

## Performance Ranking Committee Report – 2016 Annual Meeting

### **1. 2017 Slate of Regattas**

Each year the committee looks at the entire schedule to ensure the regattas offer an adequate number of scored berths to the conference each weekend, equal opportunity to schools in various locations in the conference, and maximum head to head competition amongst member schools. After this year's discussion the committee recommends no changes to the slate, with the following notes:

- On weekend 3 our B-level event has several openings with the C-level way overprescribed. The committee encourages teams to consider the Ross Trophy if they are on the alternate list at the BC Central Series.
- On weekend 6, the Southern Series C-level has no host. It's preferred for this event to be hosted in the south to keep the spread of scored regattas across the conference. However, a central host would suffice. The event should remain one day.

*Proposal: Approve the 2017 slate of regattas as noted in the 2017 online schedule.*

### **2. Women's Performance Ranking System**

The committee recommends no change to the women's performance ranking system.

### **3. Coed Performance Ranking System**

#### Total number of scores kept

The committee had a long discussion about the total number of scores to be kept in the coed system, looking at two options: 4+NEISA Fall Championship (NFC) and 5+NFC. The committee was split in our decision with three votes for 4+NFC, two votes for 5+NFC, and one abstention.

Members in favor of continuing to score 5+NFC feel that the system has been working well and needs no change. 5+NFC is the 'right number' to accurately rank our teams. Once you start dropping scores you are getting less data points and therefore a less accurate ranking. Additionally, the number of scores that you keep ultimately will not change some team's approach to weekends off because you can always chase a higher score.

Members who would like to see the change to 4+NFC suggest that one less kept score will allow teams more flexibility when scheduling their season. If this had been in place for 2016, teams 1-9 would have mostly dropped scores they gained with non-starters and 10-18 would have dropped B and C level events. The overall ranking changes only slightly with one less score, with teams moving up or down one spot here and there (data attached on second page).

The committee also recognized that its membership only represents teams in the top-13 in NEISA so felt we needed a broader conversation amongst the conference. Therefore we suggest a 10-15 minute discussion during the meeting to come up with one of the two proposals. One of them must be approved prior to the scheduling meeting.

*Proposal #1: In the coed PRS, teams will keep five scores plus the NEISA Fall Championship.*

*Proposal #2: In the coed PRS, teams will keep four scores plus the NEISA Fall Championship.*

#### 4. ACC/ACT Score

The committee recommends no change with regards to the ACC/ACT score. While it has been brought to our attention that it's not perfect, the committee feels the way we score the event now is in NEISA's best interest.

#### 5. Singlehanded Nationals

The committee unanimously agrees the Singlehanded Nationals should not be counted in the performance ranking.

#### 6. Committee Chair/Membership

As of December 3, Mike Kalin will take over as Chairman of the Performance Ranking Committee. The committee's membership will go from six members to five to create an odd number scenario for voting and ease of scheduling committee meetings. Next year the committee will continue rotating members both in and out.

Respectfully Submitted,  
 Jeffrey Bresnehan, Connecticut College  
 Amanda Callahan, Roger Williams University  
 Mike Kalin, Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
 Frank Pizzo, Bowdoin College  
 Stan Schreyer, Boston University  
 Brian Swingly, US Coast Guard Academy (Chair)

2014 6 scores		2014 5 scores		2015 6 scores		2015 5 scores		2016 6 scores		2016 5 scores	
		Drop				Drop				Drop	
Yale	4.77	0.757	4.01	BC	4.61	0.71	3.9	Yale	4.79	0.76	4.03
Dart	4.386	0.663	3.72	Yale	4.57	0.7	3.87	Tufts	4.55	0.73	
BC	4.385	0.615	3.76	<i>Harvard</i>	<i>4.50</i>	<i>0.71</i>	<i>3.79</i>	Dart	4.51	0.71	3.8
Tufts	4.32	0.599	3.73	<i>CGA</i>	<i>4.27</i>	<i>0.43</i>	<i>3.84</i>	<i>BC</i>	<i>4.47</i>	<i>0.71</i>	<i>3.76</i>
<i>RW</i>	<i>4.31</i>	<i>0.639</i>	3.67	BU	4.1	0.59	3.51	<i>MIT</i>	<i>4.46</i>	<i>0.62</i>	<i>3.84</i>
<i>Harvard</i>	<i>3.78</i>	<i>0.513</i>	3.26	<i>Dart</i>	<i>3.99</i>	<i>0.69</i>	<i>3.3</i>	BOW	4.17	0.62	3.55
Brown	3.76	0.556	3.19	<i>MIT</i>	<i>3.89</i>	<i>0.53</i>	<i>3.36</i>	<i>BU</i>	<i>3.85</i>	<i>0.52</i>	<i>3.33</i>
MIT	3.73	0.521	3.2	RW	3.85	0.57	3.28	<i>CGA</i>	<i>3.83</i>	<i>0.48</i>	<i>3.4</i>
UVM	3.66	0.473	3.18	Brown	3.66	0.58	3.08	RW	3.6	0.47	3.13
CGA	3.48	0.473	3	BOW	3.5	0.5	3.06	Harvard	3.31	0.46	2.85
BU	3.34	0.418	2.92	Tufts	3.41	0.44	2.97	Brown	3.2	0.38	2.82
BOW	3.08	0.379	2.7	URI	2.86	0.37	2.49	URI	2.72	0.35	2.77
URI	2.94	0.426	2.51	Camels	2.8	0.46	2.34	Camels	2.67	0.37	2.3
Camels	2.42	0.362	2.05	UVM	2.52	0.26	2.16	UVM	2.31	0.31	2
NU	2.19	0.308	1.88	NU	2.36	0.32	2.04	NU	2.24	0.34	1.9