2018/19 Season Statistical Review

McMaster Marauders

RECAP

McMaster entered this season knowing this was year 1 of the rebuild. The expectations were minimal. Yet McMaster managed to surprise everyone and reach the 2nd round of the playoffs and show they are true contenders.

Examining Individuals

We will start this seasons break down by examining We Value Stats which has been something we have tried to reiterate to players in game and in practice

WE VALUE IN GAME

WE VALUE - SEASON TOTALS

PLAYER/STAT	CHARGES TAKEN		DEFLECTIONS	CONTEST %			50/50		O.REB.	1 MORE		TURNOVERS	PAINT TOUCHES	TOTALS
	Made	Att.		Cont.	Miss.	%	Won	Lost		Made	Missed			
#3 Kwasi Adu-Poku	2	2	15	10	7	58.82%	2	7	20	3	4	9	0	32
#4 -Mackenzie Hart	0	0	3	1	1	50.00%	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	3
#5 - Brandon Bernard	0	0	4	5	1	83.33%	1	2	5	1	0	5	0	9
#6 - Tristan Lindo	1	2	22	15	7	68.18%	3	4	18	3	3	10	0	45
#10 - Matt Quiring	0	1	14	14	8	63.64%	3	10	17	0	5	7	0	26
#11 -Connor Gilmore	0	1	19	20	21	48.78%	7	3	25	7	5	20	0	50
#12 -Josh Nardini	1	3	5	1	2	33.33%	3	4	8	3	2	3	0	12
#21 - David McCulloch	5	3	47	17	18	48.57%	15	2	13	12	3	20	0	84
#22 Damiann Prehay	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
#23 Sefa Otchere	1	1	14	3	4	42.86%	2	0	12	0	0	6	0	26
#25 Kim-Joshua Massela	0	1	3	1	2	33.33%	3	0	3	0	0	4	0	6
#31 Yaw Antwi-Boasiako	0	2	3	1	2	33.33%	0	0	5	0	0	3	0	6
#32 -Jordan Henry	7	3	17	18	10	64.29%	4	3	4	3	2	26	0	22
#33 - Jacob Edwards	1	0	0	2	2	50.00%	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	-1
#44 -Maliek Gordon	0	0	9	2	0	100.00%	0	2	1	0	0	9	0	1
#45 -Graham	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	-2
RS-Luka Micetic	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS-Jesse Mukama	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TEAM TOTALS	18	19	175	110	85		43	43	134	32	24	126	0	319

TAKE PRIDE IN DOING ALL OF THE LITTLE THINGS THAT WIN BASKETBALL GAMES

WE VALUE PRACTICE

WE VALUE - TOTALS

PLAYER/STAT	CHARGES TAKEN		DEFLECTIONS	50/50		O.REB.	TURNOVERS	TOTALS
	Made	Att.		Won	Lost			
#3 -Kwasi Adu-Poku	0	1	22	1	0	12.5	13	23.5
#4 -Mackenzie Hart	0	0	22	0	0	13	15	20
#5 - Brandon Bernard	0	0	25	0	0	5	15	15
#6 - Tristan Lindo	1	3	36	0	0	5	9	36
#9 Ray Kasongo	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
#10 - Matt Quiring	0	0	21	0	1	20.5	10	30.5
#11 -Connor Gilmore	0	0	15	0	0	6.5	3	18.5
#12 -Josh Nardini	0	0	17	2	0	1	21	-1
#21 - David McCulloch	1	1	38	1	0	1	12	55
#22 Damiann Prehay	2	4	34	0	0	10	28	22
#23 Sefa Otchere	1	2	56	0	0	9	19	49
#25 Kim-Joshua Massela Mbongo	0	0	48	0	0	5	24	29
#31 Yaw Antwi-Boasiako	1	1	21	0	0	9.5	45	-12.5
#32 -Jordan Henry	3	5	31	0	0	2	18	23
#33 - Jacob Edwards	0	0	3	0	0	3	13	-7
#44 -Maliek Gordon	1	1	19	0	0	3	15	9
#45 -Graham Treffry	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	-1
RS- Luka Mircetic	0	0	6	0	0	4	3	7
TEAM TOTALS	10	18	412	4	1	106	120	311

TAKE PRIDE IN DOING ALL OF THE LITTLE THINGS THAT WIN BASKETBALL GAMES

Where did McMaster actually rank?

