

---

U.S. TRACK & FIELD AND CROSS COUNTRY  
COACHES ASSOCIATION



**2010**  
**NCAA Division I**  
**Track & Field Team Rankings**  
**Rationale and Guidelines**

---

Prepared by:  
Tom Lewis  
Communications Manager, USTFCCCA  
tom@ustfccca.org  
(504) 599-8904

revised 12/8/09



## Introduction

*For the third-straight year, national team rankings will be compiled by mathematical formulae based on national descending order lists and data taken from previous seasons. For the preseason ranking and early-season rankings, data will be taken from previous seasons as well as the current season. The purpose and methodology of the rankings is to create an index that showcases the teams that have the **best potential** of achieving the top spots in the national-team race.*

The rankings should not be confused as a “form chart” or a hard-line predictor of NCAA Championship team finishes, but as indicator of those who have the best chances and deepest rosters to compete as the nation’s best.

Individuals and relay teams aren’t “ranked” by the USTFCCA, but they hold spots on the national descending order list. When preseason data is used, a person’s rank on the national-descending order list may differ from their scored position within the national team rankings as a best mark could come from either the current or previous season. When preseason data is NOT used, then a person’s spot on the national-descending order list will match their scored position within the team rankings.

In addition, the USTFCCA National Team Rankings should not be referred to as a “poll” as no voting occurs during the process.



# Rankings Calendar

## INDOOR

December 8	Preseason declare forms sent to SIDs
January 4	Deadline for preseason declare forms to be sent to USTFCCCA office
January 5	Preseason rankings released (PS/C)
January 26	Week 1 rankings (PS/C)
February 2	Week 2 rankings (PS/C)
February 9	Week 3 rankings (PS/C)
February 16	Week 4 rankings (C*)
February 23	Week 5 rankings (C*)
March 2	Week 6 rankings (C)
March 9	Week 7 rankings (D)
March 12-13	NCAA Division I Indoor Championships, Fayetteville, Ark.
March 15	Final rankings (NCAA)

## OUTDOOR

March 16	Preseason rankings released (PS/C)
April 6	Week 1 rankings (PS/C)
April 13	Week 2 rankings (PS/C)
April 20	Week 3 rankings (PS/C)
April 27	Week 4 rankings (C*)
May 4	Week 5 rankings (C*)
May 11	Week 6 rankings (C*)
May 18	Week 7 rankings (C) [will include all pre-NCAA regional data]
May 25	Week 8 rankings (D) [only those declared for the NCAA first round will be included]
June 1	Week 9 rankings (D) [only those qualified for the NCAA Championships are considered]
June 9-12	NCAA Division I Championships, Eugene, Ore.
June 14	Final rankings (NCAA)

## KEY

PS/C – both preseason and current season data is used in the rankings

C\* - current season data is used, with the exception of combined events which will use a combination

C – only current season data is used in rankings

D – postseason declarations for NCAA Championships will be used to compile rankings

NCAA – final results from the NCAA Championships will be considered as the final ranking



# Scoring Detail

## Team Ranking Score

The scoring system for the teams shall be the sum of two factors measured per individual/relay performance on the descending-order lists: **place** on the descending order list and a **weighed value of the individual/relay performance** based on the field (“bonus”).

**Team Ranking Score =**  
 $\Sigma$  (Athlete’s Place Points + Athlete’s Separation Bonus)

## Step 1: Place Points

### Basics

Specific place points are assigned to spots one through 35, indoor, and one through 50, outdoor. The No. 1-ranked performance during the indoor season is given 20 place points. In the outdoor season, the top spot earns 30 points for their team.

Points cascade downward, at a regressive exponential rate with one (1) point representing those who are located at the average cut-off position of national qualification (i.e. 17th place indoor, 24th place outdoor).

Points continue downward with small fractions of a point given to those in the latter places, representing those who have diminishing chances of making the national meet.

Therefore, teams can benefit when having multiple individuals who have performances that stand just outside the normal eighth-place scoring spot. With the rationale being that those who stand within a certain range from the normal-scoring position on the descending-order lists have a possibility of scoring in the NCAA meet.

