

# PROPOSAL RE "AT LARGE" FROM LEAGUE TO PRELIMS

**"If a team is ranked in the top 16 in TWO of the last FOUR polls(beginning the weekend before Mt SAC), it will be eligible for consideration for available\* "at large" slots in CIF prelims."**

\*available=no heat should have more than 17 teams, so for example, if in a four heat division, if there were 2 heats of 16 and 2 of 17, then 2 spots would be made available to the highest ranked teams, not automatically qualified

In 2006 B1 had 17,17,16,17 G1 16,16,17,17 B2 15,16,15,16  
G2 all 15's B3 17 and 16 G3 15,16 B4 16,15  
G 4 14,13,13 B5 12,11,13 and G5 13 and 14

## RATIONALE AND CONSIDERATIONS:

As the number of schools continues to increase and number of competitive teams especially in D1 and 2 increases, the chances continue to increase that quality, CIF Finals caliber teams will be left out of PRELIMS from especially competitive league under the current system.

The choice of a ranking to 16 is a reflection of the reality above that we often have, on average 16 teams in the heats and so rankings/seedings are required to a depth of 16

The choice to extend to 4 weeks instead of the current 3 is a reflection of several important realities

First, the Orange County Championships for example involving many highly ranked teams does not "count" as one of the ranking weeks under the **current** system. Teams who may have concerns about rankings for "at large" may face having to run very well , TWO weeks in a row, plus whatever dual or clusters are mixed in with that schedule. If OCC were included, a team could choose to rest or opt out of Mt Sac which currently can't be done if you are a potential "at large " team.

Second, with the many leagues who have gone to clusters, some teams may have little, if any chance to gain recognition unless they run well at Mt Sac since they may only have one other meet other than SAC to demonstrate their worth. Expanding to one week prior gives more of an EQUAL chance with schools have may have more races to run to earn the rankings.

Third, as most would agree, being essentially forced by the rankings/at large system to race and race well at MT Sac may actually be detrimental to the teams chances for success later. Expanding the weeks to four provide more options that are less potentially damaging.

I AGREE WITH THE PROPOSAL\_\_\_\_ I OPPOSE THE PROPOSAL\_\_\_\_  
I WOULD SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL AS i AMENDED ABOVE\_\_\_\_\_