The purpose of the WEVALUE stats were to reiterate defensive priority and taking care of our back end

League Defensive Stats

Rank	Team	Poss	Points	PPP	FG%	aFG%	%TO	%FT	%SF	%Score
1	Carleton University Ravens	2688	1900	0.707	34.20%	39.30%	18.80%	10.80%	8.60%	32.80%
2	Ryerson University Rams	2746	1961	0.714	33.90%	40%	18.80%	9.20%	7.50%	31.90%
3	Queens (ON) University Golden Gaels	2564	2054	0.801	40%	45.40%	17%	10.10%	8.80%	36.90%
4	Ottawa Gee-Gees	2647	2176	0.822	40.40%	46.60%	17.60%	10.20%	8.50%	37%
5	Western Ontario Mustangs	2220	1833	0.826	43.10%	48.90%	21%	12.10%	9.60%	38.60%
6	Wilfrid Laurier	2874	2383	0.829	40.90%	46.80%	18.90%	12%	8.70%	38.40%
7	Lakehead University Thunderwolves	2977	2496	0.838	39.90%	45.50%	14.70%	11.30%	9.10%	38.80%
8	Brock Badgers	2875	2464	0.857	41.80%	48.70%	17.20%	11.70%	9.20%	39.40%
9	York (ONT) Lions	2760	2381	0.863	41.40%	47.50%	17.20%	13.50%	11%	40%
10	McMaster Marauders	2846	2459	0.864	42.60%	47.70%	16.30%	12.90%	9.10%	40.60%
11	Windsor Lancers	2595	2269	0.874	40.70%	47.40%	13%	9.10%	8%	39%
12	Guelph Gryphons	2642	2315	0.876	42.20%	46.90%	13.80%	13.10%	10.20%	41.60%
13	Nipissing Lakers	2337	2080	0.89	42.70%	48.80%	14.60%	9.90%	7.40%	40.60%
14	Laurentian Voyageurs	2461	2219	0.902	44.20%	50.20%	16.20%	10.80%	8.20%	41.20%
15	Algoma Thunderbirds	2472	2254	0.912	44.40%	50.70%	14.40%	10.50%	8.50%	41.70%
16	Waterloo Warriors	2809	2575	0.917	43.30%	48.70%	11.40%	11.90%	9.40%	42.80%
17	Toronto Varsity Blues	2274	2122	0.933	45.30%	52.80%	14.90%	11%	8.50%	42.70%

Notes on Defense

- McMaster ranks middle of the pack on defensive points per possession

- This is due to McMaster's high pace game which allows other teams to get more possessions than they usually would

