

## 2024 CIAC Boys Tennis Tournament Report

### Class Tournament Results:

1. Class LL Champion: Greenwich; Runner-Up: Staples
2. Class L Champion: New Canaan; Runner-Up: Wilton
3. Class M Champion: Avon; Runner-Up: Daniel Hand
4. Class S Champion: Stonington; Runner-Up: Nonnewaug

### Invitational Results:

Singles Champion: Lukas Phimvongsa, Enfield;

Singles Runner-Up: Michael Lorenzetti, NDWH

Doubles Champions: Nate Smock/Kevin Zuo, New Canaan

Doubles Runners-Up: Matthew Guadarrama/Haydon Frey, Staples

Player of the Year: Lukas Phimvongsa, Enfield

Coach of the Year: Ben Young, New Canaan

### Summary

For 2024 our Committee voted (closely) to retain the team tournament and Invitational format that we have used since 2019. We also voted to move the Class Tournament finals from Wesleyan to 4 different sites (Conard, Amity, Joel Barlow and Wilton). That decision allowed us to assign matches with the girls that were geographically more convenient for most teams. For the Invitational tournament, we moved to the brand new facilities at Hall and Conard High Schools in West Hartford. With 12 courts each, that allowed both girls and boys Invitational to expand to 64 singles and 32 doubles entries. Our opening rounds of singles were played on Sundays which facilitated fewer conflicts with the school day, then proceeded to Monday-Wednesday that posed very little disruption of school. The weather cooperated this year, and the tournaments proceeded smoothly. There is no question that the best teams in the states won their respective class titles, and that the best singles and doubles teams won the Invitational crowns. The more closely contested rounds occurred before the finals.

### Discussion Topics

1. Website: The new website challenged many coaches and AD's and a learning curve is to be expected. Our liaison to the website (Dana) did an awesome job of responding to our inquiries and putting out the many fires that occurred. Let's hope that the confusion surrounding the website will improve as everyone gets used to the changes. We also hope that more coaches and/or ADs input detailed

results for all matches so that we may track lineups and results for our Invitational.

2. Multiple Sites for Class finals: Overall, this was helpful to have matches assigned to more geographically convenient locations. However, due to delayed reporting of results, schools were not notified until late the evening before their matches, where they were heading the next day. That put some pressure on AD's to procure buses and announce release times for players and coaches.
3. Packet Study: We are still getting coaches and AD's who are not reading the packet or following the rules stated in the packet. Unfortunately this can affect players, especially when a player is ineligible due to the coach not following the rules stated in the packet. We have reached out to coaches/AD's and league coordinators to help with greater compliance, but this is still a work in progress.
4. Invitational Nominations: Too many schools did not nominate players that may have been included or considered for the tournament. Others nominated players but did not submit records of matches as requested. One team submitted a doubles team that got accepted but failed to notify the players that they were in. The team was a no-show.
5. Line-up formation: This is a problem in many conferences. Coaches are moving players around in the lineup and sometimes not following the order of strength principle. This is a complex issue and somewhat subjective, but it is happening with greater frequency. The consequences affect conference standings, Invitational nominations, acceptances and seedings. For example if a #2 is stronger than a #1 but has been playing #2 for the entire season, then our Committee cannot accept that player over the #1 or seed him higher. And that has ramifications for the draw as we saw this year. Often, a freshman and a senior are involved. Is there something we can do as CIAC Committee to assist coaches with lineup formation and, perhaps, serve as an arbiter for disputes?
6. Qualifications for lineups and for the Invitational: Currently, we have stated that players must be in 8 matches or 50% of their schedule to play in that position for the class tournament, and to be nominated for the Invitational. With injuries and other legitimate conflicts, is that a reasonable rule, or do we need to modify it? How do we maintain the integrity of lineups while allowing coaches to put together their best and truest lineups?

I'd like to thank the member schools that were willing to host our Class tournament finals (Conard, Wilton, Amity and Joel Barlow) and the West Hartford Schools, Hall and Conard (Jason Siegal, AD) for hosting the Invitational.

Tournaments of this caliber can only be accomplished by a group of dedicated professionals who are unwavering in their focus on what is best for the student-athlete.

Our thanks go to the members of the Committee, the site directors and volunteers who have made this a year long commitment to making this the best event it can be by being willing to assess and tweak it every year. It is imperative that we continue to recruit (younger) coaches who share this vision and are willing to dedicate themselves to offering the best possible postseason scholastic tennis tournaments.

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Solomon  
Tournament Director