# An Analysis of College Basketball Team Shot Selection

Max Brandt

# An Analysis of College Basketball Team Shot Selection

Max Brandt

**Abstract**

Statistical analysis in sports, particularly in basketball, is a complex and ever-evolving field with millions of data points available for analysis in leagues, teams, and player performances. Insights drawn from these data points can reveal player comparisons, team competitiveness, and the efficacy of different playing styles. One notable trend in both the NBA and college basketball is the increasing rate of three-point shot attempts by teams. This paper aims to assess the statistical validity of this strategy, recognizing its prevalence among various teams. While success has been observed in teams emphasizing three-point shooting, the study acknowledges that it is not the exclusive determinant of success. By examining success at the collegiate level, this research seeks to identify the optimal percentage of shots from three-point territory for teams, contributing to a deeper understanding of the strategic balance in modern basketball.

## Introduction

With each passing season, college basketball teams spend more and more on outside consultants, analytical reports, and scouting services. Every team, from the National Champion UCONN Huskies to the last-ranked LIU Brooklyn Sharks, is looking for an analytical edge; an ironclad statistic or algorithm to competitively assess their players or opponents. To make themselves indispensable, many scouting services try to bring something unique or new to the table. It may be an original metric to evaluate worth, such as Rolan Beech's "Rolan Rating" (Ballard, 2005), or it may be an impressive form of data visualization from industry leaders such as Synergy Sports and HD Intelligence. There is one thing, however, that is relatively consistent across basketball scouting and self-evaluating: a team's ability to shoot three-point shots, compared to its ability to shoot traditional two-point shots or shots at the rim (Cheng, 2020).

Coaches around the world have differing views about which scoring strategy is more effective. A "traditional" coach may say that games are won in the post near the basket: they would advise their players to advance as close to the rim as possible before shooting. However, many current coaches and executives — such as (former) Rockets' General Manager Daryl Morey — have made differing conclusions (Kubatko, 2007; Ballard, 2012) about the value of the three-point shot. In line with Morey's philosophy, many teams have experimented with using non-traditional height combinations to exploit inept defenders and add more shooting ability (Miguens Amaro, 2022). Research to date has shown that shooting more three-point shots than two-point shots in any given game leads to a higher probability of winning while, conversely, shooting more two-point shots positively correlates to a higher probability of losing (Gou, 2022). However, this blanket statement, widely accepted as fact in the world of basketball, does not account for other factors of the game, such as the offensive strengths of each team.

The choice may be obvious when you have highly skilled three-point shooters such as Steph Curry of the Golden State Warriors or Trae Young of the Atlanta Hawks on your team: *"Shoot the three!"* However, analytically speaking, this may not be the most strategic balance of shooting when you have a team full of average (or below average) three-point shooters. Many college basketball teams do not have the luxury of guards that can reliably shoot three-pointers. Although it has been concluded that the average team benefits from shooting more three-point shots than two-point shots (Gou, 2022), the below-average shooting team may not benefit from this strategy at all. While it may be exciting and alluring when strong shooting teams attempt more three-point shots, the below-average teams may benefit most from shooting closer shots. Many teams can maximize their offensive potential by only taking shots that they make with a high degree of success and confidence. Sometimes this may mean avoiding the three-point shot altogether. Thus, there is a small number of college basketball teams that have not adopted the modern strategy of an increased three-point shooting volume (Ryan, 2012). These few outliers may be sticking to a traditional distribution of shot types, not because of their deficiencies in three-point shooting but their prowess in mid-range two-point jump shots or shots at the rim.

To approach the subject philosophically, Herrnstein's Law of Matching may be conceptually applicable to a basketball team's shot selections. The theory generally states that people primarily want to do things for which they have had past success and stay away from things for which they have failed (Bourret & Vollmer, NA). This could explain shooting tendencies such as players' preferences for shooting three-pointers or their unwillingness to drive to the rim. Many teams throughout the various conferences of Division I basketball show an unwillingness to stray from the strategy of attempting more three-pointers than two-pointers.

While some teams are well-served by this strategy, many are not. This study will determine which players (and teams) attempt the most analytically strategic balance of shots.