- McMaster allows oppositions the 4th most possessions in the league

Individualized Defensive Rankings

Rank	Player	GP	Poss	Points	PPP	FG%	aFG%	%TO	%FT	%Score
1	Connor Gilmore	30	199	129	0.648	30.20%	33.70%	10.10%	5.50%	30.20%
2	Matt Quiring	30	121	82	0.678	33.70%	39.50%	17.40%	5%	29.80%
3	David McCulloch	28	259	194	0.749	35.30%	41.50%	14.30%	6.90%	33.60%
4	Maleik Gordon	18	83	65	0.783	31.30%	37.50%	12%	10.80%	34.90%
5	Jordan Henry	30	204	161	0.789	34.80%	41.10%	14.70%	9.80%	34.30%
6	Tristan Lindo	30	208	165	0.793	35.70%	40.60%	10.60%	9.10%	35.60%
7	Josh Nardini	29	91	75	0.824	34.80%	41.70%	14.30%	14.30%	36.30%
8	Damian Prehay	15	94	79	0.84	35.70%	42.90%	11.70%	13.80%	40.40%
9	Sefa Otchere	23	130	118	0.908	38.10%	46.20%	10%	11.50%	39.20%
10	Brandon Bernard	21	35	34	0.971	44.80%	51.70%	11.40%	8.60%	42.90%
11	Kwasi Adu-Poku	30	99	105	1.061	43.60%	51.30%	7.10%	18.20%	47.50%
12	Mackenzie Hart	8	19	21	1.105	46.70%	60%	10.50%	15.80%	47.40%
13	Kim-Joshua Massela Mbongo	16	29	33	1.138	46.20%	55.80%	3.40%	10.30%	48.30%
14	Yaw Antwi-Boasiako	14	30	36	1.2	57.10%	69%	13.30%	20%	53.30%

Individual Defensive Notes

- The void by Dave's departure means that someone will have to step up on the defensive end and possessions

- If we are trying to maintain a competitive team that will compete for a national title, we must have players who only allow .87 points per possession or less. This would mean that every player is in at least the 60th percentile.

League Offensive Stats

Rank	Team	Poss	Points	PPP	FG%	aFG%	%TO	%FT	%SF	%Score
1	Carleton University Ravens	2880	2870	0.997	47.60%	53.80%	12.80%	12%	9.30%	45.80%
2	Ryerson University Rams	2778	2682	0.965	46.80%	52.90%	14.80%	12.70%	10.20%	44.30%
3	Ottawa Gee-Gees	2608	2384	0.914	42.30%	50.70%	15.40%	11.50%	9.20%	40%
4	Brock Badgers	2882	2573	0.893	44.40%	50.70%	16.70%	9.90%	7.90%	40.50%
5	Laurentian Voyageurs	2474	2184	0.883	42.20%	48.80%	15.80%	10.90%	8.70%	39.90%
6	Wilfrid Laurier	2901	2544	0.877	42.80%	49.50%	15.90%	10.30%	8.10%	40%
7	Western Ontario Mustangs	2226	1905	0.856	42.40%	48.60%	16.80%	9.80%	7.70%	39.10%
8	McMaster Marauders	2824	2401	0.85	41.30%	46.70%	15.50%	12.30%	10.10%	40.20%
9	Queens (ON) University Golden Gaels	2546	2142	0.841	41.90%	48.10%	16.80%	10.50%	7.30%	38.60%
10	Lakehead University Thunderwolves	2913	2421	0.831	39.60%	46.10%	16%	10.90%	8.70%	37.70%
11	Toronto Varsity Blues	2295	1869	0.814	37.70%	44.20%	16.10%	11.10%	8.30%	36.80%
12	Waterloo Warriors	2715	2171	0.8	37.70%	43.50%	16.10%	11.30%	9.10%	36.60%
13	York (ONT) Lions	2667	2126	0.797	39.40%	44.60%	17.10%	12.30%	9.80%	37.80%
14	Guelph Gryphons	2781	2187	0.786	39%	43.40%	17.90%	13.10%	10%	37.60%
15	Windsor Lancers	2428	1885	0.776	36.80%	42.90%	15.50%	9%	7.30%	34.90%
16	Algoma Thunderbirds	2554	1979	0.775	36%	40.80%	13.80%	11.80%	10%	36.30%
17	Nipissing Lakers	2321	1759	0.758	37.20%	42.40%	17.60%	9.70%	7.80%	35%

Notes on League Offense

- Once again McMaster's Pace factor plays a huge role in the number of possessions McMaster gets

- McMaster has everything that Carlton and Ryerson have offensively other than our conversion rate. We have a score percentage 4% less than Carlton and Ryerson.

- A good example of this is we only had 200 points this season less than Ryerson.

