

2024 NEISA Performance Rank report for Winter Meeting – December 3, 2024

Committee Members:

- Mike Kalin (Chair, MIT)
- Jeff Bresnahan (Connecticut College)
- Amanda Callahan (Roger Williams)
- Frank Pizzo (Bowdoin)
- Jared Reineck (Bentley)
- Carter Brock (NEISA Scheduling Coordinator)

Overview

The NEISA Performance Ranking system, last revamped in 2017, has served NEISA well over the years. However, recent championship results and performance rankings have been misaligned for a number of teams ranked 12-25. The 2024 Performance Ranking committee has identified a number of loopholes and has proposed revisions to the Performance Ranking system to ensure a fair, transparent, and effective ranking system for all of the teams in NEISA.

Identified Issues

1. Teams ranked 12-25 compete under two different systems:

- Teams 1-11 (this year) were all scoring A-level regattas and the system fairly evaluated their relative performances.
- The relative weighting of some B and C level regattas creates a situation where teams ranked 12-25 have no scoring incentive to compete at A level NEISA events. The committee feels that more frequent competition at higher level regattas would benefit the competitive strength of teams ranked 12-25 and give them a better experience while competing at the appropriate conference championships (Schell and Coast Guard Alumni Bowl). The current PR scoring system incentivizes attending small B and C level regattas, instead of A level regattas.

2. Disproportionate Weight of Specific Events:

- Sloops and singles events can have an outsized influence on overall rankings for teams ranked outside of the top 10, skewing results in favor of teams excelling in these formats, even if they underperform elsewhere.

There are several examples of teams that score performance points while not actually beating any competitors. This currently can happen in the following situations:

- New England Monotype: score near last, but with only 12 unique teams, 12/18 at an A-level is a decent score (a “keeper”).

- Combined division B level events: Finish 8/8, but be scored as if a 16 team event; teams can score a lot of points at these events.

3. Transparency and User Interface Challenges:

- The existing Python-based program automates score collection from TechScore but lacks transparency, making it difficult for teams to verify results or identify errors.

Proposed Solutions

1. New Scoring Tables - downgrade of B and C, relative to A:

- Here is the [old scoring table](#)
- Here is the [proposed scoring table](#)
- Here is a [simulation of the 2024 scores](#), but using the proposed 2025 scoring system.

Notes on Proposed Scoring Table:

- **The B-level floor of 16** would be removed. The tables have scoring for small regattas (7-10 teams), medium regattas (11-14 teams) and large regattas (15-18 teams). Danmark (20 teams) has its own table.
- **Duplicate teams** are ignored/removed from results. Teams scoring behind a duplicate team will have their finish position moved up one spot. The exception to this is women/open singles (see below).
- **Match Race New Englands:** scored on the table marked “A level, 11-14 teams” (up to 8th place)
- **Open Monotype New Englands:** scored as “A level” by actual finish in the regatta, regardless of unique teams. Presently, a team can now finish 30th place, but “12th unique team” and receive an outsized result compared to their dinghy results. In the proposed scoring table, teams will count their best competitor at the event. The scoring table used for Open Monotype is an A level with 18 boats.
- **Women’s singles New Englands:** scored as “A level” by actual finish. A level - in the range of corresponding fleet size.
- **Danmark** is scored as a “large” 18 school regatta A-level regatta, even though there are 20 entries. Only 4 teams counted the Danmark (H, CGA, BC, RWU) in their score. The committee felt that keeping the system “simple” is more important than creating separate scoring tables for each A-level event.

2. Transparent Scoring System:

- **Google Sheets Interface:**
Carter Brock (NEISA Scheduling coordinator) designed a user-friendly,

transparent Google Sheets-based system where all teams can access and review each other's scores.

- **Benefits:** Increased transparency and ease of error identification.
- **Challenges:** Requires manual data entry.
- **Mitigation:**

Proposal: NEISA Scoring Coordinator Position:

- Introduce a stipend-funded **NEISA Scoring Coordinator** position to manage data entry and accuracy.
- The role would involve approximately 4 hours of work per week for 8 weeks during the season, on Mondays, to input scores and maintain accuracy.
- Proposed compensation: \$1000 total (roughly \$30/hour).

Conclusion

These updates aim to increase the accuracy, accessibility, and transparency of the NEISA Performance Ranking system., fostering a more equitable and competitive sailing environment.

The committee looks forward to feedback on these proposals at the 2024 Winter Meeting.

Motion 1: Pass the report and "Proposed 2025 Performance Ranking update".

Motion 2: Limit A and "A-" regattas to only 2 entries per school.

Motion 3: Add a paid NEISA stipend position of Performance Rank co-ordinator at \$1000 per season.