## Literary Review

The paradigm of efficient offense in today's college basketball is based on shooting three-pointers whenever the opportunity presents itself. The accepted principle of the model is that the heightened risk of taking a shot from further away (behind the three-point arc) for an extra point (three as opposed to two) is more efficient than taking a closer shot (within the three-point arc) for two points (Ballard, 2005). When the three-point shot was introduced in the NBA in 1979, teams took 2.8% of their shots from three-point territory. As of last season, that rate had increased over 1200% to roughly 35.5% (Zajac, 2023).

Division I college basketball, ahead of the curve in this regard, surpassed the glaring NBA percentage years ago, with over 38.6% of shots in the 2019-2020 season being three-point attempts (Collinsworth, 2021). From statistics like this, data analysts can form conclusions to help make informed coaching and personnel decisions. Data-driven minds in the world of basketball have been leveraging such statistics and metrics for years, fine-tuning their analysis to improve player and team performance. A common way teams and consultants have approached their scouting efforts is with all-encompassing metrics of efficiency called offensive and defensive ratings (Collinsworth, 2021).

Offensive and Defensive Rating Formulas

$$Offensive\ Rating = (Pts/Pos) \times 100$$

$$Defensive\ Rating = (OppPts/OppPos) \times 100$$

*Pts = Points Scored*

*Pos = Number of Possessions*

*OppPts = Number of Opponents' Points Scored*

*OppPos = Number of Opponent's Possessions*

This rating system is essentially a more mathematically sound way to view a player's or team's points per possession. These two statistics are often included as variables in other metrics. Many basketball coaches and executives have made proper use of this data by applying applicable metrics to their players and teams, as well as upcoming opponents.

There may be no NBA executive who has embraced analytics more than current Philadelphia 76ers General Manager Daryl Morey. MIT graduate-turned NBA innovator, Morey is a pioneer in the industry of using big data in basketball analytics, with a philosophy even named after him: "Moreyology" (Ballard, 2012). Morey was named General Manager of the Houston Rockets in 2007 and wasted no time integrating advanced analytics into the NBA, creating original metrics to evaluate players and their roles on a team. His statistic-informed decision-making process was referred to across the league as "Moreyball" and became a standard for opposing teams to follow (Ballard, 2012).

One of Morey's favorite metrics, Efficient Field Goal Percentage (eFG%), will be used throughout this paper to compare players and position efficiency across Division I basketball teams. Like Roland Beech's 'Roland Rating,' (Ballard, 2005), eFG% is a metric aimed at quantifying a player's shooting ability, adjusting for the increased difficulty of a three-point shot compared to a traditional two-point shot.

eFG% Formula

*eFG% = (FGM + (0.5(3PTM))) / FGA*

*FGM = Field Goals Made*

*3PTM = Three Point Baskets Made*

*FGA = Field Goal Attempts (2pt and 3pt Attempts)*

The eFG% formula assigns additional value to each three-point shot a player makes, as an average player is more likely to make a two-point shot than a three-point shot. A player's eFG%, rather than their standard field goal percentage, gives a more accurate representation of scoring ability.

In contrast to Morey's adherence to his metrics' findings, many coaches prefer to "trust their gut" and make coaching decisions purely based on intuition rather than data-driven analytics (Roberts, 2020). Although "gut instinct" may feel random or chance, it can likely be explained by Herrnstein's Matching Law.  This law is simple yet multi-faceted. Its premise is that if someone is presented with concurrently available options, their choice will be a direct representation of their relative rate of reinforcement (Bourret, 2003).

Matching Law Formula

$$\frac{R1}{R1+R2}=\frac{r1}{r1+r2}$$

*R1& R2 = Rates of Two Response Options*

*r1 & r2 = Rates of Reinforcement for each Response Option*

Applying the Matching Law to basketball, a player has an opportunity to take a mid-range shot or a three-point shot. If he makes the mid-range shot, he will be rewarded with two points. However, shooting from beyond the arc nets him three points. The first option of points scored (two) divided by the second option of points scored (three) posits that shooting a three-point shot offers 50% more positive reinforcement than a two-point shot. Regardless of the rate of making each shot attempt (shooting percentage), there is 50% more “reinforcement” in making a three-point shot than a two-point shot. The same is true for coaches calling plays resulting in three-point baskets (Bourret, 2003). Other factors can contribute to shot selection, such as the opportunity to be fouled, the value of a shot at the rim, and more. This paper will further examine these factors and their relation to the Matching Law in college basketball shot selection.