Individual Offense

Rank	Player	GP	Poss	Points	PPP	FG%	aFG%	%TO	%FT	%SF	%Score
1	Kwasi Adu-Poku	30	150	152	1.013	59.80%	63.60%	20.70%	22.70%	19.30%	50%
2	Sefa Otchere	23	233	227	0.974	48.80%	52.90%	15%	12.90%	11.20%	47.60%
3	Tristan Lindo	30	251	226	0.9	46%	50.80%	15.50%	12%	9.60%	42.60%
4	Connor Gilmore	30	533	477	0.895	37.30%	44.70%	11.10%	14.10%	12.40%	40.20%
5	David McCulloch	28	492	430	0.874	37.70%	46%	12.60%	10.60%	8.50%	38.20%
6	Brandon Bernard	21	83	71	0.855	38.20%	47.80%	12%	6%	3.60%	36.10%
7	Matt Quiring	30	154	126	0.818	48.70%	49.60%	19.50%	5.80%	5.80%	42.20%
8	Jordan Henry	30	429	345	0.804	42.10%	46.40%	18.60%	11.40%	8.20%	39.20%
9	Damian Prehay	15	188	150	0.798	44.30%	46.20%	19.10%	12.80%	10.10%	40.40%
10	Maleik Gordon	18	135	100	0.741	39.60%	42.10%	15.60%	13.30%	13.30%	37.80%
11	Kim-Joshua Massela Mbongo	16	51	33	0.647	28.60%	31.40%	17.60%	13.70%	13.70%	33.30%
12	Josh Nardini	29	75	40	0.533	25.50%	33%	25.30%	12%	2.70%	26.70%
13	Yaw Antwi-Boasiako	14	39	13	0.333	12.90%	12.90%	12.80%	10.30%	7.70%	17.90%

Notes on Individual Offense

- This is where stats may be a little deceiving and we have players such as Kwasi dominating simply because he shoots so much from the paint.

- We are able to examine in depth stats on offence because we do not have to worry about opponent switches or bad mismatches like we do on defense.

- For example Brandon having a higher points per possession than Matt even though he has a lower shooting percentage

Individual Breakdowns

For the starting group I included those who had enough possessions and have a high likely hood of carrying forward for future seasons.

Expectation

For McMaster to be improving constantly there are statistical requirements for us and our players in order to progress.

An example of this is in transition offense, we expect our Guards to achieve at least 1 point per possession, which is the league average and matters a lot for us due to our high pace factor

Stats are calculated in per 36 min

David McCulloch

PTS	AST	TO	STL	REB	AFG%	3PT%	FT%
15.6	3.5	2	1.4	3.9	46.80%	36%	79.00%

#21	Offense		
Action	USG%	PPP	Score %
Transition	19.70%	0.99	45.40%
Spot Up	22.80%	0.911	35.70%
Post Up	0.02%	2	100%
P&R Roll	0.00%	0	0
Put Back	1.60%	1	50%
Cut	1.80%	0.778	44.40%
Off Screen	14.20%	0.8	30%
P&R Guard	26.00%	0.867	40.60%
Misc.	4.10%	0.2	10%

David McCulloch

- Dave has exemplified what it means to be a Marauder and shown he is the standard of players we are looking for.

- Dave achieves 40% scoring percentage in nearly every category except for his spot up shooting when he went through a bad shooting stretch

Connor Gilmour

PTS	AST	TO	STL	REB	AFG%	3PT%	FT%
16.2	1.5	1.8	0.7	7.8	45.60%	35.20%	78.20%

#11	Offense		
Action	USG%	PPP	Score %
Transition	15.90%	1.129	49.40%
Spot Up	22.10%	1.008	37.30%
Post Up	18.20%	0.784	41.20%
P&R Roll	15.80%	1.024	40.50%
Put Back	7.90%	0.738	42.90%
Cut	5.60%	1.033	53.30%
Off Screen	3.80%	0.4	20%
P&R Guard	0.40%	0	0%
Misc.	5.30%	0.357	21.40%

Connor Gilmour

- Connor's stats show he is doing an excellent job on his possessions
- One improvement that could be added is the improvement to the post up game
- Connor has a 65.3% chance of spinning baseline and getting the layup when he is in the post. This is sometimes accompanied by a fake to the inside but most teams know the scout by now.

