



Post Play Express

Vol.5, No. 5, January 2014

A VERY HAPPY
AND SUCCESSFUL
NEW YEAR TO ALL
FOR 2014

REPORT ON THE 2013-2014 NATIONAL RULE EXAM

By Paul Deshaies, National Rule Interpreter

This was the 3rd year that the national rule exam was administered on line. A total of 3082 members wrote the exam which represents more than 75% of the membership. This is a considerable increase over the past two years.

CABO owes a huge debt of gratitude to Martha Bradbury, interpreter for 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. The weekend of December 14-15 was particularly challenging, since about 1 200 people waited for that final weekend to write the exam. One can imagine the amount of traffic encountered over these two days.

One case of cheating was officially reported where someone who logged on under somebody else's name was ultimately identified and admitted guilt. Disciplinary sanctions were swiftly imposed by that person's local board. It is not unlikely that there were other cheating incidents of various nature. The process relies upon each individual person's honesty and sense of morality. After all, as officials, aren't we supposed to be models of integrity?

Martha has made several recommendations which will be useful in making the process more efficient and more manageable in the future.

Pursuant to the decisions made at the September AGM, there were modifications to the exam compared to the previous two years. The random ordering of questions was eliminated so that everyone had to answer the same 50 questions in the exact same order. The questions deemed to be "easier" were placed before the more complex ones.

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>
Level 3	86% & above	48%	43%	48%
Level 2	80% to 84%	14%	13%	13%
Level 1	70% to 78%	19%	19%	18%
Unsuccessful	68% & under	19%	25%	21%

Below are ten questions that were incorrectly answered by over 1 000 respondents. Try them again and see how you do (answers are provided on the last page of this issue) :

- A) A backcourt throw-in by A3 is deflected by B3. The ball bounces freely in the backcourt for 2 seconds before it is controlled by A4. Is the official correct in starting an 8-second count when A4 takes control of the ball in the backcourt?
- B) A1's pass from Team A's backcourt hits the leg of an official who is standing in Team A's frontcourt. The ball bounces back into Team A's backcourt where it is first touched by A2. Is this a violation for illegally returning the ball to the backcourt?
- C) With 1:27 to play in the 4th period, B1 commits basket interference and 2 points are awarded to Team A. Before the ball becomes live, A10 requests to substitute for A1. Shall the substitution be granted at this time?
- D) Shall the penalty for an unsportsmanlike foul always be two free throws followed by a throw-in at the mid-court line opposite the scorer's table?
- E) While the ball is in the air on a try for goal by A1 with 10 seconds remaining on the 24-second clock, B2 fouls A4. It is team B's 2nd foul in the period. The ball enters the basket. The officials count the basket by A1, award the ball to Team A for a throw-in at the place closest to where the foul occurred, and reset the 24-second clock to 24 seconds. Are the officials correct?
- F) To begin the third period, the centre line throw-in pass by A3 is caught by A5 who jumped from Team A's frontcourt, caught the ball while airborne and landed straddling the centre line. Is this a violation?
- G) A1 dribbles towards the basket, enters the no-charge semi-circle and begins the act of shooting. Before leaving the floor and with the ball in his hands, A1 charges into B4 who is inside the no-charge semi-circle area, in legal guarding position. Shall the no-charge rule apply?
- H) With 1:05 remaining in the first extra period, Team A has control of the ball in their backcourt when a technical foul is assessed to Coach B. Following Team A's free throws, Team A is granted a time-out. Shall the Team A throw-in be awarded at the "throw-in line" in Team A's frontcourt opposite the scorer's table?
- I) B4 commits an unsportsmanlike foul on dribbler A5. Before the ball becomes live for A5's first free throw, A4 is called for a technical foul. The officials rule that the two penalties cancel each other. The possession arrow favours Team B. The officials decide that play should resume with a throw-in by Team B. Are the officials correct ?
- J) A1 deliberately scores in Team A's basket. Shall two points be awarded to Team B?

MY UNLIKELY ROAD FROM THE FOOTBALL FIELD TO THE BASKETBALL COURT

By Terry Baker, Nova Scotia

The game of basketball and the game of football have very little in common. Although the arenas are different, the thrill of competition, the unity of the team, and the passion of the team supporters bare a similar appearance.

It is interesting how your profession becomes your identity throughout life. I will probably always be identified as a two time Grey Cup Champion who played 16 years in the CFL.

Becoming a basketball referee was never on my bucket list. However, being a father to three daughters who developed an interest in the sport has led me down a fulfilling path.

I moved my family to the small community of Bridgewater in 2002 to pursue life as a business owner. My girls wanted to continue their chosen sport of Basketball. I would have preferred them to play golf (my strongest passion) however basketball was the chosen sport. Unfortunately, our town lacked development programs for females and the junior high team for my eldest needed a coach. My passion for sports and my belief in being an active participant in the lives of my children led me to volunteer. I took my elementary school experience to the basketball arena and developed a rec league for girls along with coaching the junior high girls team. Realizing I knew few rules and seeking to avoid any embarrassment, I sought knowledge in my local referees and enrolled in the referee course.