## Methods

### Sources

To build a metric that determines a team’s most analytically strategic balance of shots (rim shots, two-point jump shots, and three-point shots), while accurately reflecting the current state of Division I men’s basketball, this study will use data from the most recent season of play, 2022-2023. Using several data points from Sports Reference, relevant statistics will be examined and used in conjunction to create an equation to determine the optimal offensive strategy based on a team's shooting ability. Several statistics and preexisting data points will be used in creating an entirely new metric that will assign a score to each player and team.

**Measures**

There is virtually an endless number of statistics a coach or statistician can use to examine a team or player. There are statistics as basic as a player's average points per game to more complicated data points such as offensive ratings, value over replacement player, usage rate, true shooting percentage, and many more. As the purpose of this study is to ultimately determine how a team can be more efficient with their shot selection and personnel choices, it is a clear choice to center our metric around each player's eFG% (Efficient Field Goal Percentage). If it can be determined who a team's most successful scorers are, they can be deemed the team's best offensive options.

As simple as it would be to find the correlation between players' eFG% and their shooting tendencies, several key statistics would be unfactored in determining the optimal balance of shot selection.  One of such unfactored statistics is a player's usage rate. A player's usage rate is the percentage of his team's field goal attempts taken by him while he is on the court (Barner, 2022). It is imperative to include a usage rate to adjust for players with varying volumes of shot attempts. Usage rate does not factor in success or efficiency; it is simply a measure of how often a player shoots the ball.

Adding a player's usage rate may solve the issue of volume and opportunity but does not solve other issues such as the strength of competition. A player should not be credited the same for scoring twenty points against the top-ranked UCONN Huskies and the lowly-ranked LIU Brooklyn Sharks. Statistics in basketball, and many other sports, need to be adjusted for how a player performs against varying levels of competition. There is a need to quantify a player's value compared to his average opponent.

Although it may seem impossible to quantify how a player compares to an average Division I basketball player (average replacement player), statistician and engineer Bart Torvik may have found a solution (Torvik, 2019). Torvik's PORPAGATU (Points Over Replacement Per Adjusted Game At That Usage) is a metric compiled from several statistics that are adjusted for usage, strength of competition, and college basketball player averages. The purpose of PORPAGATU is to quantify how many more points per game a player adds to their team than an average replacement player (Torvik, 2019). For example, imagine a player had a PORPAGATU score of 2.9. This would suggest that if his team were to replace this player with the average Division I basketball player, they would score 2.9 *fewer* points per game. Inversely, if a player has a PORPAGATU score of -1, an average replacement player would help his team score one *more* point per game.

PORPAGATU Formula

*PORPAGATU = (ADJOE + (104.9 – AVG_EFF) - (AVG_ORATING)) * MIN_PER * 69.4 / 500*

*ADJOE = Adjusted Offensive Efficiency*

*AVG_EFF = Average Efficiency*

*MIN_PER = Minutes Per Game*

*AVG_ORATING = Average Offensive Rating*

To quantify how many points a team scores per game, Torvik utilizes the national average adjusted offensive efficiency. Offensive efficiency is typically calculated by finding the average number of points a team scores per 100 possessions. However, as Torvik adapts his statistics to the trends of the modern game, he adjusts the metric to the average number of possessions per game rather than an arbitrary number such as 100.

The next statistic is the backbone of the PORPAGATU formula: a player's average efficiency score. A player's efficiency score is a broad statistic that summarizes a player's single-game performance (Yvette, 2021).

