

# WGGC Annual Handicap Review Process

December 2011



**We are required under CONGU regulations to carry out an Annual Review to identify players whose general playing performance and scoring pattern over the year is better or inferior than expected and should have a handicap reduction or increase. (CONGU regulations 23.1 & Appendix M)**

As part of continuous improvement CONGU has introduced the Annual Review Report. This has been designed to assist Clubs in carrying out the Annual Review by providing a guideline that "flags up" players who, through the period, have performed better than (or worse than) expectations.

The Annual Review program is merely a tool to assist Handicap Committees to identify players who may be considered for handicap adjustment. It is not intended that it be used as a substitute for the knowledge of the Committee but should compliment it.

## **The Median Gross Differential (MGD) and the Target**

The program itself is based on a mathematical model that determines the "ideal handicap" for the statistically perfect golfer based on their Median Gross Differential (MGD). (The median is used as, where a player has No-Returns, it would be impossible to calculate an average). So a "Target" MGD is determined for each handicap.

"Target" MGD = MGD that applies to the statistically perfect golfer of a given handicap

The Actual MGD of the player's scores for the year is then found and this is related to their Finish Handicap for the season (which should represent their current paying ability). This Actual MGD is compared to the Target for that handicap.

## **Target - Actual = Difference = Performance Indicator of each player**

The statistical analysis suggests that if the Actual is more than 3 shots away from the Target then the player may be over (if Difference is -3 or lower) or under handicapped (+3 or higher). The analysis showed that a minimum of seven scores is required to establish that an MGD difference of 3 represents approximately one shot in handicap terms. The more scores above 7 the player has returned the more confidence can be placed on the Difference indicating the player should be considered for adjustment.

Clearly the nearer the Difference is to 3 the case for adjustment is not so clear-cut, and the same applies the fewer scores on the record. It should be emphasised that the process effectively examines the consistency of a player compared to how consistent a player of their handicap should be. A "wild" player who either scores well under their handicap (but not very often) but mainly well over it might be "flagged" for increase so the system should not allow a player who has a Finish Handicap lower than their handicap at the start of the period to be flagged. However a very steady player who doesn't play below their handicap very often but is near to it more often than they should be may well be flagged for a decrease even though they haven't returned a score that reduced their handicap.

Whatever the result of the analysis the final judgement should be that of the Committee. It cannot be over-stressed that the Annual Review Report should not be used to make automatic adjustments solely based on the print-out.

## **WGGC Annual Review Formula**

CONGU do not allow this software to be used by anyone other than an affiliated golf club and it also applies to your gross score at every event, so by discussing with other societies and using a bit of creative thinking I have come up with the WGGC Annual review formula for review by the committee.

It has been created using some reports from the mathematical modelling formula devised and used by CONGU. The actual formula will not be released and is protected by legal restrictions. The WGGC version is shown below;

# WGGC Annual Handicap Review Process

December 2011



- Stableford scores for all events are collated and put into ascending order.
- The '**Season Median Value**' is then calculated for each individual (Column S)
- The '**Actual Stableford Difference**' from Par (36 points) is then calculated for each individual (Column T)
- The general '**Category Target**' shots away from player's Handicap is identified (Column V)
  - ✓ Category 2 (Handicap 6 – 9) Shot Range 3
  - ✓ Category 2 (Handicap 10 – 12) Shot Range 4
  - ✓ Category 3 (Handicap 13 – 16) Shot Range 5
  - ✓ Category 3 (Handicap 17 – 20) Shot Range 6
  - ✓ Category 4 (Handicap 21 – 24) Shot Range 7
  - ✓ Category 4 (Handicap 25 – 28) Shot Range 8
- The calculation is then ran '**Difference between the Actual & Target**' (Column T less V)
- Then using the player categories identify if a golfer should be considered for a handicap review (Column X)
  - ✓ If the figure returned is **-3** or more a one shot reduction could be justified
  - ✓ If the figure returned is greater than **3** a one shot increase could be justified

*So a score of 4 (or -4) or more the golfer will be marked as **Red** or **Green**, and a score of 3 (or -3) he will be marked as **Amber***

- General play and competition wins should also be taken into account when performing the annual review

## WGGC 2012/13 Season Annual Review

See Excel document for full details...