

BOYS TENNIS COMMITTEE MEETING
January 7, 2025

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. 2024 Boys Tennis Tournament Review(Jim)
3. New Tennis Tournament Directors
 - Steve Jasulavic
 - Ryan Healey
4. Possible Seeding Formula
5. Future Agenda Items

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

9. TOURNAMENT RANKING AND SEEDING

1) Teams will be ranked in each division based on power rating divided by number of games played.

- * Step 1 – Determine the power rating for each school in the division.
- * Step 2 – Determine the number of games played by each school.
- * Step 3 – Divide the power rating by the number of games played.
- * Step 4 – Rank schools by power rating/games played.

Example: 17 wins and 1 loss with a power rating of 146. Games played = 18. Power rating/games played is 8.11.

- First tie break is head-to-head competition. (Based on match(s) won not score or sets.)
- Second tie break is win percentage
- Third tie break is number of wins.
- Final tie break is by lot.
- If a school defeats an out-of-state school, the school will receive 10 points in its power rating.

a. **Most Wins** – Example: A 10-10 team would secure the higher ranking over a 9-9 team.

b. **Power Rating** – Each school is assigned a power rating based on the records of the school(s) that they beat. Schools receive one point in their power rating for each win each of the opponents they have defeated has during the season. The total number of wins of all the opponents you defeat will be your power rating.

For example: If Team A wins 10 games during the season and those 10 opponents have 13, 12, 11, 10, 10, 7, 7, 7, 6 and 4 wins, Team A's power rating would be 87. The team with the higher power rating will secure the higher ranking.

Notes:

- If a school defeats a team twice, it will receive the number of wins that opponent has twice in its power rating.
- The maximum number of power rating points a school can receive for a win is 19, which is the maximum number of victories a CIAC school can have in a season given that they lost to your school. If a school defeats an out-of-state school that has more than 20 wins, the school will receive 19 points in its power rating.

c. **By-lot Tiebreaker Number** – If a tie remains, the team securing the higher ranking will be determined electronically by lot using computer assigned random tiebreaker numbers to be set at the start of the season. The team with the greater tiebreaker number will secure the higher ranking.

2) A team maintains its initial ranking throughout the tournament.