Efficiency Score Formula

*Efficiency = Points Scored + Total Rebounds + Assists + Steals + Blocks – Missed Field Goal Attempts – Missed Free Throws – Turnovers*

Torvik utilizes a player's average game's efficiency score, rather than their season's efficiency score, to account for the fact that not all teams play the same number of games and that some players miss games for injuries or suspensions. A player's average efficiency is subtracted from 104.9 simply to make the value lower; the number is arbitrarily chosen.

The next statistic in the PORPAGATU formula is Torvik's adjusted offensive rating. Torvik's adjusted offensive rating is a simple calculation to quantify the number of points a player contributes to a game (Fromal, 2012).

Torvik's Adjusted Offensive Rating Formula

*Torvik's Adjusted Offensive Rating = 100*PP/(FGA+0.44*FTA+TO)*

*PP = Points Produced*

*FGA = Field Goal*

*FTA = Free Throw Attempts*

Points Produced can be calculated by adding the points the player scores, the points scored as a result of the player's assists, and the points scored on an extra possession created by the player's offensive rebounds (Fromal, 2012).

The next statistic factored into PORPAGATU is a player's minute percentage.  This simple statistic measures what percentage of a team's total minutes each player is in the game. The inclusion of this statistic is to account for the volume of play.

These data points are then all multiplied by 69.4 to account for tempo. Tempo is a quantification of the amount of possessions per game (Torvik, 2019).  Torvik predetermines a value for tempo (69.4), rather than adjusting it as the season goes on, as this is an extremely volatile statistic that changes drastically from week to week.  Changing the tempo variable after each week's games would cause variations in PORPAGATU scores that are out of the player's control.

The final step in determining a player's PORPAGATU is to divide everything by 500. Some factors in this metric are in percentage form, while others are arbitrarily multiplied by 100 for ease of application.  Dividing the equation by 500 makes the total PORPAGTU score more representative of the desired effect; determining how many points per game a player adds to a team over the average Division I replacement player (Torvik, 2019).

**Procedure and Data Analysis**

Using the three previously mentioned metrics, this study forms an entirely new metric called a B-Score.  A B-Score is a quantifiable summation of a player's average performance, prorated over a college basketball season, and adjusted for the current trends and pace of Division I Men's Basketball. The first step in calculating a B-Score is finding the average of a player's efficient field goal percentage and usage rate. That number is then divided by ten to add value to the player's PORPAGATU. The final step in finding a B-Score is multiplying the preceding number by his PORPAGATU.

B-Score Formula

*B-Score = (((FGM + (0.5(3PTM))) / FGA) + (FGA/ATFGA))/20) * ((ADJOE + (104.9 – AVG_EFF) - (AVG_ORATING)) * MIN_PER * 69.4 / 500)*

*FGM = Field Goals Made*

*3PTM = Three Point Baskets Made*

*FGA = Field Goal Attempts (2pt and 3pt Attempts)*

*TFGAWOC = Team Field Goal Attempts While On the Court*

*ADJOE = Adjusted Offensive Efficiency*

*AVG_EFF = Average Efficiency*

*MIN_PER = Minutes Per Game*

*AVG_ORATING = Average Offensive Rating*

*Simplified B-Score = (eFG%+USG_RATE)/20) * PORPAGATU*

*eFG = Efficient Field Goal Percentage*

*USG_RATE = Usage Rate*

*PORPAGATU = Points Over Replacement Per Adjusted Game At That Usage*

After obtaining a B-Score for all Division I Men's Basketball players, it can be studied how the players with the highest scores are accumulating their points; whether shots at the rim, two-point jump shots, or three-point jump shots.

The B-Score metric was applied to every player who recorded a statistic in a Division I basketball game in the 2022-23 season. Players who appeared in a game but did not record any standard statistics (shot attempts, rebounds, steals, assists, turnovers, etc.) were not included in the study. Of the 5,047 qualifying players examined, 3,417 had a positive B-Score. The highest B-Scores belonged to household names such as Purdue's National Player of the Year Zach Edey, and Indiana standout Trayce Jackson-Davis. However, some of the highest B-Scores belonged to players that many casual basketball fans may have never heard of, such as tenth-ranked Taevion Kinsley from Marshall or eleventh-ranked Xavier Castaneda from Akron.

