

GEDNEY HILL GOLF CLUB

CONGU® ANNUAL REVIEW - COMPUTER ANALYSIS. HOME CLUB MALE MEMBERS

Period 01/01/2017 to 31/12/2017

Use of the Report

This report is designed to assist the Club's Handicap Committee when carrying out the Annual Review. It identifies players who potentially require a handicap adjustment.

Players listed in the Report should NOT receive an adjustment automatically. The full handicap record of a player should be examined before any decision is reached. Whether highlighted by the report or not the performance of all who have received a handicap in the review period players should be scrutinised.

It must be stressed that ONLY players who have returned 3 or more Qualifying scores in the period are included in the Report. Players who returned fewer scores may require adjustment based on performances (note more than one) in other forms of competition (Matchplay, four-ball, etc) or non-Qualifying competitions, considered by the Committee to be better than average for the player's handicap.

The statement "with other information" indicates that the player returned too few scores to give sufficient accuracy to the forecast. These players should be decreased only when other information supports the adjustment.

The general principles as set out in Appendix M of the UHS Handicap Manual should be followed when conducting the Review.

Important Notes:

It should be emphasised that the Report should not be used as a substitute for the Committee's judgement, and all players listed should be considered **carefully** with any other information available before any adjustment is made.

There may well be players, whom the Committee consider require adjustment, who have not been identified in this report. Just as a player identified for consideration should not be given an automatic adjustment, so a player not identified in the report is not precluded for consideration for adjustment.

The report is based on a computer model, supported by typical scoring patterns for each handicap. However the nature of the game, and how it is played, mean that assessments based on scoring patterns can never be 100% accurate.

The handicaps predicted by the model have a wider spread of uncertainty as the number of scores used in the individual assessment decreases.

The Report has been designed after considerable research, but it is considered that it may be improved in the light of experience from widespread application. If any Committee wishes to submit data to CONGU that they consider would be helpful, they should do so via their Handicapping Authority.

PLAYERS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR A HANDICAP REDUCTION

- The Players listed below have returned between 3 and 6 scores in the Review period and should be considered for handicap decrease. Normally, with such few scores, either the performance under Target should be significant (minus 5 or lower) or there should be other supporting evidence.

Player	Comps	Start Handicap	Final Handicap	No. Of NRs	Actual Median Net Diff	Target Median Net Diff	Performance Against Target		Action	Comment
Category : 3										
Mr Stefan Markillie	5	22.3	18.4	0	1.60	5.94	-4.34			Consider for decrease - with caution
Totals	1	5								
Category : 4										
Mr S Porter	3	28.0	26.9	0	4.10	7.95	-3.85			Consider for decrease - with caution
Totals	1	3								

PLAYERS TO BE CONSIDERED FOR A HANDICAP INCREASE

3. The Players listed below who have returned 3 or more Qualifying Scores should be considered for handicap increase.

Player	Comps	Start Handicap	Final Handicap	No. Of NRs	Actual Median Net Diff	Target Median Net Diff	Performance Against Target		Action	Comment
Category : 3										
Mr N Bird	3	16.0	16.2	0	9.80	5.41	4.39			Consider for increase - 1 shot suggested
Mr Nigel Bright	18	15.1	14.6	0	8.40	5.04	3.36			Consider for increase - 1 shot suggested
Mr G James	3	18.3	18.6	0	10.40	5.98	4.42			Consider for increase - 1 shot suggested
Mr C Johnson	17	17.9	13.2	0	8.80	4.70	4.10			Consider for increase - 1 shot suggested
Mr T Sewell	5	15.8	15.9	1	9.10	5.34	3.76			Consider for increase - 1 shot suggested
Totals	5	46								
Category : 4										
Mr C Augustus	3	24.4	24.7	0	13.30	7.43	5.87			Consider for increase - 2 shots suggested
Mr D Chamberlain	5	28.0	28.0	0	17.00	8.21	8.79			Consider for increase - 2 shots suggested
Mr C Claxton	12	26.6	25.3	0	10.70	7.57	3.13			Consider for increase - 1 shot suggested
Mr Stan Cleaver	11	28.0	28.0	1	21.00	8.21	12.79			Consider for increase - 2 shots suggested
Mr Pete Evans	8	24.4	26	2	17.00	7.74	9.26			Consider for increase - 2 shots suggested
Mr T Grantham	10	28.0	28.0	1	20.00	8.21	11.79			Consider for increase - 2 shots suggested
Mr L Kempster	8	23.1	21.8	0	13.70	6.74	6.96			Consider for increase - 2 shots suggested
Mr G Loos	12	26.5	28.0	2	15.00	8.21	6.79			Consider for increase - 2 shots suggested
Mr Gary Moore	3	28.0	28.0	0	15.00	8.21	6.79			Consider for increase - 2 shots suggested
Mr Tom Penning	29	19.6	21.7	0	10.30	6.72	3.58			Consider for increase - 1 shot suggested
Mr K Roberts	22	28.0	28.0	0	14.00	8.21	5.79			Consider for increase - 2 shots suggested
Mr David Spridgen	16	28.0	28.0	2	18.00	8.21	9.79			Consider for increase - 2 shots suggested
Mr Ron Walpole	5	28.0	28.0	2	21.00	8.21	12.79			Consider for increase - 2 shots suggested
Mr Paul Wood	15	28.0	28.0	2	12.00	8.21	3.79			Consider for increase - 1 shot suggested
Totals	14	159								