The Colorado Buffaloes women’s basketball team last made an NCAA Tournament appearance in the 2012-13 season. During that season, the team finished with a 25-7 overall record as well as a 4th place finish in the Pac-12 after going 13-5. However, the program clearly struggled from 2013-16 with an overall record of 41-55, winning just 14 of 54 Pac-12 games. But there’s something brewing in Boulder, CO.

After the 2015-16 season, Colorado parted ways with their head coach and hired JR Payne, a coach with the reputation of rebuilding programs. Throughout her career, Payne’s right-hand man and confidant has been her husband Toriano Towns. Everything they seem to touch turns to Gold and the chemistry between the two is undeniable.

* For starters, they met while attending college together at St. Mary’s. There’s no question this was the foundation of their trust in one another that would eventually bring them both to Boulder.
* Payne and Towns served together at Boise State as assistants and helped lead the program to Back-to-Back Western Athletic Conference Championships and an appearance in the NCAA Tournament during the 2007-2008 season.
* Together, they spent five seasons at Southern Utah University, winning the Big Sky Conference Championship in 2013-14. SUU would finish that season with a 23-10 overall record, including 15-5 in conference play.
* After SUU, Payne and Towns would again make headlines in 2015-16, by leading the Santa Clara Broncos women’s basketball program to their first winning season in eight years with a 23-9 overall record. Santa Clara would also finish T-3rd in the West Coast Conference with a 13-5 record.
* Colorado was 17-16 during the 2016-17 season and 15-16 during the 2017-18 season respectively. They also reached the Third Round of the WNIT in 2016-17. Payne and Towns have already produced 32 victories in their first two seasons at Boulder. That’s 10 more wins than the last staff produced from 2014-16.
* The Buffaloes have finished no better than 9th in Pac-12 during the first two seasons of Payne and Towns. However, their team mantra is “Earned Not Given” and my gut tells me with Payne and Towns at the helm, Colorado is close.

Let’s use Synergy to determine just how close they are to making a surge in 2018-19. Synergy is an analytical tool designed to help coaches evaluate players, team performance, as well as their tendencies. In short, the numbers give an indication where your team has been efficient and inefficient. The numbers can help teams devise a cerebral game plan.

But let’s be realistic here. While numbers are informative, they are certainly no replacement for athleticism, talent, or hard work. Let’s begin by breaking down the Colorado offense.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Offense** | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| Colorado Buffaloes | 100% | 2675 | 2146 | 60th | Good | 1166 | 801 | 1967 | 40.7% |
| Transition | 20.4% | 545 | 547 | 84th | Excellent | 187 | 202 | 389 | 51.9% |
| Half Court | 79.6% | 2130 | 1599 | 41st | Average | 979 | 599 | 1578 | 38% |
| Short Shot Clock |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| less than 4 secs | 4.9% | 131 | 82 | 59th | Good | 78 | 32 | 110 | 29% |

**Overall Offense (Good):** Colorado had 2,675 total offensive possessions last season and scored 2,146 points. That’s .802 points per possession. This placed the Buffaloes in the 60th percentile among all D-1 teams according to Synergy. However, the Buffs only converted 801 of 1,967 field goal attempts, slightly below 41%. Here’s how those numbers matched up against the rest of the Pac-12 Conference.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pac-12 Offense Points per Possession** | **PPP** | **Poss** | **Points** | **Rating** |  | **Pac-12 Offensive FG%** | **FG%** | **FGM** | **FGA** |
| Oregon | 1.011 | 3082 | 3117 | Execellent |  | Oregon | 49.7% | 1161 | 2337 |
| Oregon State | .941 | 2604 | 2451 | Excellent |  | Oregon State | 47.9% | 935 | 1952 |
| USC | .875 | 2271 | 1986 | Excellent |  | California | 45.2% | 818 | 1811 |
| Arizona State | .874 | 2709 | 2367 | Excellent |  | Arizona State | 43.8% | 911 | 2078 |
| UCLA | .864 | 3040 | 2628 | Excellent |  | Utah | 43.6% | 828 | 1899 |
| Utah | .857 | 2638 | 2261 | Very Good |  | UCLA | 42.3% | 988 | 2333 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| California | .856 | 2483 | 2125 | Very Good |  | Stanford | 42.2% | 909 | 2153 |
| Stanford | .830 | 2882 | 2393 | Very Good |  | USC | 40.9% | 696 | 1702 |
| **Colorado** | **.802** | **2675** | **2146** | **Good** |  | **Colorado** | **40.7%** | **801** | **1967** |
| Washington | .789 | 2450 | 1934 | Good |  | Washington State | 39.4% | 741 | 1879 |
| Washington State | .781 | 2457 | 1920 | Average |  | Washington | 37.8% | 696 | 1842 |
| Arizona | .753 | 2298 | 1731 | Below Avg |  | Arizona | 36.1% | 618 | 1711 |

The numbers show Colorado was 8th last season both in offensive points per possession (PPP) and offensive FG%, good enough to earn them a ‘Good’ rating. But let’s say instead of shooting 40.7% from the field last season, they shot 45%. That number would have increased their Field Goals Made (FGM) from 801 to 885 and assuming they were all 2-point field goals, it would have increased their points from 2,146 to 2,314. Although this is a hypothetical situation, we’re only talking an increase of 2.7 FGM per game over the course of their season. That alone, would have taken Colorado to an ‘Excellent’ rating. This team is so CLOSE.

**Transition (Excellent):** Transition was 20.4% of the Buffaloes offense last season and in their 545 possessions, they produced 547 points, 1.003 PPP. This placed them in the 84th percentile of all D-1 teams. Colorado shot 51.9% in transition, converting 202 of 389 field goal attempts.

Now, let’s say I coach the University of Arizona who only utilizes transition as 13.3% of my offense. There’s already a concern because we’d be facing a team who pushes the ball 7% more and converts 1 out of every 2 shots. Hopefully, our team would all sprint back with someone picking up the ball, but it doesn’t always work that way. The 7% discrepancy is possibly enough to change how we would normally defend transition. If our team normally sends one guard back, do we now decide to send two guards back, or even three players to defend against the break? Our decision to send more players back will also restrict our opportunities for offensive rebounds. But hopefully it’s enough to slow down the Colorado transition. So, the 20.4% most definitely will grab the attention of a lot of teams and often cause them to adjust in one area, while affecting the team in another.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b2eac764b8b54b270d251ba>

**½-Court (Average):** ½-Court was 79.6% of Colorado’s offense and in their 2,130 possessions, the Buffaloes scored 1,599 points. Their .751 PPP placed them in the 41st percentile. The Buffaloes ½-court offense will be broken down later in this report, however, they converted 599 of 1,578 field goal attempts for 38%. Just a 4% increase in FG% would have pushed Colorado’s FGM to 662. When you figure the numbers, the Buffaloes only needed to increase their FGM 2.03 per game.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b2ead074b8b54b270d251c1>

**Short Shot Clock | < 4-seconds (Good):** The Buffaloes were only forced into a short shot clock situation (with less than 4 seconds) 4.9%. They achieved .62 PPP by scoring 82 points in 131 short shot clock possessions. Colorado ranked in the 59th percentile, however, the team struggled in their efficiency just a bit, only making 32 of 110 shots for 29.1%. Consider this for a moment. Colorado shot 29.1% in short shot clock situations and still produced a PPP number that earned them a ‘Good’ rating. This team is so close.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b2eada14b8b54b270d251c8>

The 3rd clip in the short shot clock edit was impressive and couldn’t have been executed any better. What exactly transpired? 1). After a made free throw, Aubrey Knight grabs the ball out-of-the-net without it hitting the floor and quickly throws it in to Kennedy Leonard.

2). Leonard, with a sense of urgency, quickly pushes the ball up the floor. 3). Mya Hollingshed sprints the floor and heads directly to the ball-side block. 4). Leonard delivers a perfect bounce pass for a strike to Hollingshed who finished the play.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| BLOB | 9.6% | 205 | 130 | 13th | Poor | 103 | 55 | 158 | 34.8% |
| SLOB | 5.2% | 110 | 75 | 36th | Average | 57 | 26 | 83 | 31.3% |
| After Time Outs | 13.1% | 278 | 187 | 21st | Below Average | 131 | 75 | 206 | 36% |

**BLOB (Poor):** Last season, Colorado was forced into BLOB situations 9.6%. They scored 130 points in 205 possessions with .63 PPP. Unfortunately, it placed them in the 13th percentile. The Buffaloes connected on 55 of 158 shots from the field for 34.8%. Playing the numbers game once again, if CU could have shot 40% in BLOB, they would have increased their FGM to 63. However, without watching the game fully, there’s no true way to determine that. Often, teams are forced into a BLOB situation with very little time on the shot clock, and therefore, rushing the shot without getting a quality look.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b2eadf84b8b54b270d251cf>

**SLOB (Average):** SLOB was slightly better, and the Buffaloes were able to produce .68 PPP. They scored 75 points in 110 possessions which ranked them in the 36th percentile. Colorado shot just 31.3% from the field by making 26 of 83 shots.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b2eae7a4b8b54b270d251d9>

**After Time Outs (Below Average):** Colorado scored 187 points in 278 possessions and ranked in the 21st percentile. The Buffaloes shot 36% on 75 of 206 from the field and their PPP was .672. Seven shots. That’s the difference between 36% and 40%. Of course, when one team calls a time out, the other team most likely will switch their defense and counter in some way. But isn’t that basketball? Colorado must improve in their execution after a time out.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b2eaf084b8b54b270d251e3>

Synergy numbers are great, but they must be taken with a grain of salt. This information can be misleading and could lead an analyst or an opposing staff to incorrectly misjudge another team and their personnel in certain play types. It’s all about how a coach, staff, or player processes the information. Numbers can indicate team and personnel efficiency, they certainly can’t simulate athleticism, size, skill, speed, or strength. At times, match-ups can be more favorable than the numbers.