Now that a metric has been created to distinguish efficient, valuable players from their lesser counterparts, it can be examined which players are most valuable to a team's scoring efforts. Firstly, a correlation was run to determine what types of shot players with the highest B-Scores took the most. It was determined that there is a 0.317 correlation between three-point shooting percentages and B-Scores. A 0.229 correlation was found between two-point jump shots and B-Scores. A 0.228 correlation was found between shots at the rim and B-Scores. This suggests a (small) positive correlation between shooting at the rim and from two-point territory and B-Scores. Most notably, the correlation of B-Scores to rim shots and two-point jump shots is almost exactly the same. Given this finding, it can be inferred that they are equally valuable shots. A shot at the rim is closer than a two-point jump shot, but layups and dunks are often heavily contested, while a two-point jump shot is usually the result of an unguarded man or the separation an offensive player creates from his defender.

The success rate from each shot type is certainly important, but it doesn't adjust for volume. A player who takes 90% of his shots from three-point territory would be evaluated the same as a player who takes 5% of his shots from three-point territory if their rate of success was the same. Rather than finding the correlation between the number of shots from each shooting territory (rim shots, two-point jump shots, and three-point jump shots) and B-Scores, it would be more useful to examine what percentage of a player's shots come from each territory. For example, if a player attempted one shot at the rim, three jump shots from two-point territory, and six shots from beyond the three-point arc, their percentage of shots at the rim would be 10%, their percentage of shots from the midrange would be 30%, and their percentage of shots from three-point territory would be 60%. In other words, this study is tracking *the percentage of shots* from each shooting territory, rather than *the number of shots.* With this analysis, a player's shot distribution is weighted equally, regardless of whether he is a high-volume or low-volume shooter. This is a necessary adjustment to account for productive players who may not be getting enough playing time or have missed games because of injuries.

The correlation between the percentage of shots a player takes from three-point territory and their B-Scores is -0.07, which would suggest a strong negative correlation. This affirms that players who attempt the highest percent of their shots from beyond the arc have lower B-Scores. The inverse is true; players who attempt fewer shots from three-point territory have higher B-Scores. There is a 0.057 correlation between shooting more midrange jump shots and having higher B-Scores, suggesting a strong positive correlation. Similarly, there is a 0.045 correlation between shooting more shots at the rim and having higher B-Scores, suggesting a moderate to strong positive correlation.

These findings suggest that teams and their players should focus more on taking shots at the rim and from the midrange than the currently accepted strategy of taking as many three-point attempts as possible. This study does not suggest that teams should stop shooting three-point shots entirely and attempt only two-point shots, but rather that a higher percentage of each player's shots should be from within the three-point arc.

Last year, the average Division I college basketball player took 37% of their shots from beyond the arc, 24.62% of their shots from the midrange, and 38.38% of their shots at the rim. This research suggests that to truly maximize scoring abilities, the percentage of shots that are three-pointers needs to be lower, while the percentage of field goal attempts that are two-point jump shots and rim shots needs to be higher. To find an ideal distribution of shot types, the 100 players with the highest B-Scores were analyzed; the findings were consistent with this study's hypotheses. The percentage of the top 100 players' shots from beyond the arc was 29.76%, roughly 7% lower than that of the average player. The percentage of the top 100 players' shots that were two-point jump shots was 28.74%, about 4% higher than that of the average player. The percentage of the top 100 players' shots at the rim was 41.53%, roughly 3% higher than the average player. Examining the 100 players with the lowest B-Scores in Division I basketball revealed the same findings. Players with the lowest B-Scores take more three-point jump shots and fewer two-point attempts than the average player. These findings all suggest that the average Division I basketball player takes too many three-point attempts and not enough two-point jump shots and rim shots.

**Results**

For the purpose of this study an original metric, B-Score, was created to determine any college basketball player's statistical value. Data for this study was provided by Sports Reference. B-Scores can be compared and cross-referenced to objectively rank every college basketball player. Every player who recorded a statistic (points, rebound, assist, block, steal, foul, etc.) in the 2022-2023 season was included in this study. Even if a player checked into a game for 30 seconds to intentionally commit a foul, or a walk-on player getting to play in the dying moments of a game-if a player recorded a statistic, he is included in this study. Thus, the few players who played in a game but did not record any statistics were not included in this study.