Unlike normal meet scoring, place points are not divided equally amongst those tied. Instead, each place that is tied will get the full value for that position, i.e., if three athletes are tied for sixth, all three would receive 10 points, instead of sharing points for sixth, seventh, and eighth (10-9-8).

### Rationale

Scoring in an NCAA Championship meet is difficult, since only the top eight spots garner points for their teams.

In that light, it was important to weigh those athletes that had the best potential of reaching the top eight with a wider margin of confidence than those in places 9-20. However, since those who actually make the meet have a decent shot

of scoring, they must be considered when picking the best method of including all parts of the team.

In addition, in early rankings the reflection of those athletes in the 17-35 spots (indoor) and 26-50 spots (outdoor) reflect the team’s overall potential of placing athletes in the meet, and those athletes scoring in the meet. While these athletes have the potential to score national points, the awarded points in this system are only a small proportion compared to those who are in the upper tier.

Instead of scoring the performance list in the simple 10-8-6-5-4-3-2-1 method, I recommend expanding the scoring field for the purpose of predicting the best potential for those athletes to eventually jump into the top eight.

### 2010 Indoor Place-Points Scoring Chart

1st ____ 20	13th ____ 3	25th ____ 0.2
2nd ____ 18	14th ____ 2	26th ____ 0.15
3rd ____ 16	15th ____ 1.5	27th ____ 0.125
4th ____ 14	16th ____ 1.25	28th ____ 0.1
5th ____ 12	17th ____ 1	29th ____ 0.075
6th ____ 10	18th ____ 0.9	30th ____ 0.05
7th ____ 9	19th ____ 0.8	31st ____ 0.04
8th ____ 8	20th ____ 0.7	32nd ____ 0.03
9th ____ 7	21st ____ 0.6	33rd ____ 0.02
10th ____ 6	22nd ____ 0.5	34th ____ 0.015
11th ____ 5	23rd ____ 0.4	35th ____ 0.01
12th ____ 4	24th ____ 0.3	

### 2010 Outdoor Place-Points Scoring Chart

1st ____ 30	20th ____ 3	39th ____ 0.27
2nd ____ 28	21st ____ 2.5	40th ____ 0.25
3rd ____ 26	22nd ____ 2	41st ____ 0.22
4th ____ 24	23rd ____ 1.5	42nd ____ 0.2
5th ____ 22	24th ____ 1	43rd ____ 0.17
6th ____ 20	25th ____ 0.95	44th ____ 0.15
7th ____ 18	26th ____ 0.9	45th ____ 0.12
8th ____ 16	27th ____ 0.85	46th ____ 0.1
9th ____ 14	28th ____ 0.8	47th ____ 0.07
10th ____ 12	29th ____ 0.75	48th ____ 0.05
11th ____ 10	30th ____ 0.7	49th ____ 0.02
12th ____ 9	31st ____ 0.65	50th ____ 0.01
13th ____ 8	32nd ____ 0.6	
14th ____ 7	33rd ____ 0.55	
15th ____ 6	34th ____ 0.5	
16th ____ 5	35th ____ 0.45	
17th ____ 4.5	36th ____ 0.4	
18th ____ 4	37th ____ 0.35	
19th ____ 3.5	38th ____ 0.3	

*(this chart has changed slightly from the 2008/2009 version in which 55 places were scored to reflect the change in championship structure)*



# Scoring Detail

## Step 2: “Bonus” Points

### Basics

The system’s “bonus” points benefits the individuals whose performances are within a small margin of those within the top spots of the field, or abundantly better than the rest of the field. The highest “bonus” point totals will always be assigned to those ranked highest on the descending order list.

The bonus pool, per event, consists of 20 points during the indoor season and 30 points during the outdoor season. The pool’s allotment is spread to each individual performance based on the mark in comparison to the rest of the field that is based on three variances.

A person’s mark is compared to three spots on each descending-order lists to compose the three indexes that will determine one’s “bonus” total. Should a mark better or come within one-percent of those marks at 17th (indoor) or 24th (outdoor) place on the list, then the mark will be have an opportunity for at least some bonus consideration.

