

2019 Ratings Program Final Report

The 2019 Rating Program followed the Rating Plan approved by the OCFOA Board in April 2019. The attached tables provide the compiled data and the final rankings of officials.

Rating Committee

The members of the rating committee are listed in the attached table along with their contributions during the 2019 season. Non committee members, particularly retired officials, also assisted by conducting numerous observations.

Applications

As in past years, officials were required to submit applications in order to be rated for playoff consideration. A total of 57 officials applied to work the semis/finals and another 20 applied to work the 2nd round. A total of 28 officials applied to work as a deep flank. Several of these officials either did not take the test or later chose to drop out of consideration, leaving a total of 63 officials to observe and rank.

Test

A test was given at the August 21, 2019 OCFOA meeting and two make-up dates were provided. The tests, which were designed specifically for each position, turned out to be much more difficult than intended. The wide variation in test scores resulted in it being the most important factor in determining the final rankings.

Field Observations

Officials were rated from 1 to 5 on seven characteristics. Field observations were made by OCFOA volunteers and retired officials. An online form was used to compile the information. Early in the season, it was discovered that a score could be entered with a decimal place. The form was fixed to not allow a decimal place, but the four observations that had been entered with decimals were left as they were. Most officials were given a score of 4 in most categories. A score of 3, or less, could be appealed. There were no scores below a 3.

HUDL Observations

The same form and process was used for HUDL observations as for field observations. Rating Committee members conducted all but two of the HUDL reviews. Most officials received a score of 4 in all, or most, categories. Since HUDL often did not provide a great deal of information, a 4 was the default score.

Appeals

About half of officials that received a score of 3 appealed. For appeals, the HUDL film was reviewed by multiple officials. About half of the appeals resulted in a change in scoring and about half remained as they were.

Deductions

There were no deductions made for significant officiating errors.

Service Point

All but 6 officials received the service point. The Rating Chairman sent multiple emails to those who did not already have the service point to remind them about it. It was very easy to get the point.

Final Rankings

The attached tables show the final rankings for each position and the deep flanks. For the five-man officiating positions, ranks were based on the sum of the test grade, field and HUDL observations, and the service point. In cases where there was a tie, rating committee members voted to break the tie. Committee members could not vote for an official at their own position if they were in consideration to work playoffs.

The deep flank rankings were entirely based upon votes from the rating committee. Each committee member was provided with data from each individual, including the additional experience data that was provided upon the request of the rating chairman. Committee members were also asked to use their own experience with these officials and to look at HUDL film. Each member was directed to vote for their top 6 in numeric order. The votes were submitted via email and tabulated with any non-votes considered a score of 7. A total of 18 committee members voted (members who were under consideration for a deep flank position could not vote) and the final ranks are provided in the attached table.

Non-Playoff Observation Feedback

Approximately 45 non-playoff observations were conducted and the feedback was provided to the officials. Most of the feedback was for relatively new officials and most of them expressed appreciation for the feedback. Some officials did an outstanding job providing feedback.

Conclusion

The Ratings Program functioned as designed, however, there is considerable room for improvement. The Rating Chairman will provide a detailed synopsis of the 2019 program to the OCFOA Board with recommendations for future efforts.

Rating Committee Member Contributions

	Field Observations	HUDL Observations	Appeals	Voted - Ties	Voted - Deep Flanks
Armando Amaro	0	3	1	Y	Y
Ben Hughes	0	0	0	Y	N
Bob Nunez	0	1	1	Y	N
Brian Brennan	0	4	0	Y	Y
Chris Nguyen	0	1	0	Y	Y
Chris Salio	2	2	0	Y	Y
Corey McManimen	0	3	2	Y	N
Daniel Muniz	0	0	2	N	N
Don Ariosto	0	6	0	Y	N
Eddie Marquez	0	1	0	Y	Y
Jeff Jacquot	0	2	0	N	N
Jeff Smith	1	3	0	Y	Y
Jeffery Osborne	0	5	1	Y	N
John Capen	0	3	0	Y	Y
John Holmberg	0	4	1	Y	Y
John Visciglia	0	0	0	N	N
Jon Batarse	0	1	1	Y	Y
Kip Green	0	0	2	Y	Y
Kirk Vanrooyan	0	4	0	Y	Y
Lance Orloff	0	1	1	Y	N
Marce Almarez	2	1	0	N	N
Mike Darakjian	0	1	1	Y	N
Mike Hannah	0	5	1	Y	Y
Ray Rangel	0	2	0	Y	Y
Rich Brown	1	1	1	Y	N
Richard Wilson	13	2	8	N	Y
Rick Langemeier	0	2	1	Y	Y
Steve Heyman	1	2	0	Y	N
Ted Dickenson	2	2	0	Y	N
Terry Torline	0	0	0	Y	Y
Tom Innocenti	0	4	0	Y	Y
Tony Brock	0	0	0	N	N
Troy Leonard	0	4	1	Y	Y