The B-Score formula was calculated for the 5,047 qualifying players. 3,417 players had a positive B-Score and the average grade was 3.13. The highest B-Score, 33.52, belonged to National Player of the Year Zach Edey. The lowest B-Score, -7.48, belonged to Georgia Southern's Cam Shelton. The list was headlined by players from teams that went far into the NCAA tournament, as well as high NBA draft picks. However, the metric did place some players from lesser-known conferences and teams in elite company. For example, players from the University of Detroit, University of Chattanooga, Loyola Marymount University, Liberty University, and Marshall University were included in the top ten scores.

After objectively ranking each college basketball player, a study of each player's shot selection can be used to determine how successful players score, and how unsuccessful players do not. Correlations were run between players' B-Scores and three statistical representations of their shot selection: the percentage of their attempts at the rim, the percentage of their attempts that were two-point jump shots, and the percentage of their attempts that were three-point shots. There is a 0.045 correlation between B-Scores and shooting more shots at the rim: a strong correlation. There is a 0.057 correlation between B-Scores and shooting more two-point shots: another strong correlation. In contrast, there is a -0.07 correlation between B-Scores and shooting more three-point shots: a very strong negative correlation. These findings suggest that most college basketball players would be better fit taking fewer three-point attempts and more attempts both at the rim and two-point jump shots.

To find the exact percentage of each shot type (rim shots, two-point jump shots, three-point shots) ideal for effective play, the top 100 players, ranked by B-Scores, were studied in comparison to the average player. These findings suggest the top 100 players take 7% fewer three-point shots, 4% more two-point jump shots, and 3% more shots at the rim than the average player.

**Discussion and Implications**

The results of this study are consistent with the hypothesis: most players take too many three-point attempts and not enough two-point jump shots and shots at the rim. Teams would be better served fielding a lineup that will shoot the statistically proven shot distribution of 29.76% of shots from three-point territory, 28.74% of shots from the midrange, and 41.53% of shots at the rim. These findings are not to suggest that coaches should only use players that can achieve this ratio of individual shooting. However, these findings do suggest that teams should utilize a combination of players likely to achieve this balance of shot attempts. For example, if a team's point guard and shooting guard tend to take exclusively three-point jump shots, the coach will need to field three other players capable of getting to the rim and attempting two-point jump shots. If a team likes to play small and does not start a true center that can post up for layups and hook-shots, they will need to play guards that can get downhill and attack the rim.

These findings are not consistent with other research to date. Previous studies have indicated that the more a team shoots three-point shots, the more likely they are to win a given game. Although the calculations of these studies are correct, they do not account for several key factors that must be included in such a study, such as a team's total shots per game. If a team takes more shots than their opponent, they will also take more three-point attempts. Their success, then, is not correlative to taking more three-point attempts; it is simply correlative to taking more overall shots. As previous studies determine the relationship between total three-point attempts and winning games, there are no factors to account for the percentage of shots from beyond and within the arc or at the rim. The design of this study addresses that issue.

## Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to determine the most ideal balance of shot selection for a Division I college basketball team. To do so, an original metric was created to assess basketball players using several performance-indicating factors. Once a metric was formed to rank and evaluate players, correlations were run to determine the most efficient distribution of shot types (shots at the rim, two-point jump shots, and three-point attempts). The currently accepted strategy amongst many college basketball teams is to attempt as many three-point shots as possible. *This study revealed that the average college basketball player takes about 7% too many three-point attempts, 4% too few two-point jump shots, and 3% too few shots at the rim*. These findings provide a framework for coaches to utilize their most efficient lineup by identifying ideal scoring options and player combinations.

