

Bowers Rating System

Article I Purposes

Section A. The Bowers Rating System (hereafter referred to as the System). Information concerning the System will be provided at shuffleboardcorner.com

Section B. Advancing the Sport of Table Shuffleboard

System's purposes include:

1. Foster Tournaments for local, state and national competition in the Sport of Table Shuffleboard.
2. Providing governance and development for, and developing interest and participation in, the sport of table shuffleboard throughout the United States as determined by the System.
3. Being responsible to the players;
4. Keeping those engaged in the sport of table shuffleboard informed of policy matters and reasonably reflecting their views in policy decisions;
5. Providing a viable table shuffleboard handicap rating system.
6. Providing and publishing the final ratings once each year with a mid-year adjustment rating.
7. **Exception:** Providing governance bodies that establish criteria and procedures for, and maintain among their members, individuals who are actively engaged in professional and amateur competition.
 - a. **Rating Committee** - (hereafter referred to as the Committee) will consist of approximately 18 Seasoned Raters. Each geographic Region and Area will be fairly represented among Members of the Committee. Ref Article II.
 - b. **Player Rater** – (hereafter referred to as Rater) will consist of players selected and approved by the Rating Committee. Each geographic region and area will be fairly represented among Raters.
 - c. **Oversight Committee** – Selected individuals from within the Rating Committee whom will investigate and make recommendations to the Rating Committee for any and all grievances that may apply to the Rating System including its players and their ratings. Decisions of the Rating Committee are final.

1. Committee will consist of approximately 3 Rating Committee members.
2. Duties will include but not limited to reviewing each year's rating cycle submissions before they are adopted as Final Ratings by the Rating Committee.
 - a) Submitted ratings will be flagged for review, if any individual rater ranks a player out of deviation to the median submitted by other raters as a whole. This deviation is currently set at + or – 0.50
 - b) Recommendations for corrective action will be presented to the Rating Committee for approval.
3. At any time a Rating Committee Member may advise and or offer evidence representing any individual grievance.
 - a) This process may require temporarily replacing on a one to one basis, an Oversight Committee member with a Rating Committee member should the existing member have no knowledge of the player of interest or the rater filing the grievance.
4. All grievances and appeals must be in writing and directed by an area rater to the Rating Committee, any of its members or Chairman Ron Bowers.
5. All grievances, reviews and appeals will be handled on a timely basis and submitted to the Rating Committee for final approval.

Article II Rating Committee

Section A. Authority and Duties

Management and governance of the system is vested in the Rating Committee. The Committee is a strategic governing body; and its powers and duties include, but not limited to:

1. Determining programs and services;
2. Establishing guidelines and monitoring the performance of the system.
3. Determining the System's policy positions;
4. Amending, interpreting, and enforcing all policies and procedures, rules and requirements, criteria, standards and grievances;
5. Reserving the authority over the applicability and enforceability of the system's requirements within the organization;

6. Communicating applicable rules and changes to players and raters.
7. The Rating Committee has the authority to change a questionable rating at any time during the year, but the majority of changes will be made at the mid-year rating adjustments.
8. Other duties;
 - a. The committee will vote on all newly proposed rater(s) (new or replacement) as recommended by an existing rater or volunteer on their own and must be approved by the committee before becoming official. An excess or shortage of raters in specific geographic areas is only one of the considerations before approving to add a newly proposed rater or removing an existing rater. If a rater drops out for any reason during the year, the committee will review the need for replacement and approve proposed replacements if it is determined a replacement is needed.
 - b. The rating committee will help come up with some basic guidelines and suggestions to aid our raters in getting a more accurate rating for our players.

Section B. 2018 Rating Committee Members

Ron Bowers – Chairman
Travis Ward – Vice Chairman
Morey Balins - Colorado
Mary Brown - Indiana
James Cummings - Texas
Louise Freer - Pennsylvania
Mark Gray - Missouri
Bob Hunt - California
John McDermott - Michigan
Bill Melton - Oklahoma
Lorraine Olson - Oregon
Doug Paben – Florida/ Texas
Jim Payne - Missouri
Dave Shewbridge - Maryland
Gordie Smith - Canada
Mike Taylor - Texas
Mike Waters – Washington
Jeri Williams – Texas

Article III Definitions

Section A. – Refinement of argumentum by the “The Bowers Rating Committee”.