Matt Quiring

PTS	AST	TO	STL	REB	AFG%	3PT%	FT%
4.3	0.4	0.6	0.5	3.9	52.70%	25%	70%

#10	Offense		
Action	USG%	PPP	Score %
Transition	11.00%	0.882	41.20%
Spot Up	4.50%	0.714	28.60%
Post Up	20.10%	0.516	29.00%
P&R Roll	9.10%	1.024	28.60%
Put Back	26.60%	1.024	53.70%
Cut	19.50%	1.267	66.70%
Off Screen	0.00%	0	0%
P&R Guard	0.00%	0	0%
Misc.	9.10%	0.143	7.10%

Matt Quiring

- Matt having 11% of his possessions in transitions indicates that he is the big running down, but also that our guards are not around to drive for easy lay ups. He should have less than 10% and our guards need to be up the court faster. His PPP is also under 1 which is below average.

- Matt is also in the lower 25% in post up PPP and scoring % although his movement in the paint causes trouble for opponents as seen in his cut %

- Another point is that 9.1% of actions are considered Misc. which means the play has broken down and Matt is on his own. From there he has a mere .143 PPP which is less than if he just shot the ball from wherever he was.

Jordan Henry

PTS	AST	TO	STL	REB	AFG%	3PT%	FT%
11.6	4.5	2.4	1.5	4.2	47.50%	26.20%	64.90%

#32	Offense		
Action	USG%	PPP	Score %
Transition	25.20%	0.972	50.00%
Spot Up	20.50%	0.727	29.50%
Post Up	0.00%	0	0.00%
P&R Roll	0.00%	0	0.00%
Put Back	1.20%	0.4	20.00%
Cut	2.60%	1.033	72.20%
Off Screen	0.70%	0	0%
P&R Guard	33.60%	0.785	38%
Misc.	7.70%	0.394	27.30%

Jordan Henry

- Jordan calls himself an "in-game shooter" and hits clutch shots but overall has a 26% 3 point percentage, along with a below 65% FT%, those are 2 keys that must be improved

- Jordan's 38% scoring % on Pick and Rolls would be significantly higher as we can see from his PPP if he hit his free throws.

- Jordan has over 7% Misc. plays, which we cannot have from a point guard who is suppose to call the plays and control the game

Tristan Lindo

PTS	AST	TO	STL	REB	AFG%	3PT%	FT%
7.7	1.4	1.1	0.7	2.9	51.10%	37%	65.60%

$6	Offense		
Action	USG%	PPP	Score %
Transition	40.60%	0.922	46.10%
Spot Up	31.30%	0.91	37.30%
Post Up	0.00%	0	0.00%
P&R Roll	0.00%	0	0.00%
Put Back	6.80%	1.059	52.90%
Cut	6.00%	1.2	60.00%
Off Screen	3.20%	1.5	62.5%
P&R Guard	4.80%	0	0%
Misc.	4.40%	0.636	36.40%

Tristan Lindo

- Essentially Tristan's only offensive action is Transition, and he is just shy of the Points per Possession amount we are looking for

- Other than spot up shooting Tristan does not have many other offensive actions and his reluctance to shoot or do too much unless completely wide open has over inflated his stats

Sefa Otchere

PTS	AST	TO	STL	REB	AFG%	3PT%	FT%
10	0.5	1.4	1.3	3.7	55.10%	38%	81.00%

#23	Offense		
Action	USG%	PPP	Score %
Transition	31.80%	1.014	51.40%
Spot Up	28.30%	1	45.50%
Post Up	0.90%	1	50%
P&R Roll	0.40%	0	0
Put Back	12.40%	1.172	58.60%
Cut	8.60%	1.4	70%
Off Screen	2.60%	1.167	50%
P&R Guard	3.40%	1	50%
Misc.	7.70%	0.167	11.10%