# Appendix

## Appendix A – Top B-Scores

| Rank | Player | Team | Conference | Pos. | B-Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Zach Edey | Purdue | B10 | C | 33.53 |
| 2 | Trayce Jackson-Davis | Indiana | B10 | C | 28.45 |
| 3 | Jalen Pickett | Penn St. | B10 | Scoring PG | 27.69 |
| 4 | Drew Timme | Gonzaga | WCC | PF/C | 27.03 |
| 5 | Antoine Davis | Detroit | Horz | Scoring PG | 26.57 |
| 6 | Ryan Kalkbrenner | Creighton | BE | C | 25.79 |
| 7 | Jake Stephens | Chattanooga | SC | PF/C | 25.71 |
| 8 | Cam Shelton | Loyola Marymount | WCC | Scoring PG | 24.21 |
| 9 | Darius McGhee | Liberty | ASun | Combo G | 23.84 |
| 10 | Taevion Kinsey | Marshall | SB | Scoring PG | 23.34 |
| 11 | Xavier Castaneda | Akron | MAC | Combo G | 23.21 |
| 12 | Steven Ashworth | Utah St. | MWC | Scoring PG | 23.02 |
| 13 | Kris Murray | Iowa | B10 | Stretch 4 | 22.66 |
| 14 | Oscar Tshiebwe | Kentucky | SEC | C | 22.60 |
| 15 | Brandin Podziemski | Santa Clara | WCC | Wing G | 22.59 |
| 16 | Tylor Perry | North Texas | CUSA | Combo G | 22.38 |
| 17 | Azuolas Tubelis | Arizona | P12 | PF/C | 22.25 |
| 18 | Josh Cohen | St. Francis PA | NEC | C | 21.77 |
| 19 | Kobe Brown | Missouri | SEC | Wing F | 21.61 |
| 20 | Hunter Dickinson | Michigan | B10 | PF/C | 21.59 |
| 21 | Adama Sanogo | Connecticut | BE | PF/C | 21.55 |
| 22 | Max Abmas | Oral Roberts | Sum | Combo G | 21.50 |
| 23 | Max Fiedler | Rice | CUSA | C | 21.36 |
| 24 | Kendric Davis | Memphis | Amer | Scoring PG | 21.18 |
| 25 | Isaiah Stevens | Colorado St. | MWC | Pure PG | 21.16 |
| 26 | Jordan Miller | Miami FL | ACC | Wing G | 21.16 |
| 27 | Isaac Jones | Idaho | BSky | PF/C | 21.09 |
| 28 | Jordan Dingle | Penn | Ivy | Combo G | 20.98 |
| 29 | Jordan Walker | UAB | CUSA | Scoring PG | 20.81 |
| 30 | RayJ Dennis | Toledo | MAC | Scoring PG | 20.62 |
| 31 | Adam Flagler | Baylor | B12 | Scoring PG | 20.43 |
| 32 | DaRon Holmes II | Dayton | A10 | C | 20.36 |
| 33 | Marcus Sasser | Houston | Amer | Scoring PG | 20.31 |
| 34 | Cameron Parker | Portland St. | BSky | Pure PG | 20.25 |
| 35 | Tyree Appleby | Wake Forest | ACC | Pure PG | 20.24 |
| 36 | JT Shumate | Toledo | MAC | Stretch 4 | 19.99 |
| 37 | Markquis Nowell | Kansas St. | B12 | Pure PG | 19.84 |
| 38 | DeAndre Williams | Memphis | Amer | PF/C | 19.55 |
| 39 | Brandon Miller | Alabama | SEC | Stretch 4 | 19.32 |
| 40 | KJ Williams | LSU | SEC | Stretch 4 | 19.07 |
| 41 | Eric Dixon | Villanova | BE | Stretch 4 | 19.03 |
| 42 | Jaime Jaquez Jr. | UCLA | P12 | Wing F | 18.90 |
| 43 | Ajay Mitchell | UC Santa Barbara | BW | Scoring PG | 18.84 |
| 44 | Isaiah Moore | South Alabama | SB | Scoring PG | 18.80 |
| 45 | Boogie Ellis | USC | P12 | Scoring PG | 18.52 |

**References**

Ballard, C. (2005). MEASURE Of Success. Sports Illustrated, 103(16), 60.