1. **Rater** – Player Rater (hereafter referred to as Rater)

A. Eligibility and Composition

- a. Raters will consist of Players selected and approved by the Rating Committee.
- b. Each geographic Region and Area will be fairly represented among Raters.
- c. Raters must conduct themselves and comply with all rules set forth by the Bowers Rating System to the best of their abilities and at all times.
- d. Be free of any bias or prejudice caused by personal feelings.
- e. New raters will be on a two-year probation and in the beginning, should work with the rater that recommended them as a rater.

B. Authority and Duties - Player Raters duties include, but not limited to;

- a. Abide to all programs and services used as aids to increase and preserve the integrity of the Bowers Rating System.
- b. When submitting qualifying rating status of each Player subject to the Bowers Rating System, be consistent with standards and monitoring set forth by the Rating Committee.
- c. Add and remove Players
- d. Expedite in a timely manner, each above process due date
- e. Submit any ideas, suggestions, etc. that may aid in improving the Rating System.

2. **Seasoned Rater** – A Rater whom is consistent with demonstrating their ability and knowledge in rating a wide range of players in each category or level with accuracy in Ranking as set forth by the Rating Committee. Each Rating Committee Member should accomplish and maintain Seasoned Rater Status.

3. **Rating** – Whole number categories or levels; 4, 3, 2, 1, 0 and -1, whereas each rated player has qualified and will be referenced as.
4. **Final Ratings** – a process implemented and maintained by the Rating Committee whom as a whole, postulates submitted rankings and finalizes the average of each player’s ratings/rankings and expresses each in **hundredths**.
 - A. **Ranking** – A rater’s scale of 10 graduates representing definitive characteristics.
 - B. **Increments** – **Raters should use increments of .1 when doing their ratings.** Example: a rater rating a 2 rated player should use a rating of 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8 1.9, 2.0, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, or 2.4.
5. **Amateur status are players having final ratings with positive numbers**
 - a. (4) rated player status = 3.50 thru 4.49
 - b. (3) rated player status = 2.50 thru 3.49
 - c. (2) rated player status = 1.50 thru 2.49
 - d. (1) rated player status = 0.50 thru 1.49
 - e. (0) rated player status = -0.49 thru 0.49
 - f. (-1) rated player status = -0.50 thru -1.50
6. **Professional status are players having final ratings with negative numbers between “-1.50” thru “-0.001”.**
7. **Game** – Players are subject to be rated by their abilities in the game of Switch Hammer.
 - a. Many variables are used in formatting the game and or event.
 - b. Table Shuffleboard offers a wide variety of games, which are subject to allow incorporating our resource and system’s logics.

**Article IV
Rater’s Guidelines**

Section B. Rating Schedule

Rating Dates:

2019 Mid-Year Adjustments

- 23 Jun 19 - Request for Raters to submit nominations for Mid-Year Correction
- 10 Jul 19 - Deadline to submit nominations for Mid-Year Correction
- 11 Jul 19 - Mid-Year recommendations and justifications sent to Rating Committee for review
- 14 Jul 19 - Deadline for Rating Committee to vote on Mid-Year List
- 15 Jul 19 - Mid-Year list sent to Raters for rating
- 19 Jul 19 - Last day to turn in Mid-Year Ratings
- 20 Jul 19 - Mid-Year Ratings published

2019 Annual Rating

- 11 Oct 19 - Request for adding/dropping players
- 07 Nov 19 - Last day to add/drop players
- 09 Nov 19 - Rating sheets sent to raters
- 17 Nov 19 - Last day to turn in ratings
- 19 Nov 19 - Ratings sent to Rating Oversight Committee
- 30 Nov 19 - Preliminary rating sent to Raters for review
- 04 Dec 19 - Last day for Raters to recommend rating changes
- 06 Dec 19 - Final ratings published