However, if the information Synergy provides is used correctly, then even athleticism, size, skill, speed, and strength can be placed in uncomfortable situations. Synergy may provide clips and data, but there’s no substitute for watching a game in person to witness the little things tape doesn’t show.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| Against Man-to-Man | 80.3% | 1711 | 1241 | 30th | Below Average | 782 | 465 | 1247 | 37.3% |
| Against Zone | 19.7% | 419 | 358 | 72nd | Very Good | 197 | 134 | 331 | 40.5% |
| Press Offense | 7.4% | 158 | 99 | 29th | Below Average | 73 | 34 | 107 | 32% |

**Man-to-Man (Below Average):** In their offensive breakdown, Colorado faced a man-to-man defense 80.3% of their total offensive possessions. The 80.3% wouldn’t be an issue, except for the .725 PPP and ranking in the 30th percentile. Their offense converted 465 of 1,247 field goal attempts for 37.3%. Here’s how their man-to-man offense stacks up against the rest of the Pac-12.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pac-12 Offense vs Man-to-Man** | **PPP** | **Poss** | **Points** | **Rating** |  | **FG%** | **FGM** | **FGA** |
| Oregon | .976 | 2292 | 2237 | Excellent |  | 49.1% | 838 | 1708 |
| Oregon State | .909 | 1815 | 1649 | Excellent |  | 47.3% | 636 | 1346 |
| Arizona State | .851 | 1776 | 1512 | Excellent |  | 42.2% | 570 | 1352 |
| UCLA | .827 | 1432 | 1184 | Very Good |  | 40.2% | 427 | 1062 |
| California | .819 | 1376 | 1127 | Very Good |  | 45.1% | 437 | 968 |
| Utah | .816 | 1686 | 1376 | Very Good |  | 42% | 501 | 1194 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC | .810 | 1117 | 905 | Very Good |  | 37.7% | 306 | 811 |
| Stanford | .809 | 1776 | 1436 | Very Good |  | 41.4% | 538 | 1300 |
| Washington State | .755 | 1720 | 1299 | Average |  | 38.8% | 505 | 1300 |
| Washington | .742 | 1560 | 1157 | Average |  | 35.2% | 408 | 1158 |
| **Colorado** | **.725** | **1711** | **1241** | **Below Avg** |  | **37.3%** | **465** | **1247** |
| Arizona | .724 | 1615 | 1170 | Below Avg |  | 34.6% | 414 | 1198 |

Colorado was 11th in the conference with their PPP and finished 10th with their FG%. The Buffaloes would need to increase their FGM 1.90 per game to reach 42%. This would in theory increase their PPP to .794 and give them an ‘Average’ rating. As they seek to improve, less is more. Therefore, the 1% solution will be discussed later.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b2eaf9f4b8b54b270d251f2>

**Zone (Very Good):** The Buffaloes faced a zone 19.7% and they were solid. They scored 358 points in 419 possessions and produced .85 PPP. Colorado earned a ranking in the 72nd percentile last season. Their shooting increased 3.2% when they faced a zone. The Buffaloes converted 134 of 331 field goal attempts for 40.5%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b2eb05f4b8b54b270d251fc>

**Press Offense (Below Average):** Synergy shows Colorado was forced into a press offense only 7.4%. They scored 99 points in 158 possessions for .62 PPP. Unfortunately, this placed them 29th. However, this is where the numbers may not match up to what’s being seen.

The Buffaloes press offense displayed patience, poise, and their ability to not allow their opponents to speed them up. They were able to not only break or discourage the press, but also cross the timeline and run their sets. The shots Colorado missed weren’t because they were sped up in any way. No, their team was able to establish good looks. However, they just simply missed on some possessions, and that’s basketball as we know it. Synergy is truly a transcendent tool when it comes to analytics, but there will always be a small margin for human error. When using Synergy, it’s always important to ask if the numbers match up to what you’re viewing. With that thought in mind, let’s continue to break down the Colorado offense.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Offensive Play Types** | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **Transition** | **20.4%** | **545** | **547** | **84th** | **Excellent** | **187** | **202** | **389** | **51.9%** |
| Spot-Up | 20.2% | 540 | 435 | 46th | Average | 324 | 147 | 471 | 31.2% |
| P&R Ball-Handler | 17.1% | 457 | 306 | 47th | Average | 215 | 124 | 339 | 36.6% |
| Cut | 8.4% | 224 | 213 | 46th | Average | 90 | 90 | 180 | 50% |
| **Offensive Rebs: Put-backs** | **7%** | **188** | **195** | **72nd** | **Very Good** | **71** | **78** | **149** | **52.3%** |
| Post-Up | 5.3% | 142 | 115 | 61st | Good | 58 | 49 | 107 | 45.8% |
| Isolation | 3.6% | 95 | 59 | 24th | Below Average | 48 | 24 | 72 | 33.3% |
| P&R Roll-Man | 3.4% | 91 | 79 | 60th | Good | 49 | 31 | 80 | 38.8% |
| Off-Screen | 3.3% | 89 | 64 | 34th | Average | 59 | 25 | 84 | 29.8% |
| **Hand-Off** | **2.4%** | **63** | **59** | **93rd** | **Excellent** | **31** | **22** | **53** | **41.5%** |

The Buffaloes rated average or above in 9 of the 10 Synergy offensive play types. As they seek to make improvements, their mindset isn’t to be 100-percent better than all their opponents, but 1-percent. Wait, 1-percent? That doesn’t sound correct. Perhaps the concept is better explained in Tom Connellan’s book, The 1% Solution. In his book, Connellan reminds readers of the 2008 Beijing games. Michael Phelps won the 100-meter butterfly in a time of 50.58 seconds, just ahead of Serbia’s Milorad Cavic’s 50.59. Phelps won gold by only 1/100 of a second.

Connellan’s take away message: “the difference between exceptional and exceptionally exceptional is 1-percent.” He goes on to write that “we can all be 1-percent better at hundreds of things.” 1-percent better in transition, spot-up shooting, pick-and-rolls, basket cuts, offensive rebounds (put-backs), post-up, isolations, off-screens, hand-offs, you name it. The thought may sound crazy, but not when it’s further explained.

The 1% Solution goes on to say, “too many people who have been around for 30 years don’t really have 30 years’ experience. They have one year’s experience 30 times. They’ve never grown.” Further on, it discusses Deliberate Practice. Deliberate Practice is designed specifically to improve performance. It’s able to be repeated and comes with constructive feedback. So, the question isn’t, “How much time do you spend practicing each day?” But, “How much time do you spend deliberately practicing each day?”

To those skeptical about the idea and can’t see how it’s worth all that deliberate practice if you still only get 1-percent improvement, Connellan says to look at this with a longer lens. “Let’s say you keep up your new routine and you improve by another 1-percent each day for a week. Then the second week’s 1-percent improvement wouldn’t be an improvement just on your original skill level. You were already 1-percent better, so now you would be improving on your improvement.” Deliberate Practice has a snowball effect to improvement.

Now that the 1% Solution has been discussed, let’s continue to break down the Colorado Offense. Because transition has already been discussed on page No. 3, we’ll move on to the various play types.

**Spot-Up (Average):** Spot-Up shooting was 20.2% of the Colorado offense last season, their most preferred play type. With .80 PPP, the Buffaloes scored 435 points in the 540 possessions. They were in the 46th percentile among roughly 335 Division-1 level basketball teams for women. But Payne and Towns aren’t reaching for average here, especially when they have kids with the ability to shoot the ball. CU shot just 147 of 471 from the field for 31.2%.

**P&R Ball-Handler (Average):** This was the second most used play type and 17.1% of the Colorado offense. The Buffs were in the 47th percentile, scoring 306 points in 457 possessions for .67 PPP. Their guards have speed and the ability to get to the basket, so they should look to attack more in this play type. Surprisingly, it often takes them too long for the P&R to develop, giving full advantage to the defense. It may not seem like much, but if they can find a way to go from 36.6% to even 40%, that would make a tremendous difference in their efficiency as well as production. That’s just an increase of 13-14 FGM in this play type.

**Basket Cuts (Average):** Synergy shows this was 8.4% of the Colorado offense and the Buffaloes appeared to be quite efficient when they cut to an open area on the court. They scored 213 points in 224 possessions for .95 PPP. But perhaps the eye-popping number, they shot 50% from the field doing so, making 90 of 180 field goal attempts. Next season’s game plan should include a steady dose of basket cuts.

**Offensive Rebounds | Putbacks (Very Good):** The Buffaloes were ranked in the 72nd percentile. Not much to say other than that’s flat out toughness. 1) Go get the board, and 2) put it back in.

**Post-Up (Good):** This was perhaps Colorado’s most underused play type last season. Post-Up was only 5.3% of their offense even though the Buffs shot 45.8% from the field. The Buffaloes scored 115 points in 142 possessions for .810 PPP. CU made 49 of 107 field goal attempts, an area they could be more efficient in, but still good enough to place them in the 61st percentile.

**Isolation (Below Average):** This was a difficult play type for the Colorado program this past season. As 3.6% of their offense, they managed to score just 59 points in 95 possessions. That’s .62 PPP, placing Colorado in the 24th percentile. The team would only connect on 24 of 72 field goal attempts for 33.3%.