Sefa Otchere

- Sefa, along with many others, boasts an incredibly high score percentage on Cut plays
- This paired with above 45% for his remaining 2 highest used actions demonstrates a high understanding of the attacking the basket
- Under Misc. plays we notice that a high 7% of the time, Sefa is lost and ultimately turns the ball over or takes an incredibly bad shot which results in an 11% scoring percentage
- Sefa takes pride in shooting 81% FT%

Damian Prehay

PTS	AST	TO	STL	REB	AFG%	3PT%	FT%
10.1	0.8	1.8	0.9	4.6	48.10%	19%	68.80%

#22	Offense		
Action	USG%	PPP	Score %
Transition	25.00%	0.915	44.70%
Spot Up	23.40%	0.886	40.90%
Post Up	8.50%	0.688	37.50%
P&R Roll	4.30%	1.125	62.50%
Put Back	8.00%	0.4	20%
Cut	6.90%	1.145	61.50%
Off Screen	0.50%	0	0
P&R Guard	2.70%	0.8	40%
Misc.	6.90%	0.462	30.80%

Damian Prehay

- 19% 3 point percentage
- 1.8 Turnovers per 36 min
- Dame's size allows him to be a tank on the pick and roll because he is faster and more explosive than most bigs and dominates guards with his size
- Dame shows he can ball individually by posting a nice 30% scoring % when the play breaks down

Kwasi Adu-Poku

PTS	AST	TO	STL	REB	AFG%	3PT%	FT%
5.1	0.2	0.9	0.2	3	63.20%	39%	53.80%

#3	Offense		
Action	USG%	PPP	Score %
Transition	18.00%	1.074	55.60%
Spot Up	21.30%	0.781	31.40%
Post Up	6.00%	0.444	33.30%
P&R Roll	6.00%	0.889	44.40%
Put Back	16.70%	1.28	60%
Cut	17.30%	1.5	76.90%
Off Screen	0.70%	3	100%
P&R Guard	0.70%	2	100%
Misc.	12.70%	0.526	31.60%

Kwasi Adu-Poku

- Kwasi has fantastic stats and shows his physical dominance by having a large portion of his actions being put backs

- 12% of his actions are considered Misc which means he loses track of the play and the action breaks down. Although he has a reasonable scoring percentage afterwards, 12% is simply too high

Maliek Gordon

PTS	AST	TO	STL	REB	AFG%	3PT%	FT%
4.9	1	0.8	0.5	2	43.50%	19%	46.70%

#44	Offense		
Action	USG%	PPP	Score %
Transition	23.00%	0.806	41.90%
Spot Up	23.70%	0.875	43.80%
Post Up	0.70%	0	0
P&R Roll	0.00%	0	0
Put Back	3.00%	0.25	25%
Cut	2.20%	0	0
Off Screen	0.70%	0	0
P&R Guard	30.40%	0.732	39%
Misc.	5.90%	0	0%

Maliek Gordon

- Maliek had just enough possessions for a stat breakdown. I also wanted to call him out for his below 50% FT% which has actually cost us games.

- Maliek's spot up scoring is very impressive but his transition Points Per Possession needs to be elevated if we are to compete with the top teams

- He has a fairly average Points per Possession on Pick and rolls but a low scoring percentage due to the fact that he misses so many FT's

Defensive Action Stats

Defensive stats are hard to measure at this level because you have players attempting to cover for others mistakes and guys being beat because they didn't get help on D or a variety of errors that are not worth quantifying. What we can see is the play type oppositions score on.

