

A MESSAGE FROM THE COMMISSIONER

COMPETITIVE EQUITY PLAYOFFS – A SNAPSHOT



Approximately one year ago, I wrote a Message from the Commissioner regarding the upcoming vote of the CIF Southern Section Council in January, 2016, regarding the Competitive Equity Playoff Model for the CIF Southern Section. In that message, I shared some results from various sports during our 2015 Fall Playoffs to illustrate issues we were trying to address related to placing individual schools, instead of entire leagues, into playoff divisions by competitive equity.

Now that the Competitive Equity Playoff Model has arrived this Fall, here is an update on the sports I reviewed one year ago, comparing the former system to our new system.

FOOTBALL

Average Margin of Victory by Winners of First Round Contests

(Note: The four divisions below are the divisions used as examples last year.)

- **2015 – Pac-5 Division** – Games won by an average of 37.75 points

- **2016 – Division 1** – Games won by an average of 28.87 points – all 8 games; 23.14 – 7 games

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 23.7% - all 8 games; 38.8% – 7 games

*(Note: The margin of victory is reduced to **23.14** points a game, and the percentage reduction in margin of victory is **38.8%**, if you remove the 69-0 score from the game involving the #1 seed.)*

- **2015 – Inland Division** – Games won by an average of 37.25 points

- **2016 – Division 3** – Games won by an average of 17.37 points

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 53.4%

- **2015 – Southern Division** – Games won by an average of 27.62 points

- **2016 – Division 10** – Games won by an average of 14.50 points

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 47.6%

(Note: 6 of the 8 First Round contests in Division 10 were decided by 14 points or less.)

- **2015 – East Valley Division** – Games won by an average of 25.62 points

- **2016 – Division 11** – Games won by an average of 13.75 points

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 46.3%

2016 – Other Divisions, Margin of Victory in First Round Contests

- Division 2 – 16.50 points

- Division 4 – 25.37 points

- Division 5 – 21.00 points

- Division 6 – 26.37 points

- Division 7 – 18.62 points

- Division 8 – 22.00 points

- Division 9 – 23.62 points

- Division 12 – 27.62 points

- Division 13 – 25.87 points

COMMISSIONER'S MESSAGE #5 - COMPETITIVE EQUITY UPDATE

2-2-2

FOOTBALL (Cont.):

Final Statistic

- 2015 – 104 First Round games played, **29 (27.8%)**, were decided by 14 points or less.
- 2016 – 104 First Round games played, **38 (36.5%)**, were decided by 14 points or less.

Football – Automatic Entries into the Playoffs

Ever since the Competitive Equity Playoff Model was introduced, there were questions regarding how this new system would affect automatic entries from leagues into the Football Playoffs. Specifically, would this new system eliminate teams from the Football Playoffs who would have automatically qualified under the former system? Here is some information related to that issue...

- 2015 – 175 automatic entries from leagues; 2016 – 176 automatic entries from leagues **(+1)**
- 2015 – 33 At-Large selections; 2016 – 32 At-Large selections **(-1)**
- 2015 – All 1st Place teams auto qualified; 2016 – All 1st Place teams auto qualified **(Same)**
- 2015 – All 2nd Place teams auto qualified; 2016 – All 2nd Place teams auto qualified **(Same)**
- 2015 – 15 Third Place teams auto qualified; 2016 – 25 Third Place teams auto qualified **(+10)**
- 2015 – 18 At-Large 3rd Place teams selected; 2016 – 7 At-Large 3rd Place teams selected **(-11)**

As you see, there was virtually no difference between how many total teams automatically qualified this season compared to the total from last season. Furthermore, there were actually 10 more 3rd Place teams this year, who automatically qualified from their leagues than last year.

BOYS WATER POLO

Average Margin of Victory by Winners of First Round contests

Division 1

- 2015 – Games won by an average of 9.75 goals; 2016 – 6.37 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 35%

Division 2

- 2015 – Games won by an average of 7.37 goals; 2016 – 7.25 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 2%

Division 3

- 2015 – Games won by an average of 8.37 goals; 2016 – 6.75 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 20%

Division 4

- 2015 – Games won by an average of 7.87 goals; 2016 – 3.50 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 56%

Division 5

- 2015 – Games won by an average of 8.50 goals; 2016 – 7.43 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 13%

Division 6

- 2015 – Games won by an average of 10.25 goals; 2016 – 6.50 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 37%

Division 7

- 2015 – Games won by an average of 10.50 goals; 2016 – 5.62 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 47%

- more -

COMMISSIONER'S MESSAGE #5 - COMPETITIVE EQUITY UPDATE

3-3-3

BOYS WATER POLO (Cont.):

Totals for all 7 divisions – (Adding all average margins of victory from all 7 divisions.)

- 2015 – Games won by a total of 62.61 goals; 2016 – 43.42 goals

Average Margin of Victory – All 7 divisions – Reduced 31%

Boys Water Polo – Average Margin of Victory by winners of Quarterfinal contests

- **Division 1** – 2015 – Games won by an average of 6.75 goals; 2016 - 4.00 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 41%

- **Division 2** – 2015 – Games won by an average of 1.75 goals; 2016 - 2.75 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Increased 36%

- **Division 3** – 2015 – Games won by an average of 6.25 goals; 2016 - 2.75 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 56%

- **Division 4** – 2015 – Games won by an average of 7.00 goals; 2016 - 3.00 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 57%

- **Division 5** – 2015 – Games won by an average of 4.25 goals; 2016 - 5.25 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Increased 19%

- **Division 6** – 2015 – Games won by an average of 6.50 goals; 2016 - 3.00 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 54%

- **Division 7** – 2015 – Games won by an average of 8.75 goals; 2016 - 2.50 goals

Average Margin of Victory – Reduced 73%

Totals for all 7 divisions – (Adding all average margins of victory from all 7 divisions.)

- 2015 – Games won by a total of 41.25 goals; 2016 – 23.25 goals

Average Margin of Victory – All 7 divisions – Reduced 44%

Final Statistic

- 2015 - 28 Quarterfinal games played, **10 (36%)**, were decided by 2 goals or less.

- 2016 - 28 Quarterfinal games played, **13 (46%)**, were decided by 2 goals or less.

GIRLS TENNIS

Average Margin of Victory – First and Second Round Matches

First Round

- 2015 – 80 matches played; 59 matches ended with scores of 13-5 or higher. ($59/80 = 73.8\%$)

- 2016 – 80 matches played; 36 matches ended with scores of 13-5 or higher. ($36/80 = 45.0\%$)

Number of matches with scores of 13-5 or higher – Reduced 28.8%

Second Round

- 2015 – 40 matches played; 3 with a score of 9-9, 5 with a score of 10-8. ($8/40 = 20.0\%$)

- 2016 – 40 matches played; 8 with a score of 9-9, 9 with a score of 10-8. ($17/40 = 42.5\%$)

Number matches with scores of 9-9 or 10-8 – Increased 22.5%

As mentioned, this is a snapshot of what has taken place over the last few weeks. As we proceed further, we will continue to analyze and process the relevant data available to us in an effort to keep moving this concept forward in the time ahead. However, never forget that our ultimate goal remains the same, which is to deliver a product that provides realistic opportunities for as many of our member schools as possible to compete for section championships.

Thank you very much for your help and support, it is truly appreciated.

Rob Wignel