Our area needed referees so it was suggested that I put my knowledge to work and become an active referee. That was ten years ago. I instantly took to this new role. I enjoyed the challenges in every game and worked to better my performance. I became a sponge to the game and slowly but persistently I have grown to become an active member of the University and College Panel in Nova Scotia.

The transition from athlete, to coach, to official was oddly similar given the preparation needed in conditioning, study and the ability to ignore any verbal abuse. As a punter/placekicker I was very accustomed to a stadium of fans voicing their pleasure or displeasure of my performance. My skin is, therefore, pretty thick when parents or coaches choose to enlighten me with their opinions.

This has been an enjoyable, stimulating, and thought-provoking ride. I believe the principles of sport are universal. My daughters have moved on to new interests however I still love the game.

FURTHER THOUGHTS ON ACCOUNTABILITY

By Mike McPhee, Interpreter for Ontario

Accountability: An obligation or willingness to accept responsibility for one's actions.

Integrity: The quality of being honest and having strong moral principles; moral uprightness.

The change of the calendar to a new year is a time for many people to “make resolutions” about the time ahead of them. Often these plans mean that the person is looking for a way to change their situation by doing something different. For officials I would suggest it's a good time to think of doing something we should do, have done to some degree up till now, but need to do better.

A record cold start to the New Year here in Ontario quickly followed an icy mess just before Christmas and kept many of us busy attending to the necessities of day to day life. As a result, I was distracted from thinking about my article for this issue. One of the things I did was to look at the December issue (so as not to be repetitive) and discovered from the articles of Jamey Jennings and Bill Denney two important concepts – Accountability and Integrity.

The other day, I arrived home to discover that the furnace was off and the house temperature was 6 degrees. The natural option was to call the “heating guy” to make things work. I felt confident that, in his hands, things would be looked after and the problem solved. Why? Because he is a professional who is trained in his field. That, my fellow officials, is what the public, our clients, think that we are. It's why they contact our associations to provide them with the people who will arbitrate the game. What do they expect from us in return? Knowledge, Accountability, Integrity, Reliability, Preparation.

The other catalyst for this article was the administration of the CABO exam. Martha Bradbury gave over nearly a month of her life shepherding over 3000 writers, and I know that all of us (Interpreters) shadowed the ones of those belonging to us. It's a tiring process and one that is made more difficult when more than 1/3 of the country waits till the final weekend to write. Here in Ontario, 44% of our test takers waited until the last weekend and 70% of them wrote on the last day, which meant we were glued to computers until midnight. The serious problem though was the existence of ‘non-compliant’ test taking. So what is the problem?

Examination: A formal (standardized) test of a person's knowledge or proficiency in a particular subject or skill.

That is the definition of the word, and “Standardized tests” are used by certain governing bodies (i.e. CABO) to determine if a test taker is allowed to claim competency in a specific set of skills. Jamey called our exam a “great educational tool to measure what one knows or doesn't know about FIBA rules”. But, you take the test to find out what you don't know, and then educate yourself “post-test”. What you don't do is gather together, have an “educational” discussion of the exam questions, and then submit a group mark as your own. People at the games we officiate want a call... not a conference between the crew when each decision has to be made. The other point that Jamey made was that the exam is the only tool for the achievement of a standard that can change an official's

NOCP Level. Therefore your 86% (or greater) must reflect your knowledge when you submit it. To do anything else shows a lack of integrity, and isn't fair to those who follow the rules, do what is expected of them and are therefore accountable.

So let us all resolve to do a better job at this next year. Even better than that, let those who deviated this time have the integrity, to be accountable for what they did, and accept the consequences whatever they might be.

ANSWERS TO THE TEN QUESTIONS

- A) No. Article 28.1.1. On a backcourt throw-in, the game clock, shot clock, and 8-second count all start as soon as ANY player touches the ball in the backcourt.**
- B) No. Article 30.1.2. For a backcourt violation to occur, the player causing the ball to return to the backcourt must be in the frontcourt.**
- C) Yes. FIBA Interpretations, Articles 18/19, Statement 7, Example 2**
- D) No. Article 36.2.2. If the foul is committed on a player in the act of shooting: the goal, if made, shall count and, in addition, ONE (1) free throw. If the foul is committed on a player in the act of shooting and the goal is not made: two (2) or THREE (3) free throws.**
- E) No. Article 29.2.1; FIBA Interpretations: Article 29, Statement 7, Example 1**
- F) Yes. Articles 11.1; 30.1.2. Team A has team control during the throw-in. A5 catches the ball in the frontcourt (last player to touch the ball in the frontcourt) and returns to the backcourt by landing straddling the line (first player to touch the ball in the backcourt).**
- G) No Article 33.10. The no-charge rule applies when the offensive player driving to the basket is airborne coming across the plane of the no-charge semi-circle.**
- H) No. Article 17.2.3. Following the free throws for a technical, unsportsmanlike or disqualifying foul, the throw-in shall be administered at the centre line, opposite the scorer's table.**
- I) No. Article 42.2.7. After a cancellation, if no penalty is left to administer and a team had control of the ball at the time of the first infraction, play shall resume with a throw-in by this team.**
- J) No Article 16.2.3.**