centre line extended, opposite the scorer's table.

Example:

(b) If during a fighting situation, members of both teams are disqualified, there are no other foul penalties remaining for administration, and at the time the game was stopped a team had control of the ball or was entitled to the ball.

CONGRATULATIONS!

Here are the lists of officials nominated for the spring national championships, including the CIS women's regionals.

CCAA Women

Lethbridge, AB

Chris Gurunlian, QC
Chris Brischuk, SK
Peter Tsui, BC
Trevor Barss, BC
Kristen Kwiatek, AB
Wayne Zack, AB
Paul Rocca,, AB
Frankie Billingsley, AB
Stephanie Nordlee, AB
Matthew Kallio, AB
Pascale Mapleston, ON
Farhan Baig, ON

CCAA Men

Truro, NS

Jonathan McAloon, NB
Patrick Mischook, QC
Jayson Stiell, QC
Karn Dhillon, BC
Jon Hunt, NS
Brian States, NS
Ryan Lutes, NS
Darren Dahl, NS
Greg Parsons, NS
Paul Debelie, NS
Carl Artis Jr, AB
Vern Bovell, ON

CIS Women

Calgary, AB

Daniel Patterson, NB
Anthony Metrakos, QC
Scott Aaro, SK
Michael Reed Scott, BC
Martha Bradbury, MB
Richard MacKinnon, PE
Dave McGrattan, NS
Troy Eagar, AB
Oggie Sokolovic, ON
Kenneth E. Pennell, ON
Penny Wright, ON
Ian Peers, ON

CIS Men

Halifax, NS

Varouj Gurunlian, QC
Mike Homsy, QC
Marc Franklin, SK
Tanner Cervo, BC
Reid Kenyon, MB
Paul Hanson, NS
Michael Weiland, AB
Michael Falloon, ON
Geoff Astles, ON
Kevin Moore, ON
Phil Lawn, ON
Scott Critch, NL

CIS women's regionals :

Éric Brouillard, QC
Matthew Rosgen, SK
Stephane Labonne, AB

Marla Van Gelder, AB
Michael Reed Scott, BC
Lloyd Eidelman, ON

Malcolm Huber, ON
Al Duddridge, BC
Ian Peers, ON

Ray Holder, ON
Earl Roberts, MB
Chris Keats, NL