**P&R Roll-Man (Good):** The Buffaloes were solid when distributing the ball to the roll-man, but they could have been more efficient. They scored 79 points in 91 possessions with it being 3.4% of their offense. That’s .87 PPP. CU ranked in the 60th percentile and converted 31 of 80 shots for 38.8%.

**Off-Screen (Average):** A year older and a year wiser should make this one of Colorado’s favorite play types next season. Last year, it was only 3.3% of their offense and they scored 64 points in 89 possessions. The Buffs earned a ranking in the 34th percentile with .72 PPP. Although the team only converted 25 of 84 shots for 29.8% last year, look for that number to soar with Robinson and Leonard a year older, a year wiser, and a year better.

**Hand-Off (Excellent):** Lastly, hand-off was a play type the Buffaloes ran only 2.4% though it would earn them a favorable rating. The team produced 59 points in 63 possessions and ranked in the 93rd percentile with .93 PPP. With guards like Leonard and Robinson, it wouldn’t be surprising to see Colorado increase the usage of this play type from 2.4% to roughly 6% next year. Those two guards are crafty enough to not only improve the efficiency of this play, but also improve Colorado’s point production in the number of possessions. But if they can aggressively turn the corner and attack the lane, the floor will open where they seem to excel. With that said, the Buffaloes making 22 of 53 field goal attempts for 41.5% isn’t concerning.

The next phase of this report will be spent breaking down Colorado’s key individual players. The offense will be broken down based on how often the Buffaloes used each play type. Before Colorado’s key personnel is discussed, here’s how their offensive play types break down.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **Transition** | **20.4%** |  |  |  | **Excellent** |  |  |  |  |
| Kennedy Leonard | 29.2% | 159 | 158 | 64th | Good | 45 | 50 | 95 | 52.6% |
| Alexis Robinson | 17.1% | 93 | 95 | 71st | Very Good | 38 | 35 | 73 | 47.9% |
| Annika Jank | 10.8% | 59 | 66 | 82nd | Very Good | 22 | 24 | 46 | 52.2% |

**Transition:** 1): Colorado’s leader in transition last season was Kennedy Leonard. She was 29.2% of their transition offense. Kennedy scored 158 points in 159 possessions, just under 1-PPP. She ranked in the 64th percentile with a ‘Good’ rating. Kennedy also converted 50 of 95 field goal attempts for 52.6%. 2): Alexis Robinson was 17.1% of the Buffaloes transition. She produced 95 points in 93 possessions, ranking her in the 71st percentile with a ‘Very Good’ rating. Alexis had 1.02 PPP and was 35 of 73 in transition for 47.9%. 3): Annika Jank was 10.8% of transition for Colorado, scoring 66 points in 59 possessions. She too earned a ‘Very Good’ rating with 1.11 PPP. Jank converted 24 of 46 field goal attempts for 52.2%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b2ecbd94b8b54b270d25456>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **Spot-Up** | **20.2%** |  |  |  | **Average** |  |  |  |  |
| Alexis Robinson | 21.7% | 117 | 125 | 90th | Excellent | 67 | 41 | 108 | 38% |
| Kennedy Leonard | 17.2% | 93 | 76 | 59th | Good | 60 | 26 | 86 | 30.2% |
| Quinessa Caylao-Do | 13.3% | 72 | 54 | 47th | Average | 40 | 16 | 56 | 28.6% |
| Annika Jank | 11.9% | 64 | 43 | 34th | Average | 45 | 16 | 61 | 26.2 |
| Mya Hollingshed | 10.4% | 56 | 57 | 86th | Excellent | 30 | 19 | 49 | 38.8% |

**Spot-Up:** 1): Robinson led the team in spot-up shooting and she was 21.7% of that specific play. Her 125 points in 117 possessions, ranked in the 90th percentile with an ‘Excellent’ rating. That’s 1.06 PPP. Alexis connected on 41 of 108 shots for 38%. 2): Leonard was 17.2% of Colorado’s spot-up offense. In her 93 possessions, she produced 76 points for .82 PPP. Kennedy ranked in the 59th percentile with a ‘Good’ rating and converted 26 of 86 field goals for 30.2%. 3): Quinessa Caylao-Do was 13.3% of the spot-up offense and scored 54 points in 72 possessions. She ranked in the 47th percentile with .75 PPP and an Average’ rating. Caylao-Do was 16 of 56 for 28.6%. 4): Jank produced 11.9% of the Buffaloes spot-up offense. She had .67 PPP by scoring 43 points in 64 possessions. Though ranking in the 34th percentile, Annika still received an ‘Average’ rating. She converted 16 of 61 field goals for 26.2%.

5): As 10.4% of this play, Mya Hollingshed scored 57 points in 56 possessions. With her 1.02 PPP, she ranked in the 86th percentile and was rewarded with an ‘Excellent’ rating. Mya connected on 19 of 49 shots for 38.8%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b2ed4b94b8b54b270d2556e>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **P&R Ball-Handler** | **17.1%** |  |  |  | **Average** |  |  |  |  |
| Kennedy Leonard | 42.9% | 196 | 143 | 65th | Very Good | 86 | 53 | 139 | 38.1% |
| Alexis Robinson | 17.7% | 81 | 32 | 11th | Poor | 54 | 14 | 68 | 20.6% |
| Quinessa Caylao-Do | 15.3% | 70 | 50 | 61st | Good | 32 | 21 | 53 | 39.6% |

**P&R Ball-Handler:** 1): No surprise here. Leonard was 42.9% as the ball-handler in Colorado’s Pick-and-Roll offense. She is no doubt the engine and heartbeat of the Buffaloes. What better play type is there for the two-time first-team All-Pac-12 player who is only 84 assists shy of becoming Colorado’s all-time leader? Kennedy scored 143 points in 196 possessions, ranking her in the 65th percentile. There’s no reason to believe her .72 PPP won’t be higher in this play type next season, especially as an experienced senior. She earned a ‘Very Good’ rating and completed 53 of 139 field goal attempts for 38.1% last year. Leonard will be far more calculating as a senior and Colorado’s surge next season will very well rest on her leadership and execution. 2): Robinson initiated the pick-and-roll 17.7% as the ball-handler, but she only scored 32 points in 81 possessions. Unfortunately, that’s only .39 PPP as the pick-and-roll ball-handler. Alexis ranked in the 11th percentile, receiving a ‘Poor’ rating. That’s surprising, especially considering Robinson is a speed demon with tremendous athleticism and the ability to get to the rim as well as shoot the ball. However, for some reason, she struggled. Alexis connected on 14 of 68 shots for 20.6%. With next year being her senior season, look for Robinson to be more on the attack as the secondary ball-handler. As the backcourt mate with Leonard, this could undoubtedly be discussed as the most difficult backcourt to defend in the Pac-12. 3): Caylao-Do initiated 15.3% of pick-and-rolls, scoring 50 points in 70 possessions. That was .71 PPP, ranking her in the 61st percentile with a ‘Good’ rating. Caylao-Do converted 21 of 53 field goal attempts for 39.6%.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **Basket Cuts** | **8%** |  |  |  | **Average** |  |  |  |  |
| Annika Jank | 31.3% | 70 | 61 | 36th | Average | 31 | 24 | 55 | 43.6% |
| Mya Hollingshed | 12.9% | 29 | 28 | 51st | Good | 11 | 12 | 23 | 52.2% |
| Aubrey Knight | 8% | 18 | 17 | 48th | Average | 8 | 8 | 16 | 50% |

**Basket Cuts:** 1): The numbers indicate Jank was 31.3% of this offensive play and she scored 61 points in 70 possessions. Her .87 PPP ranked in the 36th percentile with an ‘Average’ rating. Annika converted 24 of 55 shots for 43.6%. 2): Hollingshed was 12.9% of basket cuts offensively and scored 28 points in 29 possessions. With her .96 PPP, she fell within the 51st percentile with a ‘Good’ rating. Hollingshed connected on 12 of 23 field goal attempts for 52.2%. 3): Aubrey Knight was only 8% of this play type but showed promise. Displaying great hands, she would catch and score .94 PPP. Knight scored 17 points in 18 possessions and ranked in the 48th percentile with an ‘Average’ rating. Making the most of scoring opportunities, she connected on 8 of 16 attempts for 50%.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **Off Rebs put-backs** | **7%** |  |  |  | **Very Good** |  |  |  |  |
| Annika Jank | 19.10% | 36 | 37 | 59th | Good | 13 | 14 | 27 | 51.9% |

**Offensive Rebounds (put backs):** Jank appears to be the workhorse for Colorado and was 19.1% of their put backs from offensive rebounds. She scored 37 points in 36 possessions and her 1.03 PPP ranked in the 59th percentile with a ‘Good’ rating. Jank finished 14 of the 27 shots after an offensive rebound for roughly 51.9%. At times, Jank even rebounded the missed shot of her offensive put-back.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **Post-Up** | **5.3%** |  |  |  | **Good** |  |  |  |  |
| Annika Jank | 23.9% | 34 | 26 | 52nd | Good | 12 | 10 | 22 | 45.5% |
| Mya Hollingshed | 10.6% | 15 | 15 | 89th | Excellent | 5 | 6 | 11 | 54.5% |

**Post-Up:** 1): Jank was 23.9% of Colorado’s post-up offense and seems to be settling into her role. She produced .76 PPP by scoring 26 points in 34 possessions. Annika ranked in the 52nd percentile and earned herself a ‘Good’ rating. She made 10 of 22 shots for 45.5% and showed great touch off the glass, something uncommon in a majority of player’s today. Her size as well as her ability to catch and shoot the ball will make her tough to defend. 2): Hollingshed was only 10.6% of the Buffaloes post-up offense but was quite efficient, scoring 15 points in 15 possessions. Her 1-PPP ranked in the 89th percentile with an ‘Excellent’ rating, so the Buffaloes show promise inside with Hollingshed and Jank.