2020 Mid-Year Adjustments

- 21 Jun 20 - Request for Raters to submit nominations for Mid-Year Correction
- 08 Jul 20 - Deadline to submit nominations for Mid-Year Correction
- 09 Jul 20 - Mid-Year recommendations and justifications sent to Rating Committee for review
- 12 Jul 20 - Deadline for Rating Committee to vote on Mid-Year List
- 13 Jul 20 - Mid-Year list sent to Raters for rating
- 17 Jul 20 - Last day to turn in Mid-Year Ratings
- 18 Jul 20 - Mid-Year Ratings published

Section C. Objectives

1. Development and support for aiding and accomplishing standardization among all raters.
 - a. Free of any bias or prejudice caused by personal feelings. **Ref; Article III.A.1d**
 - b. 2 rated raters should not rate pros (-1.5 thru -0.01) players unless they are extremely sure of their rating.

- c. Most players either get better or worse every year. Do not rate a player assuming you remember them from past years. A rater should not rate anyone they have not seen play in recent years.
- d. Players should not use whole numbers only, to rate. **Ref; Article III-A.3, 4a, 4b & 5**
- e. Raters should attempt to travel to out of town tournaments.
- f. Raters should rate everyone they have seen play, not just hometown players.
- g. Raters should rate a player even though he/she does not think he/she has changed.
- h. Raters should keep notes during the year.
- i. Raters should set examples for good sportsmanship and professional courtesy at all times.
- j. Raters should continually look for qualified new raters.
- k. Strive to be consistent with your rating no matter where the player is from. A 2.0 player from the West. Central, or East area should have the same basic qualifications. There are many good examples to use as guidelines.
- l. If a rater runs into a problem or question, they should not hesitate to contact a member of the Rating Committee.
- m. There should only be one rater per household, except if they were raters previously.

Section D. Mid-Year Adjustments Guidelines

1. The purpose of a mid-year rating change is to adjust for a very obvious difference in a players rating and their current ability.
2. All raters are eligible to make a recommendation for a mid-year adjustment.
 - a. Only recommend those players who need to be moved from one rating class to another.
 - i. A rating class change is moving from one whole number rating to another (i.e. from a 2 to a 1)
 - ii. Moving from “Amateur” status to “Pro” status would constitute a change in rating class.
 - iii. A rating class change may be either up or down.
 - b. All recommendations for a mid-year adjustment **MUST** include a justification that establishes a valid reason for the recommendation. A valid reason might include, but is not limited to:
 - i. A player who was obviously rated incorrectly at the beginning of the rating cycle.

- ii. A rapid improvement in a player's skill level.
 - iii. A physical handicap/medical issue that prevents a player from being competitive in their current rating class.
 - c. Any recommendations that do not include a justification will be summarily rejected.
- 3. The Rating Committee will review the recommendations to determine which players will be put on the list for mid-year adjustment consideration.
 - a. The members have the right to confer with other raters to aid in their decisions.
 - b. The members will vote YES or NO (to keep or remove the player from the list) for each player submitted.
 - c. Only those players that receive at least a 50% YES vote (50% of the actual replies for that player) will remain on the list. For example, if a player receives 5 YES votes and 5 NO votes, they will be added to the list.
- 4. The finalized list of players recommended for mid-year adjustments will be sent to all raters for consideration.
 - a. Raters should submit a recommended rating for any player on the list they are qualified to rate.
 - b. Raters shall only rate players they have observed play between the beginning of the rating cycle and the mid-year adjustment rating cycle.
 - c. All ratings shall be in tenths of a point (i.e. 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, etc.).
- 5. A player's rating will only be mid-year adjusted under the following conditions:
 - a. They have at least half the number of mid-year raters they had at the beginning of the rating cycle (rounded down). For example:
 - i. A player that had 12 raters at the beginning of the rating cycle would require at least 6 mid-year raters.
 - ii. A player that had 21 raters at the beginning of the rating cycle would require at least 10 (21 divided by 2, rounded down, = 10) mid-year raters.
 - b. Their mid-year rating must result in a change of rating class (i.e. from a 2 rating to a 1 rating).