An individual’s “bonus” index is the **sum of three parts**: comparisons with third place (“Show” index), comparisons with eighth place (“Score” index), and comparisons with 17th/24th place (“Make” index). The mark is compared to each of those three parts, and should the mark better or come within one percent, of any or all of those parts, then an index will be calculated for each part affected.

### Example

For example, let’s take the indoor women’s 200-meter dash. Sue’s mark at sixth place on the descending order list is a time of 22.99 seconds. We will compare Sue’s mark versus what is currently third place, which is 22.92, currently eighth place, which is 23.24, and currently 17th-place, which is 23.52.

- Sue’s mark is 99.6955% (within one-percent) of the 22.92 in third place, therefore she garners a “Show” index of **0.6955**.
- Sue’s mark is 101.0874% as good as the mark at eighth place (23.24), therefore, Sue’s “Score” index is **2.0874**.
- Sue’s mark is 102.3054% of the 17th-place mark for a “Make” index of **3.3054**.
- Sue’s sum of all indexes is **6.0883**.
- The sum of all indexes amongst the field in the event is **66.3747**.
- Since 6.0883 is 9.173% of 66.3747, Sue will be awarded 9.173% of 20 points, which is **1.834**.
- Sue would receive 10 place points (based on the table on the following pages) for sixth-place. Adding, her 1.834 bonus, Sue will receive a total of **11.834** towards her team’s ranking.

In this example, only six people received a “Show” index, as only six people were better or within one-percent (0.23 seconds) of third place’s 22.92. Fifteen performances were better of within one-percent of eighth place’s 23.24 and received a “Score” index. There were 22 performances worthy of a “Make” index, better or within one-percent of 17th place’s 23.52.

Also in this example, first place, earned 2.39 bonus points as the athlete accumulated 11.97% of the field’s indexes.

### Full Formula

Separation Bonus =

$$\frac{\text{Individual's Bonus Index}}{\sum \text{All Indexes Among Same Event}} \times \begin{matrix} 20 & \text{(indoor)} \\ 30 & \text{(outdoor)} \end{matrix}$$

Individual’s Bonus Index =

“Show Index” + “Score” Index + “Make” Index

“Show” Index =

$$\left( \frac{\text{Athlete's Performance}}{\text{Third-place Performance}} \right) - 0.99$$

NOTE: These formulas inside the parentheses are flipped for field events.

“Score” Index =

$$\left( \frac{\text{Athlete's Performance}}{\text{Eighth-place Performance}} \right) - 0.99$$

“Make Index” =

$$\left( \frac{\text{Athlete's Performance}}{\text{"Making"-place Performance}} \right) - 0.99$$

Making-place =

17th for the indoor season, 24th for the outdoor season

### Rationale

Basically, those who are within one-percent (0.99) of the performance set by the “show-person”, the person with the third-best performance in the field, the “score-person”, the person with the eighth-best performance in the field, and the “make-person”, the person with the 17th- or 24th-best performance in the field (representing those who have the best chance to make the meet), will get some portion of the bonus.

Those who have performances better than those in third, eighth, and (17th or 24th) will get the most points.



# Scoring Detail

## Multiple Entries

Special considerations are given to those who have marks in multiple events.

Should an athlete have marks in two or more events that have shown a history of participation in both or all at the national championships (i.e. indoor 3000 and 5000 meters), points will add to the team sum as normal.

However, if marks are made in events that have shown a pattern of non-participation in some, but not all (i.e. indoor 800 meters and Mile runs), then only the event that would yield the highest place points shall receive full consideration. The individual's remaining events will receive the full "bonus" stipend as assigned, but no more than two place points. On the expanded rankings list, those who are re-assigned place points based on their events are listed with a "D".