Hollingshed also converted 6 of 11 field goal attempts for 54.5% and she showed a nice little jump hook just outside the lane.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **Isolation** | **3.6%** |  |  |  | **Below Average** |  |  |  |  |
| Kennedy Leonard | 28.4% | 27 | 20 | 53rd | Good | 12 | 8 | 20 | 40% |
| Alexis Robinson | 25.3% | 24 | 15 | 33rd | Average | 14 | 6 | 20 | 30% |
| Quinessa Caylao-Do | 13.7% | 13 | 9 | 43rd | Average | 5 | 3 | 8 | 37.5% |
| Annika Jank | 11.6% | 11 | 10 | 79th | Very Good | 6 | 5 | 11 | 45.5% |

**Isolation:** 1): Leonard was 28.4% of the Buffaloes isolation offense. She produced .81 PPP by scoring 20 points in 27 possessions. Leonard ranked in the 53rd percentile with a ‘Good’ rating and hit 8 of 20 isolation attempts for 40%. 2): Robinson was 25.3% of Colorado’s isolations and along with Leonard, they accounted for more than half of the teams’ isolation attempts. Robinson’s .62 PPP ranked in the 33rd percentile, but still earned her an ‘Average’ rating. She scored 15 points in 24 possessions, converting 6 of 20 shots for 30%. 3): Caylao-Do scored 9 points in 13 possessions. As 13.7% of the Buffs isolations, she ranked in the 43rd percentile, with .69 PPP. She too had an “Average’ rating and knocked down 3 of 8 shots for 37.5%. 4): Colorado used Jank quite a bit in this play type as well. She was 11.6% of isolations and scored 10 points in 11 possessions, ranking in the 79th percentile with a ‘Very Good’ rating. Jank converted 5 of 11 field goal attempts for 45.5% and produced .91 PPP.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **P&R Roll-Man** | **3.4%** |  |  |  | **Good** |  |  |  |  |
| Annika Jank | 42.9% | 39 | 27 | 28th | Below Average | 26 | 11 | 37 | 29.7% |
| Mya Hollingshed | 30.8% | 28 | 34 | 88th | Excellent | 11 | 12 | 23 | 52.2% |

**P&R Roll-Man:** 1): Annika was targeted 42.9% as the roll-man in the Buffaloes pick-and-roll sets. She scored 27 points in 39 possessions, ranking her in the 28th percentile for a ‘Below Average’ rating. Annika produced .69 PPP, but this is an easy fix for her. She made just 11 of 37 shots for 29.7%. Let’s say Jank was instead 17 of 37 for 45.9%. That would potentially add an additional 12-points and give her 1-PPP. Her numbers will no doubt improve as she gains more and more reps in this play type.

2): Hollingshed had her number called quite a bit in this play type as well. She was targeted 30.8% as the roll-man in pick-and-roll sets and she scored 34 points in 28 possessions. Her 1.21 PPP ranked in the 88th percentile and earned an ‘Excellent’ rating as well. She converted 12 of 23 field goal attempts for 52.2%.
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Jank and Hollingshed were targeted 73% as the roll-man in Colorado’s pick-and-roll sets. The two of them produced 77% of the 79 points scored by the roll-man and attempted 75% of the 80 shots. Jank and Hollingshed also accounted for 74% of the 31 field goals made. However, let’s discuss a few areas of improvement for Colorado’s P&R game.

* **Wait for the screen:** Leonard and Robinson must be a little more patient, but this isn’t completely their fault. At times, they appear to be waiting for the screen to get set so one can certainly understand their eagerness to get moving. But, if it comes down to being early or late, it’s better to be late.
* **Set the defender up:** Even in their successful pick-and-rolls, Leonard and Robinson use the screen, but a high percentage of the time they fail to set their man up. Because of this, there’s no need for a team to play them honest. The screen can always be refused, but it’ll be far more effective when they set up their defender.
* **Attack:** Leonard and Robinson are two very good guards with speed, athleticism, and the ability to shoot the ball. At times, they can be a little passive as they come off the screen. This guard tandem can be a nightmare for opponents attempting to defend the pick-and-roll, but they must keep defenders on their heels by aggressively attacking.
* **Sprint to the screen:** The Buffaloes pick-and-roll game will become far more efficient and productive when Jank and Hollingshed learn to sprint to the area they are assigned to screen. Numerous times, Leonard signaled for a screen, but the P&R took far too long to develop because she was waiting. Making this one adjustment alone, will give defenders less time to react and make the play tougher to defend.
* **Set solid screens:** There’s no question Leonard, Robinson, Jank, and Hollingshed can all be dangerous pick-and-roll or pick-and-pop combinations. But if Jank and Hollingshed fail at any part, failure to set a solid screen can’t be it. They must make solid contact. Their screens have typically been either ‘brush screens’ or missed all together. Jank and Hollingshed will benefit from setting a solid screen for Leonard and Robinson who are more than capable of making the right play. The foursome all have the ability to wreak havoc on opponents, but it’ll start with Jank and Hollingshed setting screens to either stop defenders or force them over the top.
* **Roll.** Not too sure if it’s by staff design or player preference, but Jank and Hollingshed seem to mostly pick-and-pop. That’s not a problem if it falls in line with the staffs’ game plan. However, as effective as Jank and Hollingshed have shown themselves to be around the rim, Colorado’s P&R will be far more effective and efficient by rolling those players to open low post areas. Less predictability is all they need. Now let’s discuss the Buffaloes key individual players in their off-screen sets.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **Off-Screen** | **3%** |  |  |  | **Average** |  |  |  |  |
| Alexis Robinson | 47.2% | 42 | 24 | 22nd | Below Average | 30 | 10 | 40 | 25% |
| Kennedy Leonard | 14.6% | 13 | 4 | 5th | Poor | 9 | 2 | 11 | 18.2% |
| Mya Hollingshed | 12.4% | 11 | 9 | 53rd | Good | 8 | 3 | 11 | 27.3% |

**Off-Screen:** 1): Alexis Robinson is arguably Colorado’s best shooter, but she only produced .57 PPP here. She was 47.2% of their off-screen offense. That’s why it’s surprising to see she only scored 24 points in 42 possessions and ranked in the 22nd percentile with a ‘Below Average’ rating. But it’s understandable. Without question, teams respect her ability to shoot the ball and it’s clear having Alexis move from her stationary position, affects the rhythm of her shot. She only converted 10 of 40 shots for 25%. A surprising statistic given her ability to shoot the ball. Let’s compare her spot-up and off-screen numbers.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Alexis Robinson** | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **Spot-Up** | **20.2%** |  |  |  | **Average** |  |  |  |  |
|  | 21.7% | 117 | 125 | 90th | Excellent | 67 | 41 | 108 | 37.8% |
| **Off-Screen** | **3.3%** |  |  |  | **Average** |  |  |  |  |
|  | 47.2% | 42 | 24 | 22nd | Below Average | 30 | 10 | 40 | 25% |

Robinson averages 1.07 PPP as a spot-up shooter, but only .57 PPP when she comes off-screens. However, she still has great form and a great stroke. She just merely needs to find a way to feel the same comfort coming off-screens as she does when she spots-up. Once Alexis finds a way to do that, her efficiency and productivity in off-screen shooting will soar. 2): Leonard on the other hand was only 14.6% of Colorado’s off-screen offense. She scored 4 points in 13 possessions, ranking in the 5th percentile with a ‘Poor’ rating. Leonard was 2 of 11 from the field for 18.2%.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Kennedy Leonard** | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **Spot-Up** | **20.2%** |  |  |  | **Average** |  |  |  |  |
|  | 17.2% | 93 | 76 | 59th | Good | 60 | 26 | 86 | 30.2% |
| **Off-Screen** | **3.3%** |  |  |  | **Average** |  |  |  |  |
|  | 14.6% | 13 | 4 | 5th | Poor | 9 | 2 | 11 | 18.2% |

Leonard’s numbers drop significantly as well here. She goes from .82 PPP as a spot-up shooter, to .31 PPP when she comes off-screens. If she too can improve her efficiency and productivity in off-screen shooting without her spot-up shooting deteriorating in any way, it’ll be a special senior season. 3): Mya produced .82 PPP after scoring 9 points in the 11 possessions she was used in off-screens. She ranked in the 53rd percentile with a ‘Good’ rating. But Mya also struggled shooting off-screens, converting only 3 of 11 shots for 27.3%.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Possessions** | **Points** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **Hand-Off** | **2.4%** |  |  |  | **Excellent** |  |  |  |  |
| Alexis Robinson | 31.7% | 20 | 25 | 97th | Excellent | 9 | 10 | 19 | 52.6% |
| Kennedy Leonard | 22.2% | 14 | 15 | 87th | Excellent | 6 | 5 | 11 | 45.5% |
| Quinessa Caylao-Do | 20.6% | 13 | 12 | 75th | Very Good | 6 | 4 | 10 | 40% |

