

California



Early Look Report

Date

January 1st

Location

Chapel Hill, NC

Time

12:00 pm

Game Type

ACC

8-4 Overall; 2-3 in last 5 Games; 0-2 in Away Games



California Roster Overview

Top 10 Players in Minutes Played Per Game

Player	Num	Yr	Ht	Mins	Stats
Taylor Barnes	3	FR	6-0	362	9.0 Pts, 5.3 Reb, 2.0 Ast
Lulu Laditan-Twidale	10	JR	5-9	339	14.6 Pts, 4.1 Reb, 3.1 Ast
Sakima Walker	35	SR	6-4	287	10.6 Pts, 7.0 Reb, 1.6 Ast
Aliyahna Morris	25	FR	5-5	285	7.5 Pts, 3.0 Reb, 3.8 Ast
Mjracle Sheppard	1	JR	5-10	253	10.6 Pts, 5.1 Reb, 2.6 Ast
Lola Donez	5	SO	5-11	221	2.9 Pts, 0.9 Reb, 1.2 Ast
Gisella Maul	21	JR	5-11	214	5.3 Pts, 5.1 Reb, 1.4 Ast
Naya Ojukwu	7	JR	6-1	92	6.7 Pts, 3.3 Reb, 0.2 Ast
Claudia Langarita	22	SR	6-4	71	1.9 Pts, 0.7 Reb, 0.4 Ast
Isis Johnson-Musah	6	FR	5-10	33	0.7 Pts, 0.6 Reb, 0.4 Ast



Four Factors Overall Report Card




Stat	Value	%tile Comp. to NCAA Avg.	Rating
<u>Offense</u>			
eFG%	49.5	75%	Very Good
TOV%	18.7	67%	Above Average
ORB%	34.8	62%	Above Average
FT/FGA	19.1	42%	Below Average
<u>Defense</u>			
eFG%	42.6	71%	Above Average
TOV%	18.8	29%	Weak
ORB%	29.3	64%	Above Average
FT/FGA	14.1	93%	Elite

- High 3PA volume (78th at 3PAr), sharply limiting opponents' 3PA (352nd)
- Slightly dominant on rebounding overall
- Plays at a slower tempo (308th/363 teams at Pace)
- Low opponent turnover frequency
- Elite at limiting opponent FT/FGA
- Solid shooting efficiency (105th of 363 in eFG%)

California %tiles Comp. to NCAA

Stat Wheel (%tile Based)



Wheel Values

%tiles Relative to NCAA Seen on Wheel Graph

ORTG	DRTG	TS%	FT%	3PAr	ORB%	TRB%	STL%
112.4	92.9	52.5	66.7	40.9	34.8	53.4	10.7

- Great **ORTG**, supported with solid **TS%**, take a high volume of **3s** than average
 - 40.9% of all shots from 3, with average 3pt% (30.2%)
 - Good in overall **Rebounding** (53% of TRBs)
 - Limiting turnovers to fewer than the national average
- **FT%** is below average at 66.7%
- Great **DRTG** but poor at forcing **STLs**, resulting in limited opponent **Turnovers**
- Elite at controlling their **Personal fouls**, They also rarely get to the **FT line**



W/L Comparison

Averages throughout all games, last 5 games, wins, and losses

Stat	Averages				W/L Difference ¹
	Overall	L5	Win	Loss	
<u>Team</u>					
ORB PG	10.3	10.8	9.6	12.0	-2.4
TRB PG	34.4	34.4	34.9	33.0	1.9
STL PG	6.7	6.2	7.2	5.3	1.9
TOV PG	14.2	14.4	14.4	13.7	0.7
Fouls PG	14.4	14.2	14.4	14.3	0.1
Pace	61.9	62.4	62.0	61.7	0.3
ORB%	32.9	34.0	31.8	35.7	-3.9
FTAr	29.0	23.1	33.6	17.0	16.6
3PAr	41.1	43.0	39.7	44.8	-5.1
Tov%	22.8	23.0	23.1	22.2	0.9
<u>Opponent</u>					
ORB PG	7.8	7.4	6.2	12.0	-5.8
TRB PG	28.2	27.6	26.2	33.3	-7.1
STL PG	7.8	8.8	6.6	11.0	-4.4
TOV PG	14.0	13.6	15.5	10.0	5.5
Fouls PG	18.0	15.8	19.5	14.0	5.5
Pace	64.9	64.0	67.1	59.0	8.1
ORB%	23.6	23.6	19.8	33.8	-14.0
FTAr	21.8	24.1	20.2	26.0	-5.8
3PAr	25.6	26.1	27.0	22.0	5.0
Tov%	21.4	20.8	23.1	16.8	6.3
<u>Other</u>					
Rebound Differential ²	6.2	6.8	8.6	-0.3	8.9
Turnover Differential ³	-0.2	-0.8	1.1	-3.7	4.8

¹ Positive - More in wins than losses; Negative - Less in wins than losses

² Average amount they win/lose the Rebound battle by

³ Average amount they win/lose the Turnover battle by

Biggest Differences


- The biggest differences come from their **Free Throw Attempt rate**
 - FTA rates are about twice as high in wins as in losses, respectively
 - They are also allowing about 6% points more in FTAr to the opponent when they are losing
- Another big difference is with how they **Rebound**
 - In wins their opponents ORB% is 14% points lower than in games they lose on average
 - As a result, Rebound Differential shows about 9 TRBs gap between wins and losses
- In wins, they also made the difference by forcing opponent **Turnovers**

Takeaways

- Manage Foul
- Own the glass
- Secure the ball

California Offense vs. North Carolina Defense


Bars represent %tile values compared to league.
Numbers above the bar represent true value.



- When compared to national averages, California shows solid efficiency at **Shooting**, and outperforms UNC's defense
 - UNC is good at limiting opponent **ORTG**, while California's ORTG is above average but still falls short
 - California's solid **eFG%** outperforms UNC's opponent efficiency, which is average
- UNC's defensive **3PAr** is above the national average, and California's 3PAr is higher than average. Also, California's **3PT%** is average, similar with UNC's defense on 3PT%
- UNC's **FTr** defense is average, California matches it with average FTr
- UNC is elite at forcing opponent **TOV%**, which surpasses California's TOV%, even they are good at securing the ball
- California's **Rebounding** is above average, but UNC is dominant at rebounding and outweighs California's

North Carolina Offense vs. California Defense

Bars represent %tile values compared to league.
Numbers above the bar represent true value.



- UNC shows an elite **ORTG**, better than California's **DRTG**. UNC also has an **eFG%** advantage here, even though California's defensive **eFG%** is above average
 - California is great at limiting **3s** with top level opponent **3PAr**, also good at opponent **3PT%** defense. However, UNC slightly outperforms California on 3PT metrics with solid 3PAr and elite accuracy
 - UNC rarely gets to the line, while California is elite at keeping opponents off it; California's opponent **FTr** is even lower than UNC's FTr
- UNC is elite at limiting **TOVs**, giving UNC a clear edge over California's bad Turnover creation
- California is an average team on the glass, UNC slightly exceeds with their solid **ORB%** and **TRB%**