Non Rating Committee Member Contributions

	Field	HUDL
Andrew Lambert	5	0
Bill Ehart	2	0
Dave Nelson	13	0
Jess Senn	3	0
Jim Molden	0	1
Kyle Cason	1	0
Mike Weir	1	0
Rich VanVliet	1	0
Sal Figuora	10	0
Steve McKay	0	1

2019 Final Rankings by Position

Referee

Rank	Name	Test	Field	HUDL	Ser.	Total
1	Ariosto	4.0	4.3	4.6	1	13.9
2	Heyman	4.0	4.2	4.4	1	13.6 ^a
3	Darakjian	4.0	4.4	4.2	1	13.6
4	Roberts	3.0	4.1	4.4	1	12.5
5	Corrigan	3.3	3.9	4.0	1	12.2
6	Bautista	3.3	4.0	3.8	1	12.1
7	Gizzi	3.0	4.0	4.0	1	12.0
8	Douglass	2.0	4.8	4.0	1	11.8
9	Yoakum	2.7	4.0	4.0	1	11.7
10	Locy	2.3	4.1	4.0	1	11.4
11	Stickney	2.0	4.2	4.0	1	11.2 ^a
12	Gilman	2.0	4.2	4.0	1	11.2
13	McKay	2.0	4.0	4.0	1	11.0
14	Smith*	1.7		4.0	1	10.7
15	Sousa*	1.7		3.7		9.0

Umpire

Rank	Name	Test	Field	HUDL	Ser.	Total
1	Vega	4.0	4.0	4.4	1	13.4
2	Snow	3.7	4.4	4.0	1	13.1
3	Molden	3.0	4.5	4.6	1	13.0
4	Youngdahl	3.7	4.3	3.8	1	12.7 ^a
5	Van Rooyan	3.0	4.7	4.0	1	12.7
6	Osborne	3.0	4.2	4.2	1	12.4
7	Thompson*	3.3	3.9	3.8	1	12.0
8	Salio	2.0	4.5	4.1	1	11.6
9	Capen	2.3	4.0	4.0	1	11.3
10	Garcia	2.0	4.1	4.1	1	11.2
11	Van Vliet	2.0	4.1	4.0	1	11.1
12	Scherer	3.0	4.0	4.0		11.0
13	Torline	1.7	4.0	3.9	1	10.6
14	Sanchez*	2.3	4.0	4.0		10.3
15	Brant	2.0	4.1	4.0		10.1

Head Linesman

Rank	Name	Test	Field	HUDL	Ser.	Total
1	Ryan	3.0	5.0	4.5	1	13.5
2	Andrews	3.7	4.0	4.0	1	12.7
3	Bundy	3.0	4.5	4.0	1	12.5
4	Moreno	3.0	4.3	4.0	1	12.3 ^a
5	Hatcher	3.7	3.7	3.9	1	12.3
6	Druding*	4.0		3.7	1	12.3
7	Weir*	3.0		4.0	1	12.0
8	Biggio	2.0	4.3	4.4	1	11.6
9	Rangel	2.3	4.0	4.2	1	11.5
10	Nesbitt	2.0	4.2	4.0	1	11.2
11	Norris	1.7	4.3	3.9	1	10.8

Line Judge

Rank	Name	Test	Field	HUDL	Ser.	Total
1	Orloff	4.0	4.0	4.4	1	13.4
2	Muniz*	3.7		4.2	1	13.1
3	Innocenti	3.3	4.1	4.3	1	12.7
4	Weyrick	3.7	4.4	4.0		12.1
5	Hughes, B.	2.0	4.9	4.0	1	11.9
6	Bryant	2.0	4.0	4.7	1	11.7
7	Crook	2.0	4.0	4.3	1	11.3
8	Bruer	2.0	4.1	4.1	1	11.2 ^a
9	Gardner*	2.0		4.1	1	11.2
10	Brookman	2.0	4.0	3.8	1	10.8
11	Noble*	1.7		3.9	1	10.4