**Hand-Off:** 1): Alexis Robinson was 31.7% of the Buffaloes offense involving a hand-off. She scored 25 points in 20 possessions, which comes to 1.25 PPP. Might not be a bad idea to involve her in more hand-offs next season because she ranked in the 97th percentile with an ‘Excellent’ rating. Alexis converted 10 of 19 shots for 52.6%. 2): To no surprise, Leonard also handled hand-offs well last season. She was involved in a hand-off 22.2% and scored 15 points in 14 possessions. Her 1.07 PPP ranked in the 87th percentile and earned an ‘Excellent’ rating. Leonard connected on 5 of 11 shots for 45.5%. 3): Caylao-Do was 20.6% of their hand-offs and she produced 12 points in 13 possessions for .92 PPP. She ranked in the 75th percentile with a ‘Very Good’ rating and made 4 of 10 shots for 40%.
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Colorado’s offense, based on points per possession (PPP), has been recorded in the grid below from highest to lowest. **Excellent, Very Good, or Good ratings, are all in Bold Black.** While anything rated Below Average, Poor, and FG% below 40%, are all in red.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Offensive Play Types** | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **PPP** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| **Transition** | 20.4% | **545** | **547** | **1.003** | **84th** | **Excellent** | 187 | **202** | **389** | **51.9%** |
| Half-Court | 79.6% | 2130 | 1599 | .75 | 41st | Average | 979 | 599 | 1578 | 37.9% |
| **< 4 secs** | 4.9% | **131** | **82** | **.62** | **59th** | **Good** | 78 | 32 | 110 | 29% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLOB | 5% | 110 | 75 | .68 | 36th | Average | 57 | 26 | 83 | 31.3% |
| After a T.O. | 13.1% | 278 | 187 | .67 | 21st | Below Avg | 131 | 75 | 206 | 36.4% |
| BLOB | 9.6% | 205 | 130 | .63 | 13th | Poor | 103 | 55 | 158 | 34.8% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **vs Zone** | 19.7% | **419** | **358** | **.85** | **72nd** | **Very Good** | 197 | 134 | 331 | 40.5% |
| vs Man-to-Man | 80% | 1711 | 1241 | .72 | 30th | Below Avg | 782 | 465 | 1247 | 37.3% |
| vs Press | 7.4% | 158 | 99 | .62 | 29th | Below Avg | 73 | 34 | 107 | 31.7% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cut | 8.4% | 224 | 213 | .95 | 46th | Average | 90 | **90** | **180** | **50%** |
| **Hand-Off** | 2.4% | **63** | **59** | **.936** | **93rd** | **Excellent** | 31 | 22 | 53 | 41.5% |
| **P&R Roll-Man** | 3.4% | **91** | **79** | **.868** | **60th** | **Good** | 49 | 31 | 80 | 38.7% |
| **Post-Up** | 5.3% | **142** | **115** | **.809** | **61st** | **Good** | 58 | **49** | **107** | **45.7%** |
| Spot-Up | 20.2% | 540 | 435 | .805 | 46th | Average | 324 | 147 | 471 | 31.2% |
| Off-Screen | 3.3% | 89 | 64 | .719 | 34th | Average | 59 | 25 | 84 | 29.8% |
| P&R Ball-Handler | 17.1% | 457 | 306 | .669 | 47th | Average | 215 | 124 | 339 | 36.5% |
| Isolations | 3.6% | 95 | 59 | .621 | 24th | Below Avg | 48 | 24 | 72 | 33.3% |

Colorado’s transition numbers indicate they scored just over 1-PPP for an ‘Excellent’ rating. But they also made 202 of the 389 field goal attempts for 51.9%. In this example, one could argue the numbers somewhat match up. However, take a closer look and you will clearly see how their efficiency impacted their production. Let’s compare those same numbers to Pac-12 Champion Oregon, and USC who finished 9-9 in the conference.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Transition** | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **Pts per Poss** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| USC | 16.9% | 384 | 443 | 1.154 | 99th | Excellent | 124 | 159 | 283 | 56.2% |
| Oregon | 15.3% | 472 | 537 | 1.138 | 99th | Excellent | 173 | 196 | 369 | 53.1% |
| Colorado | 20.4% | 545 | 547 | 1.003 | 84th | Excellent | 187 | 202 | 389 | 51.9% |

What do we know? 1): Transition was 20.4% of Colorado’s offense last season. That figure exceeds USC with 16.9% and Oregon with 15.3%. However, USC who finished 20-11 with a 9-9 conference record, produced a much higher 1.154 PPP. The women of Troy clearly made the most of their transition opportunities by converting 159 of 283 shots for 56.2%. An interesting number, USC scored 59 points over their number of possessions and we will use that figure later. 2): Oregon finished 33-5 and won the Pac-12 with a 16-2 record. The Ducks produced 1.138 PPP. By converting 196 of 369 field goal attempts for 53.1%. Oregon was able to score 65 points over their number of possessions. 3): Which now brings us back to Colorado who finished 15-16 with a 5-13 conference record. The numbers indicate this team isn’t that far away. The Buffaloes transitioned 5.1% more than Oregon and 3.5% more that USC respectively. However, the team only scored two more points over their number of possessions for 1.003 PPP.

So, let’s talk hypothetically for a moment about Colorado’s numbers. If the Buffaloes were to increase their FG%, they would also increase their points over their number of possessions as well. Therefore, their PPP would obviously increase. Now, let’s say Colorado shot 53.1% to match Oregon. That would only increase their FGM to 206 and depending on if those FGM’s were 2-points or 3-points, their points in transition would jump from 547 to 555 (with 2-ptrs) or 559 (with 3-ptrs). Those numbers would only increase their PPP to 1.018 (with 2-ptrs) or 1.025 (with 3-ptrs) respectively. Not a huge jump by any means. But let’s say the Buffs shot 56.2% to match USC. Here we see their FGM would jump to 218. This number potentially could increase their points from 547 to the 579-595 range. Meaning, Colorado’s PPP potentially jumps from 1.003 to 1.091.

Finally, what would the Buffaloes’ numbers look like if their team was somehow 65 points over their number of possessions? We would then see 612 points in 545 possessions and their PPP would sky rocket to 1.122. That number would hypothetically increase Colorado’s FGM to 234 and would also increase their FG% to 60.1% in transition. The Buffaloes are close.

Now, let’s break down Colorado’s overall defense. Just a reminder, this is a partial analysis and it should be taken with a grain of salt. Video clips will display opponent scores and Colorado stops.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Play Types** | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **PPP** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| Overall Defense | 100% | 2636 | 2123 | .805 | 37th | Average | 1151 | 774 | 1925 | 40.2% |
| Transition | 18% | 475 | 465 | .979 | 13th | Poor | 184 | 181 | 365 | 49.6% |
| Half-Court | 82% | 2161 | 1658 | .767 | 47th | Average | 967 | 593 | 1560 | 38% |
| Short Shot Clock |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| less than 4 secs | 6.2% | 163 | 91 | .558 | 70th | Very Good | 95 | 32 | 127 | 25.2% |

**Overall Defense (Average):** Last season Colorado surrendered 2,123 points in 2,636 possessions. Their .805 PPP ranked in the 37th percentile. The Buffaloes allowed 774 field goals in 1,925 attempts for 40.2%. Here’s how those numbers compared to the rest of the Pac-12.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pac-12 Defensive Points per Possession (PPP)** | **Points per Poss** | **Poss** | **Points** | **Rating** |  | **Pac-12 Defensive FG%** | **FG%** | **FGM** | **FGA** |
| Oregon State | .747 | 2644 | 1976 | Very Good |  | Oregon State | 34.9% | 758 | 2171 |
| Stanford | .771 | 2822 | 2176 | Very Good |  | Stanford | 36.4% | 769 | 2115 |
| UCLA | .780 | 2837 | 2214 | Good |  | Oregon | 38.8% | 912 | 2352 |
| Oregon | .782 | 3076 | 2404 | Good |  | UCLA | 39.2% | 791 | 2016 |
| USC | .787 | 2266 | 1784 | Good |  | California | 39.4% | 762 | 1932 |
| Arizona State | .790 | 2549 | 2013 | Average |  | Utah | 39.5% | 752 | 1906 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | .791 | 2565 | 2029 | Average |  | **Colorado** | **40.2%** | **774** | **1925** |
| **Colorado** | **.805** | **2636** | **2123** | **Average** |  | USC | 40.7% | 655 | 1610 |
| Washington State | .808 | 2501 | 2020 | Average |  | Washington State | 41.7% | 739 | 1771 |
| California | .820 | 2480 | 2033 | Below Avg |  | Arizona State | 41.9% | 784 | 1873 |
| Arizona | .877 | 2390 | 2095 | Poor |  | Arizona | 43.1% | 773 | 1795 |
| Washington | .906 | 2424 | 2196 | Poor |  | Washington | 47.8% | 821 | 1717 |

Last season Colorado was 8th in the Pac-12 giving up .805 PPP, but let’s use .770 PPP as the target to reach. For the Buffaloes to have reached that goal last year, it would have taken just 94 points less over the course of their 31-game season. Assuming the 94 points were all field goals, that would have reduced their FGM by 47. That’s roughly a deduction of 3.03 points and 1.51 FGM per contest respectively. That would have dropped Colorado’s defensive FG% from 40.2% to 37.7%, placing them in the top-3 teams of the Pac-12.