Transition Defense

Team	USG %	Poss / Game	Points	PPP	FG%	aFG%	%TO	%FT	%SF	%Score
Carleton University Ravens	13.70%	11.5	9.3	0.813	41.50%	47.30%	20.10%	14.20%	12.10%	38.50%
Queens (ON) University Golden Gaels	23.20%	21.3	17.7	0.831	41.60%	47%	17.80%	11.20%	9.90%	38.60%
Lakehead University Thunderwolves	18.10%	17.4	14.5	0.835	40%	44.20%	15%	13.90%	12.80%	39.60%
Ryerson University Rams	18.30%	16.2	13.6	0.842	38.80%	45.90%	16.80%	10.60%	9.70%	36.90%
McMaster Marauders	19.90%	18.8	17.2	0.915	46.40%	52.20%	16.60%	12.60%	10.80%	42.70%
Windsor Lancers	21.90%	21.1	19.3	0.916	44.10%	49.70%	13%	10.90%	9.80%	42%
Western Ontario Mustangs	20.30%	18.8	17.3	0.922	48.90%	55.20%	21.50%	14%	12.60%	42.60%
Nipissing Lakers	21.50%	19.3	18	0.934	47.40%	52.90%	15.30%	11%	10%	43.40%
Wilfrid Laurier	21.30%	19.7	19	0.966	52.90%	59.60%	22.40%	14.40%	11%	45.20%
York (ONT) Lions	21.80%	20.7	20.3	0.98	48.70%	55.10%	16.60%	16.30%	14.50%	46.40%
Ottawa Gee-Gees	18.50%	16.3	16.3	0.996	49.50%	55.80%	15.70%	12.90%	11.60%	45.30%
Algoma Thunderbirds	22.70%	20.8	20.7	0.996	49.20%	55.40%	13.70%	10.50%	8.90%	45.70%
Guelph Gryphons	19.30%	18.2	18.4	1.012	49.30%	55%	13.40%	16.50%	14.10%	48.30%
Laurentian Voyageurs	16.40%	14.9	15.2	1.02	50.80%	56.40%	14.60%	12.90%	11.70%	46.70%
Brock Badgers	18.30%	17	17.5	1.03	50.30%	57.10%	14.80%	14.40%	12%	47.40%
Waterloo Warriors	21.90%	20.5	21.5	1.049	50.60%	55.80%	10.10%	13.70%	12%	49.60%
Toronto Varsity Blues	24.80%	21.7	23.4	1.08	55.40%	62.20%	14.70%	12.80%	11%	50.50%

McMaster is among the best when it comes to transition defense and that is extremely helpful given the Pace we play at

Cut Defense

Rank	Team	USG %	Poss / Game	Points	PPP	FG%	aFG%	%TO	%FT	%SF	%Score
1	Ryerson University Rams	8%	7.1	5.8	0.814	41.10%	41.10%	9.30%	11.50%	11.50%	41.60%
2	Guelph Gryphons	6.10%	5.8	5.6	0.981	53.90%	53.90%	13%	9.30%	8.10%	50.30%
3	Windsor Lancers	7.70%	7.4	7.7	1.03	54.10%	54.10%	8%	13.90%	13.90%	53.70%
4	York (ONT) Lions	8%	7.6	7.9	1.036	52.20%	52.20%	7.30%	17.30%	15.50%	52.70%
5	Carleton University Ravens	5%	4.2	4.3	1.036	55.60%	55.60%	10.10%	18.80%	18.10%	53.60%
6	Lakehead University Thunderwolves	6.80%	6.5	6.8	1.055	55.80%	55.80%	9%	16.90%	15.40%	55.20%
7	Wilfrid Laurier	6.40%	5.9	6.4	1.082	58.60%	58.60%	12%	15.20%	15.20%	55.40%
8	Brock Badgers	6.30%	5.9	6.5	1.11	61.60%	61.60%	9.90%	11.50%	11.50%	57.70%
9	Nipissing Lakers	6.90%	6.2	6.9	1.112	59.50%	59.50%	9.90%	9.30%	8.10%	56.50%
10	Ottawa Gee-Gees	6.60%	5.8	6.5	1.114	59.60%	59.60%	9.70%	14.30%	13.70%	56%
11	Western Ontario Mustangs	7.10%	6.6	7.4	1.12	58.70%	58.70%	9.50%	15.80%	14.60%	57%
12	Toronto Varsity Blues	8.40%	7.3	8.4	1.147	61.70%	61.70%	7.40%	12.60%	12.10%	60%
13	Waterloo Warriors	8.70%	8.2	9.5	1.163	59.40%	59.40%	4.50%	11%	11%	59.60%
14	Queens (ON) University Golden Gaels	5.50%	5	5.9	1.171	62.60%	62.60%	7.90%	15.70%	15.70%	57.90%
15	Laurentian Voyageurs	7.90%	7.2	8.7	1.2	67.10%	67.10%	12.30%	9.70%	9.20%	60.50%
16	Algoma Thunderbirds	8.30%	7.6	9.2	1.216	64.90%	64.90%	5.90%	17.20%	16.70%	62.30%
17	McMaster Marauders	7.70%	7.3	9.3	1.273	68.10%	68.10%	9.50%	13.20%	12.70%	63.60%