Ballard, C. (2012). MONEYBALLSY. Sports Illustrated, 117(22), 50–59.

Barner, M. (2022, November 4). *Fantasy Basketball: Player Usage Ratings To Watch*. NBA.com; NBA Media Ventures, LLC. https://www.nba.com/news/fantasy-basketball-player-usage-ratings-to-watch

Cheng, C. (2020, October 27). *Scouting NBA Three-Point Shooting*. The Harvard Sports Analysis Collective. https://harvardsportsanalysis.org/2020/10/scouting-nba-three-point-shooting/

Collinsworth, R. (2021, September 23). *Why College Basketball's Rising 3-Point Rate Has Actually Created Value in the Under | The Action Network*. Action Network. https://www.actionnetwork.com/ncaab/college-basketball-betting-trends-3-point-rate-over-under

Fromal, A. (2012, January 26). *Understanding the NBA: Explaining Advanced Offensive Stats and Metrics*. Bleacher Report; Bleacher Report, Inc. https://bleacherreport.com/articles/1039116-understanding-the-nba-explaining-advanced-offensive-stats-and-metrics#:~:text=Offensive%20Rating%20(ORtg)&text=Offensive%20rating%20is%20just%20the

Gou, H., & Zhang, H. (2022). Better Offensive Strategy in Basketball: A Two-Point or a Three-Point Shot? Journal of Human Kinetics, 83(1), 287–295.

Horning, C. (2020, October 15). *VORP may settle debate between Michael, LeBron*. The Daily Item. https://www.dailyitem.com/sports/vorp-may-settle-debate-between-michael-lebron/article_bad6b808-a422-5c3f-90d4-935adfc26ae5.html

Kubatko, J., Oliver, D., Pelton, K. & Rosenbaum, D. (2007). A Starting Point for Analyzing Basketball Statistics. Journal of Quantitative Analysis in Sports, 3(3). https://doi.org/10.2202/1559-0410.1070

MIGUENS AMARO, C., BRANQUINHO GOMES, B., MENDES, R., & CASTRO, M. A. (2022). Effect of different height and distance oppositions on basketball shooting precision. Journal of Physical Education & Sport, 22(5), 1271–1276.

Roberts, A. H., Greenwood, D., Stanley, M., Humberstone, C., Iredale, F., & Raynor, A. (2020). Understanding the “gut instinct” of expert coaches during talent identification. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *39*(4), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2020.1823083

Ryan, T. P. (2003). Basketball Statistics: A Matter of Adjustment. *CHANCE*, *16*(1), 14–17. Taylor & Francis Online. https://doi.org/10.1080/09332480.2003.10554832

Sports Reference. (2019). *Glossary | Basketball-Reference.com*. Basketball-Reference.com; Sports Reference LLC. https://www.basketball-reference.com/about/glossary.html

Sports Reference. (2023). *2022-23 Men’s College Basketball Leaders*. College Basketball at Sports-Reference.com. https://www.sports-reference.com/cbb/seasons/men/2023-leaders.html

Torvik, B. (2019, May 7). New stat: PORPAGATU! *Barttorvik.com*. https://barttorvik.com/porpagatu.html

Torvik, B. (2023). *T-Rank Player Stats - Customizable College Basketball Tempo Free Stats - T-Rank*. Barttorvik.com. https://barttorvik.com/playerstat.php?link=y&sIndex=8&year=2024&start=20231101&end=20240501

Vollmer, Timothy R, and Jason Bourret. Cambridge Center for Behavioral Studies, BASKETBALL AND THE MATCHING LAW.

Yvette. (2021, April 19). *Beginner's Guide on How to Calculate Player Efficiency Rating | Watts Basketball*. Wattsbasketball.com; Watts Basketball. https://wattsbasketball.com/blog/how-to-calculate-player-efficiency-rating

Zając, T., Mikołajec, K., Chmura, P., Konefał, M., Krzysztofik, M., & Makar, P. (2023). Long-Term Trends in Shooting Performance in the NBA: An Analysis of Two- and Three-Point Shooting across 40 Consecutive Seasons. International journal of environmental research and public health, 20(3), 1924. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20031924