**Transition (Poor):** It has often been said, “A team who presses, hates to be pressed.” Now, that is not implying “A team who runs, hates to defend transition,” but it’s clear Colorado was much better in transition than they were at defending it. The Buffaloes defended transition 18% last season. They yielded .979 PPP by allowing 465 points in 475 possessions. Colorado ranked in the 13th percentile and their transition defense gave up 181 shots in 365 attempts for 49.6%.
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**½-Court (Average):** When you spend 82% of your overall defense in the ½-court, you need to keep one number in mind, seventy-five percent. Seventy-five percent of all field goals come in ½-court situations. There are many defensive philosophies out there, but the main goal always remains the same. Make the other team feel uncomfortable. The Colorado defense allowed opponents 1,658 points in 2,161 possessions, .767 PPP. They ranked in the 47th percentile and opponents converted 593 of 1,560 shots for 38%.
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**Short Shot Clock | < 4 seconds (Very Good):** While most teams tend to struggle in short shot clock situations with 4-seconds or less, the Buffaloes appeared to excel. They gave up 91 points in 163 possessions, just .558 PPP. CU was ranked in the 70th percentile. Even more impressive was the fact they only surrendered 32 FGM in 127 attempts for 25.2%.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **Pts per Possessions (PPP)** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| BLOB | 9.3% | 202 | 176 | .871 | 8th | Poor | 89 | 70 | 159 | 44% |
| SLOB | 5.3% | 114 | 88 | .772 | 36th | Average | 49 | 26 | 75 | 34.7% |
| After T.O. | 13.2% | 285 | 215 | .754 | 45th | Average | 127 | 81 | 208 | 38.9% |

**BLOB (Poor):** Unfortunately, the Colorado defense didn’t defend this situation well last season. They defended this play type 9.3% and gave up 176 points in 202 possessions. With them giving up .871 PPP, the Buffs ranked in the 8th percentile. Opponents made 70 of 159 field goal attempts for 44%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b3031d24b8b5119a01ddc75>

**SLOB (Average):** The Buffaloes only defended this situation 5.3% and they were solid, yielding 88 points in 114 possessions for .772 PPP. They ranked in the 36th percentile and teams were only 26 of 75 from the field for 34.7%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b3041ca4b8b5119a01de08b>

**After Time Outs (Average):** Colorado gave up .754 PPP. The Buffaloes were ranked in the 45th percentile after teams scored 215 points in 285 possessions. CU appeared locked in here, allowing just 81 field goals in 208 attempts for 38.9%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b3042004b8b5119a01de096>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **Pts per Possessions (PPP)** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| Man-to-Man | 64.1% | 1386 | 1043 | .753 | 55th | Good | 597 | 369 | 966 | 38.2% |
| Zone | 35.9% | 775 | 615 | .794 | 47th | Average | 370 | 224 | 594 | 37.7% |
| Press | 6.2% | 134 | 97 | .724 | 43rd | Average | 51 | 34 | 85 | 40% |

**Man-to-Man (Good):** Colorado showed man-to-man 64.1%. The team surrendered 1,043 points in 1,386 possessions. Their .753 PPP ranked in the 55th percentile. The team was solid defensively and will only be better next season with an older team knowing the system and key additions. Opponents made 369 shots in 966 attempts from the field for 38.2%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b30461a4b8b5119a01de0ab>

**Zone (Average):** Zone was 35.9% of Colorado’s defense. They appeared to be vulnerable on the wing and among the baseline corners, often allowing wide open looks. Teams scored 615 points in 775 possessions, .794 PPP. This ranked in the 47th percentile. Opponents made 224 shots in 594 attempts for 37%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b304a1a4b8b5119a01de0ca>

**Press (Average):** The Buffs employed the press 6.2%, but it appears they utilized it to simply slow down the pace of opponents. Teams seemed to break the press rather easy and at times, players failed to step up to take away the reversal pass after the initial trap was set. Colorado gave up .724 PPP, with teams scoring 97 points in 134 possessions. They ranked in the 34th percentile and opponents made 34 of 85 shots for 40%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b304f484b8b5119a01de10a>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Defensive Play Types** | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **PPP** | **Rank** | **Rating** | **fgm** | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| Spot-Up | 26.6% | 702 | 622 | .886 | 14th | Poor | 382 | 219 | 601 | 36.4% |
| Transition | 18% | 475 | 465 | .979 | 13th | Poor | 184 | 181 | 365 | 49.6% |
| Basket Cuts | 12.3% | 324 | 282 | .870 | 84th | Excellent | 145 | 123 | 268 | 45.9% |
| P&R Ball-Handler | 9% | 236 | 178 | .754 | 16th | Below Avg | 109 | 60 | 169 | 35.5% |
| Post-Up | 6.9% | 181 | 141 | .779 | 55th | Good | 82 | 60 | 142 | 42.3% |
| Off Rebs: Put backs | 5.4% | 143 | 106 | .741 | 99th | Excellent | 61 | 37 | 98 | 37.8% |
| Off-Screen | 3.6% | 94 | 72 | .766 | 59th | Good | 55 | 23 | 78 | 29.5% |
| Isolation | 3.4% | 90 | 65 | .722 | 44th | Average | 45 | 20 | 65 | 30.8% |
| P&R Roll-Man | 2.3% | 61 | 57 | .934 | 30th | Below Avg | 27 | 25 | 52 | 48.1% |
| Hand-Off | 1.7% | 46 | 32 | .696 | 56th | Good | 25 | 14 | 39 | 35.9% |

**Def vs Spot-Up (Poor):** Colorado defended the Spot-Up 26.6% of their defensive possessions. Teams produced .886 PPP by scoring 622 points in 702 possessions, ranking the Buffs in the 14th percentile. Opponents made 219 shots on 601 attempts for 36.4%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b3084844b8b5119a01dea43>

**Def vs Transition (Poor):** Please refer to page 18.

**Def vs Basket Cuts (Excellent):** The Buffaloes defended Basket Cuts 12.3%. Teams scored 282 points in 324 possessions, equaling out to .870 PPP. Colorado ranked in the 84th percentile, defending this play type better than any other Pac-12 team. Further research showed the Buffaloes’ .870 PPP was even better than the Connecticut Huskies who ranked in the 24th percentile with 1.027 PPP and a ‘Below Avg’ rating. Colorado’s FG% defending basket cuts was also 2nd in the Pac-12. The chart below shows Pac-12 PPP numbers and ratings.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Defense vs Basket Cuts** | **PPP** | **Poss** | **Points** | **Rating** |  | **FG%** | **FGM** | **FGA** |
| **Colorado** | **.870** | **324** | **282** | **Excellent** |  | **45.9%** | **123** | **268** |
| Oregon St | .895 | 200 | 179 | Very Good |  | 45.3% | 78 | 172 |
| California | .9 | 271 | 244 | Very Good |  | 47% | 108 | 230 |
| Oregon | .942 | 395 | 372 | Good |  | 50.2% | 163 | 325 |
| Arizona | .944 | 249 | 235 | Good |  | 50.3% | 100 | 199 |
| Stanford | .975 | 198 | 193 | Avg |  | 49.4% | 84 | 170 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | .988 | 162 | 160 | Avg |  | 52.3% | 69 | 132 |
| USC | 1.000 | 201 | 201 | Avg |  | 57.4% | 89 | 155 |
| Washington St | 1.004 | 285 | 286 | Avg |  | 52.4% | 121 | 231 |
| Arizona St | 1.042 | 215 | 224 | Below Avg |  | 55.6% | 99 | 178 |
| UCLA | 1.063 | 286 | 304 | Poor |  | 56.9% | 132 | 232 |
| Washington | 1.158 | 259 | 300 | Poor |  | 63.5% | 139 | 219 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UConn | 1.027 | 263 | 270 | Below Avg |  | 53.9% | 118 | 219 |

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b30a54c4b8b5119a01dea5f>

**Def vs the P&R Ball-Handler (Below Average):** Colorado struggled just a bit defending the ball-handler in pick-and-roll situations. As 9% of their defense, they gave up .754 PPP. In 236 possessions, teams were able to score 178 points. This ranked the Buffs in the 16th percentile. Opponents shot 35.5%, making 60 of 169 field goal attempts.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b3105454b8b535dd4eb63d3>

**Def vs Post-Up (Good):** The Buffaloes showed grit here. They were 3rd in the Pac-12 conference defending the post. Teams were able to produce .779 PPP by scoring 141 points in 181 possessions, ranking the Buffaloes in the 55th percentile defensively. Colorado yielded 60 field goals on 142 attempts for 42.3%. Here’s how their defense against the post-up numbers stacked up against the rest of the Pac-12.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pac-12 Defense vs Post-up** | **PPP** | **Poss** | **Points** | **Rating** |  | **FG%** | **FGM** | **FGA** |
| Stanford | .6 | 160 | 96 | Excellent |  | 31.4% | 38 | 121 |
| Oregon St | .661 | 254 | 168 | Excellent |  | 34.2% | 69 | 202 |
| **Colorado** | **.779** | **181** | **141** | **Good** |  | **42.3%** | **60** | **142** |
| California | .780 | 200 | 156 | Good |  | 42.3% | 67 | 158 |
| Utah | .792 | 216 | 171 | Average |  | 42.5% | 76 | 179 |
| USC | .822 | 236 | 194 | Average |  | 48% | 83 | 173 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UCLA | .830 | 218 | 181 | Average |  | 45% | 72 | 160 |
| Oregon | .909 | 243 | 221 | Poor |  | 49.5% | 96 | 194 |
| Arizona | .909 | 263 | 239 | Poor |  | 52.3% | 103 | 197 |
| Arizona St | .918 | 243 | 223 | Poor |  | 50% | 93 | 186 |
| Washington St | .920 | 188 | 173 | Poor |  | 52.8% | 76 | 144 |
| Washington St | 1.127 | 142 | 160 | Poor |  | 60.9% | 70 | 115 |

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b31158b4b8b535dd4eb681a>

Colorado’s .779 PPP was 3rd in the Pac-12 conference behind Stanford with .6 and Oregon State with .661. The Buffaloes also had the 3rd best defensive FG% vs the post-up with 42.3%. Their surge is CLOSE.