McMaster has the worst cut Defense in not only the OUA but also Canada(63% scoring %). To counter this Mac also has a top 5 Cut offensive action.

Put Backs

Rank	Team	USG %	Poss / Game	Points	PPP	FG%	aFG%	%TO	%FT	%SF	%Score
1	Guelph Gryphons	5.80%	5.5	4.7	0.856	43%	43.40%	10.50%	17%	15%	45.10%
2	Ryerson University Rams	6%	5.3	4.6	0.859	44.60%	45%	14.70%	16.50%	13.50%	44.70%
3	Carleton University Ravens	4.70%	3.9	3.5	0.885	48.50%	48.50%	12.30%	13.80%	11.50%	46.90%
4	Queens (ON) University Golden Gaels	6%	5.5	5	0.897	46.40%	46.80%	13.50%	18.10%	17.40%	46.50%
5	Brock Badgers	6.20%	5.7	5.1	0.898	50.40%	51.20%	15.30%	16.40%	15.80%	48%
6	York (ONT) Lions	6.80%	6.5	5.9	0.91	43.90%	43.90%	10.60%	17.50%	15.90%	48.10%
7	Wilfrid Laurier	6%	5.6	5.2	0.931	47.20%	47.20%	11.60%	19.10%	15.60%	49.10%
8	Ottawa Gee-Gees	6%	5.3	5.1	0.956	53.20%	53.60%	13.10%	11.90%	11.90%	49.40%
9	Lakehead University Thunderwolves	6.30%	6	5.9	0.973	50.40%	51.40%	9.10%	17.10%	14.40%	49.70%
10	Windsor Lancers	6.60%	6.4	6.7	1.047	51.80%	51.80%	5.20%	16.90%	16.30%	54.10%
11	Nipissing Lakers	6.60%	5.9	6.3	1.071	55%	55%	9.10%	14.30%	13%	55.80%
12	McMaster Marauders	6.20%	5.9	6.3	1.074	57.70%	57.70%	9.10%	18.20%	15.90%	54%
13	Waterloo Warriors	7.50%	7	7.6	1.085	55%	55.90%	8.10%	18.50%	18%	55%
14	Laurentian Voyageurs	7.50%	6.9	7.4	1.086	55.10%	55.50%	11.40%	18.40%	16.20%	55.10%
15	Algoma Thunderbirds	6.50%	5.9	6.4	1.087	53.60%	54%	3.80%	15%	15%	55%
16	Western Ontario Mustangs	6.90%	6.4	7.1	1.111	55.80%	56.30%	9.20%	26.10%	23.50%	58.80%
17	Toronto Varsity Blues	5.70%	5	6	1.209	63.20%	64.70%	8.50%	20.20%	20.20%	62.80%

McMaster fails to protect their own paint and give up 54% scoring percentage and 1.07 PPP when opponents get an OREB

Next Years Expectations

Next season McMaster should strive to be the best defensive and offensive transition team and continue the fast pace and emotional game that they play and strive in.