

My methodology for Ranking Calculations 2009:

Rankings are based on points earned for starting courses and doing well relative to other competitors on the course. Because so many of our competitors only make it to a couple of meets a year, I chose to sum points over the season rather than average them. This awards regular attendance as well as strong performances. It also could be argued that Points are earned for every course a competitor runs (with a couple of exceptions noted below).

Total points for a competitor on a given course are the sum of time points and start points.

Start points: Starting a course was worth 1.0 points, regardless of outcome.

Time points: Calculated as follows:

1. Convert all competitor times to seconds.
2. Determine the average time of the top 3 competitors on the course.
3. Divide all competitor times by the top 3 average.
4. The individual's time points = 2/the result of the first 3 steps. (Scores range from .5 to 4.3 points or so but
5. DNFs, DQs and all times over 3 hours were given 0 time points.

This sequence normalizes between different courses although there will still tend to be wider point spreads on longer courses. Averaging the top 3 times prevents a single dominant performance from excessively devaluing everyone's else's performance but still rewards speed. I used 2 as the numerator in step 4 because I thought that yielded time point values that were balanced vs. just showing up. Typically the winner of a course earns

An additional .25 points are given for competing in or being meet director for each meet beyond two. (Example: If a competitor competes at 3 meets and is meet director for another, he or she earns .25 points for the third

I allowed points from multiple courses on a single day but did not allow anyone to get points for running the same course twice (only one case of that). I threw out one competitor time (Mike Dawson ran all 3 courses at Snowbasin and his Beginner course time was 2/3 of the 2d place time which skewed the beginner points badly.

The hardest part of establishing a ranking is accounting for all the family and group competitors (over half of the total). Everyone in a group gets the same ranking for the course; I listed group members separately in the ranking if they didn't always compete with the same people (i.e. Tihomir earned points for courses done with his son Pavel and for courses done alone; he and Pavel are ranked separately. Conversely, Mike and Tina

A few thoughts the club members might want to give input on:

1. I didn't weight points according to the difficulty of the course. Larger clubs often make the advanced courses worth more - an inducement to get better. My thinking is we want to give everyone a shot at a high ranking and
2. I didn't make any adjustments for the two days of the Brighton meet. Treating those days separately reduces the number of time for a course too much and skews the points. I thought about giving the Saturday rain

Ed White