**Def vs Off-Rebounds & Put Backs (Excellent):** When Colorado surrendered an offensive rebound, teams scored just 106 points in 143 possessions. That’s a PPP of .741 which helped them to rank in the 99th percentile. Opponents only managed 37 field goals in 98 put backs for 37.8%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b311b0e4b8b535dd4eb699b>

**Def vs Off-Screens (Good):** Here’s another area where the Buffaloes defended well. They gave up 72 points in 94 possessions for .776 PPP. CU ranked in the 59th percentile and only surrendered 23 made shots in 78 attempts for 29.5%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b31245e4b8b535dd4eb6b0a>

**Def vs Isolations (Average):** Colorado faced offensive isolations 3.4% of their defensive possessions, and were solid defending this play type, giving up .722 PPP.

Opponents scored 65 points in 90 possessions, ranking the Buffs in the 44th percentile. Teams made just 20 shots in 65 attempts for 30.8%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b314ef64b8b535dd4eb8019>

**Def vs the P&R Roll-Man (Below Average):** The Buffaloes appeared to have some issues defending the roll-man in the pick-and-roll last season. Teams were able to produce .934 PPP against Colorado by scoring 57 points in 61 possessions, ranking them in the 30th percentile.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b3159d74b8b535dd4ebaea9>

**Def vs the Hand-Off (Good):** Here, Colorado gave up .696 PPP, allowing 32 points in 46 possessions. With a ranking in the 56th percentile, opponents could only muster 14 made field goals in 39 attempts, just under 36%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b3164eb4b8b535dd4ebaec6>

Overall, Colorado showed tendencies of being a very good defensive team with the ability to defend various play types. Yes, they received a ‘Poor’ rating in defending both transition and spot-up shooting. But next year will be the 3rd season under Payne and Towns who have a history getting their players to buy in to their defensive philosophies. If Colorado is to be successful next season, they will rely heavily on Leonard, Robinson, Jank, Hollingshed, Caylao-Do, and Knight to lead the way defensively. Only the defensive play types they’ve played the most will be charted in their respective grids.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Kennedy Leonard** | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **PPP** | **Rank** | **Rating** |  | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| Man-to-Man | 65.1% | 155 | 121 | .781 | 46th | Average |  | 40 | 116 | 34.5% |
| Zone | 34.9% | 83 | 57 | .687 | 70th | Very Good |  | 21 | 68 | 30.9% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spot-Up | 48.3% | 115 | 87 | .757 | 62nd | Good |  | 30 | 91 | 33.3% |
| P&R Ball-Handler | 29.7% | 70 | 54 | .771 | 30th | Below Avg |  | 17 | 47 | 36.2% |
| Off-Screen | 9.2% | 22 | 13 | .591 | 75th | Very Good |  | 5 | 20 | 25% |

* **Man-to-Man (Average):** The two-time All-Pac-12 player was a solid defender as a junior, but it’s hard to believe she hasn’t saved her best for last next season. Leonard spent 65.1% defending in a man-to-man. She gave up .781 PPP and ranked in the 46th percentile. Opponents were able to score 121 points against her in 155 possessions. She only surrendered 40 field goals in 116 attempts for 34.5%.
* **Zone (Very Good):** Zone however, was 34.9% of her defensive possessions. Here, Leonard lowered her PPP to .687, almost .100 PPP lower than her man-to-man defense. This helped her rank in the 70th percentile. Leonard only gave up 21 made shots in 68 field goal attempts while in a zone, just 30.9%.
* **Spot-Up (Good):** 48.3% was how often Leonard spent defending the spot-up shooter. She allowed .757 PPP and ranked in the 62nd percentile. Opposing players made just 30 of 91 shots against her for 33.3%.
* **Ball-Handler in P&R (Below Average):** But Leonard struggled a bit defending the ball-handler in the pick-and-roll. She faced this type of action 29.4% and unfortunately surrendered .771 PPP with a ranking in the 30th percentile. Leonard surrendered 17 made field goals in 47 attempts for 36.2%.
* **Off-Screens (Very Good):** Lastly, defending players off-screens fared very well for Leonard, only giving up .591 PPP. Though she only defended this play type 9.2%, her numbers ranked in the 75th percentile. Opposing players would only make 5 of 20 shots vs Kennedy for 25%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b31ce384b8b535dd4ebb696>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Alexis Robinson** | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **PPP** | **Rank** | **Rating** |  | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| Man-to-Man | 63.6% | 117 | 77 | .658 | 79th | Very Good |  | 30 | 93 | 32.3% |
| Zone | 36.4% | 67 | 72 | 1.075 | 12th | Poor |  | 25 | 60 | 41.7% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spot-Up | 56.5% | 104 | 93 | .894 | 33rd | Average |  | 31 | 91 | 34.1% |
| P&R Ball-Handler | 22.3% | 41 | 27 | .659 | 53rd | Good |  | 12 | 29 | 41.4% |
| Isolation | 8.2% | 15 | 9 | .600 | 65th | Very Good |  | 4 | 13 | 30.8% |
| Off-Screen | 6% | 11 | 5 | .455 | 88th | Excellent |  | 1 | 9 | 11.1% |

* **Man-to-Man (Very Good):** So, what do you mention first when you discuss Alexis Robinson defensively? Is it her speed, quickness, or athleticism? It could be the 63.6% she spent defending in man-to-man. Or maybe it’s the 1.075 PPP she relinquished as a defender in the zone. Robinson spent 63.6% defending in man-to-man. She gave up just .658 PPP and ranked in the 79th percentile. Very solid performance. She surrendered 40-points less than her 117 possessions. Players Alexis defended made 30 of 93 shots for just 32.3%.
* **Zone (Poor):** Zone is where Alexis struggled a bit. It was 36.4% of her defensive possessions and she ranked in the 12th percentile after giving up 72 points in 67 possessions. Players connected on 25 of 60 field goal attempts for 41.7%. Earlier, speed was mentioned as one of Robinson’s assets. But so often, she overruns a shooter defensively and takes herself out of position. If Robinson can learn to harness her speed without taking herself out of position, she easily becomes the lock down defender the Buffaloes are looking for, regardless of their defensive play call.
* **Spot-Up (Average):** Low-post players aren’t the only defenders capable of altering shots. Robinson has the close-out speed and athleticism to alter/rush shots on the perimeter. She defended spot-up shooters 56.5%, giving up .894 PPP. Alexis gave up 93 points in 104 possessions and ranked in the 33rd percentile. However, opponents were only able to connect on 31 of 91 shots against her for 34.1%, so speed does help.
* **P&R Ball-Handler (Good):** Robinson defended the ball-handler in pick-and-roll sets 22.3%. She gave up 27 points in 41 possessions and her .659 PPP ranked 53rd. Players she defended were able to make 12 of 29 field goal attempts for 41.4%.
* **Isolation (Very Good):** Opponents found it to be a daunting task to score on Robinson when she defends isolations. It was 8.2% of her defense and she ranked in the 65th percentile with .600 PPP. Alexis gave up 9 points in 15 possessions and allowed only 4 field goals in 13 attempts for 30.8%.
* **Off-Screens (Excellent):** Let’s face it, when Robinson wants to defend, she can be tough. Her speed, athleticism, and quickness should make her a tough player to screen here. At times her positioning gets her hung up on the screen, but she finds a way to recover. Her numbers don’t lie here. 5 points in 11 possessions, .455 PPP, and a ranking in the 88th percentile. Alexis would surrender only 1 made field goal in 9 attempts for 11.1%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b32a49e4b8b542164743663>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Annika Jank** | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **PPP** | **Rank** | **Rating** |  | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| Man-to-Man | 60.4% | 96 | 67 | .698 | 70th | Very Good |  | 24 | 72 | 33.3% |
| Zone | 39.6% | 63 | 69 | 1.095 | 11th | Poor |  | 25 | 55 | 45.5% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spot-Up | 59.7% | 95 | 89 | .937 | 25th | Below Avg |  | 30 | 79 | 38% |
| Post-Up | 17% | 27 | 21 | .778 | 55th | Good |  | 9 | 20 | 45% |

* **Man-to-Man (Very Good):** Last season, Annika Jank showed promise both offensively and defensively. She has a tremendous upside, but like any player, there are areas to improve. However, Jank was a solid man-to-man defender, giving up 67 points in 96 possessions. Her .698 PPP ranked in the 70th percentile. Players only made 24 field goals in 72 attempts for 33.3% vs Jank.
* **Zone (Poor):** This was not a favorable defense for Jank last season who spent 39.6% defending in a zone. She was scorched for 1.095 PPP which ranked in the 11th percentile. Her surrendering 69 points in 63 possessions was due to opponents converting 25 of 55 field goals attempts for 45.5%.
* **Spot-Up (Below Average):** She may have received a low rating here, but there are numbers that indicate Jank will defend spot-up shooting better as she gains more experience. Jank was no doubt tested guarding spot-up shooters, defending them 59.7%. She gave up 89 points in 95 possessions. That’s .937 PPP and a ranking in the 25th percentile. Had she not held opposing players to 30 of 79 from the field for 38%, her numbers would have ballooned.
* **Post-Up (Good):** Jank defended the post-up roughly 17%, giving up 21 points in 27 possessions. Her .778 PPP was 55th. Players made 9 of 20 shots for 45% against Jank, but as she grows in her physicality, it’ll be tougher to score on her inside the lane.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b334ba34b8b542164744af1>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mya Hollingshed** | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **PPP** | **Rank** | **Rating** |  | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| Man-to-Man | 65% | 80 | 59 | .738 | 58th | Good |  | 20 | 63 | 31.7% |
| Zone | 35% | 43 | 47 | 1.093 | 11th | Poor |  | 17 | 38 | 44.7% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spot-Up | 51.2% | 63 | 66 | 1.048 | 10th | Poor |  | 24 | 56 | 42.9% |
| Post-Up | 28.5% | 35 | 19 | .543 | 89th | Excellent |  | 8 | 29 | 27.6% |