Back Judge

Rank	Name	Test	Field	HUDL	Ser.	Total
1	McManimen	4.0	4.5	4.5	1	14.0
2	Montgomery*	3.7	4.2	4.0	1	12.9
3	Brown	3.0	4.0	4.0	1	12.0 ^a
4	Hebbard	3.0	4.0	4.0	1	12.0
5	Batarse*	2.7	4.0	4.0	1	11.7
6	Pulos	2.0	4.3	4.0	1	11.3
7	Schneider	2.0	4.1	4.0	1	11.1 ^a
8	Dickenson	2.3	3.7	4.1	1	11.1
9	Hudak	2.7	4.2	4.1		11.0 ^a
10	Nunez	2.0	4.0	4.0	1	11.0
11	Brody	1.7	4.3	4.0	1	11.0

^a - won tie breaker by vote of Rating Committee

* - 2nd Round only (HUDL 2X if no Field Observation)

2019 Deep Flank Rankings

		Scores at Regular Position					Experience as a Deep Flank				Number of Votes									
<u>Name</u>	<u>Reg Pos</u>	<u>Test</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>HUDL</u>	<u>Service</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Yrs HS</u>	<u>Games HS</u>	<u>Yrs Col</u>	<u>Games Col</u>	<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>	<u>3rd</u>	<u>4th</u>	<u>5th</u>	<u>6th</u>	<u>7th</u>	<u>Sum</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Rank</u>
McManimen	B	4.0	4.5	4.5	1	14.0	6	16	2	17	6	3	5	1	0	2	1	50	McManimen	1
Ryan	H	3.0	5.0	4.5	1	13.5	5	20	0	0	5	2	3	1	4	2	1	61	Ryan	2
Ariosto	R	4.0	4.3	4.6	1	13.9	1	1	10 (as HL)	100 (as HL)	3	1	2	0	1	2	9	91	Ariosto	3
McKay	R	2.0	4.0	4.0	1	11.0	5	12	8	70	3	2	1	0	1	1	10	91	McKay	3
Nesbitt	H	2.0	4.2	4.0	1	11.2	5	15	3	15	0	4	3	0	1	1	9	91	Nesbitt	3
Bruer	L	2.0	4.1	4.1	1	11.2	5	15	4	15	0	1	1	3	1	0	12	106	Bruer	6
Darakjian	R	4.0	4.4	4.2	1	13.6	5	15	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	13	111	Darakjian	7
Brown	B	3.0	4.0	4.0	1	12.0	4	14	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	13	113	Brown	8
Heyman	R	4.0	4.2	4.4	1	13.6	did not provide additional experience				0	2	0	1	0	0	15	113	Heyman	8
Hughes, B.	L	2.0	4.9	4.0	1	11.9	5	15	25 (as HL/LJ)		0	0	0	3	0	0	15	117	Hughes, B.	10
Dickenson	B	2.3	3.7	4.1	1	11.1	3	8	3	17	0	0	0	2	1	0	15	118	Dickenson	11
Hudak	B	2.7	4.2	4.1		11.0	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	118	Hudak	11
Orloff	L	4.0	4.0	4.4	1	13.4	5	10	10	100	0	1	0	1	0	0	16	118	Orloff	11
Hebbard	B	3.0	4.0	4.0	1	12.0	did not provide additional experience				0	0	0	1	1	2	14	119	Hebbard	14
Roberts	R	3.0	4.1	4.4	1	12.5	2	6	5	35	0	0	1	0	1	1	15	119	Roberts	14
Locy	R	2.3	4.1	4.0	1	11.4	5	10	2	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	120	Locy	16
Bryant	L	2.0	4.0	4.7	1	11.7	did not provide additional experience				0	0	0	0	2	1	15	121	Bryant	17
Norris	H	1.7	4.3	3.9	1	10.8	did not provide additional experience				0	0	0	1	0	1	16	122	Norris	18
Nunez	B	2.0	4.0	4.0	1	11.0	did not provide additional experience				0	0	1	0	0	0	17	122	Nunez	18
Brody	B	1.7	4.3	4.0	1	11.0	did not provide additional experience				0	0	0	1	0	0	17	123	Brody	20
Gilman	R	2.0	4.2	4.0	1	11.2	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	124	Gilman	21
Osborne	U	3.0	4.2	4.2	1	12.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	126	Osborne	22
Pulos	B	2.0	4.3	4.0	1	11.3	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	126	Pulos	22
Bundy	H	3.0	4.5	4.0	1	12.5	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	126	Bundy	22

