

California

The "Cal" logo is centered in the middle of the page. It is written in a large, dark blue, cursive script. The letters are thick and fluid, with a long, sweeping underline that extends from the bottom of the "l" across the width of the logo.

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 |
|----------------|-------|--------------------------|---------------|
| Offense | | | |
| 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 |
| Defense | | | |
| 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 3PA), 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

| | Averages | | | | W/L Difference ¹ |
|------------------------------------|----------|------|------|------|-----------------------------|
| Stat | Overall | L5 | Win | Loss | |
| Team | | | | | |
| 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 |
| Opponent | | | | | |
| 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 |
| Other | | | | | |
| 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%**