* **Man-to-Man (Good):** Make no mistake, Mya Hollingshed is one of Colorado’s key players and her length and athleticism helps defensively. She defended 65% in man-to-man giving up 59 points in 80 possessions. Her .738 PPP ranked in the 58th percentile. Using her length, Mya only allowed 20 field goals in 63 attempts for 31.7%.
* **Zone (Poor):** Like Jank, Hollingshed struggled while defending in a zone, but she’s young and will defend better as she develops. Mya played zone 35% giving up 1.093 PPP. Opposing players scored 47 points in 43 possessions against her and those numbers ranked in the 11th percentile. Mya also allowed 17 field goals in 38 attempts for 44.7%.
* **Spot-Up (Poor):** Mya will need to get better defending on the perimeter or teams will continue to attack her. She defended spot-up shooters 51.2% and was charged with giving up 1.048 PPP, ranking in the 10th percentile. Players scored 66 points in 63 possessions against her and she allowed them to connect on 24 of 56 from the field for 42.9%.
* **Post-Up (Excellent):** Is there any question where Mya feels comfortable defending? She defended inside 28.5% and was incredibly effective, only giving up 19 points in 35 possessions. She would surrender just .543 PPP last season and ranked in the 89th percentile. Opposing players made only 8 of 29 shots inside against Mya for 27.6%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b33c0e94b8b542164748565>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quinessa Caylao-Do** | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **PPP** | **Rank** | **Rating** |  | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| Man-to-Man | 63.7% | 93 | 78 | .839 | 30th | Below Avg |  | 32 | 83 | 38.6% |
| Zone | 36.3% | 53 | 53 | 1.000 | 17th | Below Avg |  | 17 | 41 | 41.5% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spot-Up | 55.5% | 81 | 75 | .926 | 26th | Below Avg |  | 26 | 68 | 38.2% |
| P&R Ball-Handler | 28.1% | 41 | 35 | .854 | 18th | Below Avg |  | 14 | 33 | 42.4% |

* **Man-to-Man (Below Average):** If Colorado is to become a much better defensive team next season, it starts with Quinessa Caylao-Do. This was the Buffs Defensive MVP last season, so they can ill afford for her to receive Below Average ratings in any defensive category. She defended in man-to-man 63.7% and as a defender, she did show promise. At times, Caylao-Do is solid pressuring the ball from the point and just needs to work on her ability to recover quicker when she’s off-ball. Players scored 78 points in 93 possessions against her for .839 PPP. This ranked her in the 30th percentile. She allowed 32 made field goals in 83 attempts for 38.6%.
* **Zone (Below Average):** This was not exactly a favorable defensive play type for Caylao-Do. But with her quickness and athleticism, there’s no reason it can’t be. She defended in zone 36.3%, allowing 53 points in 53 possessions for 1-PPP. Caylao-Do is too athletic and too good of a defender to be ranked in the 17th percentile. Last season, she gave up 17 field goals in 41 attempts for 41.5% but look for her to improve in that area.
* **Spot-Up (Below Average):** Caylao-Do defended spot-up shooters 55.5%. Opposing players hit her for .926 PPP by scoring 75 points in 81 possessions. She ranked in the 26th percentile and gave up 26 field goals in 68 attempts for 38.2%. Better anticipation will allow her to rotate out quickly on open shooters as well as defend on the bounce.
* **P&R Ball-Handler (Below Average):** With her quickness and athleticism, Caylao-Do should be foaming at the mouth when she defends the ball-handler in pick-and-roll sets. She has guarded this play type 28.1% and has shown the ability to get up and pressure the ball, making it difficult for opposing guards to advance the ball. This kid can guard the bounce, but it’s when she’s tentative that hurts her team defensively. Caylao-Do gave up .854 PPP and allowed 35 points in 41 possessions last season. Too good of a defender to be ranked in the 18th percentile. Players converted 14 of 33 shots for 42.4% against her. She has the ability to control the game on the defensive end by containing the ball and not many players can say that. This is where her team needs her the most.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b33e45e4b8b542164748ab1>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Aubrey Knight** | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **PPP** | **Rank** | **Rating** |  | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| Man-to-Man | 67.6% | 73 | 57 | .781 | 46th | Average |  | 20 | 60 | 33.3% |
| Zone | 32.4% | 35 | 25 | .714 | 64th | Good |  | 10 | 33 | 30.3% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spot-Up | 54.6% | 59 | 47 | .797 | 54th | Good |  | 18 | 55 | 32.7% |
| P&R Ball-Handler | 18.5% | 20 | 11 | .550 | 74th | Very Good |  | 4 | 18 | 22.2% |
| Off-Screen | 11.1% | 12 | 11 | .917 | 32nd | Average |  | 3 | 10 | 30% |

* **Man-to-Man (Average):** Aubrey Knight showed tremendous promise last season as a Freshman. She defended in man-to-man 67.6% and yielded .781 PPP to rank in the 46th percentile. Knight would surrender 57 points in 73 possessions and allow opposing players to make 20 field goals in 60 attempts for 33.3%.
* **Zone (Good):** While most players usually struggle switching from man to zone, Knight’s numbers in zone were slightly better. She defended in a zone 32.4%, giving up 25 points in 35 possessions for .714 PPP. Knight ranked in the 64th percentile and players could only manage converting 10 of 33 shots for 30.3% against her.
* **Spot-Up (Good):** While most players in general struggle defending spot-up shooters, Knight was solid. She allowed .797 PPP with players scoring 47 points in 59 possessions. Those numbers aren’t bad for any player, let alone a Freshman. Knight ranked 54th and only gave up 18 field goals in 55 attempts for 32.7%.
* **P&R Ball-Handler (Very Good):** Just what every coach wants, someone with the ability to defend the ball-handler in the pick-and-roll. The numbers in Synergy indicate Knight has the mettle to do just that. She defended the ball-handler in the pick-and-roll 18.5%, relinquishing only .550 PPP. That’s 11 points in 20 possessions, which ranked her in the 74th percentile. Knight held players to just 4 of 18 from the floor for 22.2%.

* **Off-Screen (Average):** Here, Knight gave up .917 PPP, but she still produced solid numbers that will only get better with more reps. She ranked in the 32nd percentile, giving up 11 points in 12 possessions. Even better, Knight would give up only 3 field goals in 10 attempts for 30%.

<https://www.synergysportstech.com/EditorPlugin/?inviteId=5b33f8504b8b5421647490ce>

This report focused on Colorado’s six key players going into the 2018-19 basketball season. If the Buffaloes are to make the surge discussed earlier, those players not only will need to develop offensively and defensively, but the team will also need to improve upon their ratings in the following offensive and defensive play types.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Colorado Offense** | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **PPP** | **Rank** | **Rating** |  | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| B.L.O.B. | 9.6% | 205 | 130 | .634 | 13th | Poor |  | 55 | 158 | 34.8% |
| After a Time Out | 13.1% | 278 | 187 | .673 | 21st | Below Avg |  | 75 | 206 | 36.4% |
| Press | 7.4% | 158 | 99 | .627 | 29th | Below Avg |  | 34 | 107 | 31.8% |
| Isolation | 3.6% | 95 | 59 | .621 | 24th | Below Avg |  | 24 | 72 | 33.3% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Colorado Defense** | **% Time** | **Poss** | **Points** | **PPP** | **Rank** | **Rating** |  | **FGM** | **FGA** | **FG%** |
| Transition | 18% | 475 | 465 | .979 | 13th | Poor |  | 181 | 365 | 49.6% |
| B.L.O.B. | 9.3% | 202 | 176 | .871 | 8th | Poor |  | 70 | 159 | 44% |
| Spot-Up | 26.6% | 702 | 622 | .886 | 14th | Poor |  | 219 | 601 | 36.4% |
| P&R Ball-Handler | 9% | 236 | 178 | .754 | 16th | Below Avg |  | 60 | 169 | 35.5% |
| P&R Roll-Man | 2.3% | 61 | 57 | .934 | 30th | Below Avg |  | 25 | 52 | 48.1% |

Hopefully the Synergy numbers and video analysis not only displays the strengths and weaknesses for Colorado, but also lays out a potential game plan for them as well. Once again, Synergy numbers should be taken with a grain of salt. While the numbers are 85% to 90% accurate, it isn’t always beneficial to create a game plan on a whim if you don’t have the personnel to execute it.

However, there are always decisions and halftime adjustments to be made during a game. For example, a young Colorado team struggled to defend the pick-and-roll last season. Video breakdown showed the guards giving too much cushion as the screen was set. They also struggled to fight thru it, opting instead to go underneath and therefore giving up wide open looks on the perimeter. Suggested adjustments might be:

* Jump and trap the ball-handler early before the screen can be set
* Guard can push up and force the ball-handler away from the screen
* Post makes a hard show and keeps the ball-handler from turning the corner aggressively
* Post can hug the screener and allow the guard to go under before the ball-handler gets an open 3-point look
* Trap the ball-handler on the original screen and aggressively switch the rescreen

Those are just a few examples and every coach will have their own philosophy how they want to defend the P&R as well as the adjustments they’d like to make. Bottom line, this team belongs to Leonard and Robinson. They are the seniors and they are the leaders. The Buffaloes will clearly be a more experienced squad under Payne and Towns next season. But the team will go as far as Leonard and Robinson are willing to take them. It’s an opportunity to leave their legacy on a program looking to end a five-year NCAA Tournament drought.