### **2010 Indoor Season Multiple Entry Primer:**

#### USE BOTH:

3000m-5000m, Mile-3000m, 60m-200m, 60mH-400m

#### TAKE BEST ONE:

200m-400m, 800m-Mile, 800m-Mile-3000m, Mile-5000m

#### OTHER SITUATIONS:

Mile-3000m-5000m  
(count both 3000m-5000m if better than Mile)

### **2010 Outdoor Season Multiple Entry Primer:**

#### USE BOTH:

100m-200m, 5,000m-10,000m

#### TAKE BEST ONE:

All other combinations on the track

## Injuries, Etc.

The ranking system does not consider injury reports or events of preference.

## Preseason Rankings

Preseason rankings use season bests from the prior season through NCAA Championship weekend.

The preseason rankings are devoid of the seniors listed from the previous year. Only information provided by coaches and/or sports information contacts are considered.

In early December, SID contacts will receive information containing last season's marks, their task is to inform the USTFCCA office of changes, additions, or omissions from the prior year's list in order to make a more accurate ranking for their team. Transfers by a student-athlete listed from the year prior are considered for their new squad.

Despite changes in relay personnel, a school's 2009 season best is considered its preseason mark. Incoming freshmen are not considered in preseason rankings.

Preseason rankings will reflect those marks attached with your changes plus any NCAA-approved marks achieved December 1, 2009 to January 3, 2010 and reported to TFRRS.

Weeks one to three will contain a combination of preseason and 2010 marks with the best mark considered. Check the team rankings calendar for more detail.

SIDs should report the following:

- Those listed as seniors on last year's list are listed as "DONE" on the team's preseason roster for the 2010 season. Please note if this athlete still has remaining eligibility for the season in question. Those who have spent eligibility will not be reflected in the team's preseason ranking.
- Please note if an athlete on the list transferred TO or FROM your school. Those marks will be applied to the athlete's new school. NOTE: Junior college transfers are considered if their marks can be verified.
- *Those who redshirted in 2009 and were on the NCAA's performance list in 2008 are eligible for preseason rankings. Please note the athlete's best mark from the 2008 indoor season to be included in team's ranking score. NOTE: Those who have returned from multiple-year furloughs, i.e., mission trips, military service, will be considered using marks from their previous year of eligibility.*



# 2010 USTFCCA Track & Field Team Rankings — NCAA Division I

## Method at Work

### Scoring System at Work

In this example, we take the men's pole vault performance list prior to the NCAA Indoor competition, March 5, 2007.

Rk	Athlete	School	Mark	Place Points	Advantage			Index			Indiv. Total Index	Event Total Index	Index Pct.	Bonus Points	Total Virtual Points
					"Show"	"Score"	"Make"	"Show"	"Score"	"Make"					
1	Brad Gebauer	McNeese St.	5.60	20	1.0163	1.0370	1.0507	0.0263	0.0470	0.0607	0.1340	0.7339	18.26%	3.6526	23.6526
2	Scott Roth	Washington	5.53	18	1.0036	1.0241	1.0375	0.0136	0.0341	0.0475	0.0952	0.7339	12.98%	2.5952	20.5952
3	Thomas Skipper	Oregon	5.51	16	<b>1.0000</b>	1.0204	1.0338	0.0100	0.0304	0.0438	0.0841	0.7339	11.47%	2.2931	18.2931
4	Chip Heuser	Oklahoma	5.50	14	0.9982	1.0185	1.0319	0.0082	0.0285	0.0419	0.0786	0.7339	10.71%	2.1420	16.1420
5	McKane Lee	Washington	5.43	12	0.9855	1.0056	1.0188	0.0000	0.0156	0.0288	0.0443	0.7339	6.04%	1.2078	13.2078
6	Thorsten Mueller	Virginia Tech	5.42	10	0.9837	1.0037	1.0169	0.0000	0.0137	0.0269	0.0406	0.7339	5.53%	1.1062	11.1062
7	Graeme Hoste	Stanford	5.41	9	0.9819	1.0019	1.0150	0.0000	0.0119	0.0250	0.0369	0.7339	5.02%	1.0046	10.0046
8	Rory Quiller	Binghamton	5.40	8	0.9800	<b>1.0000</b>	1.0131	0.0000	0.0100	0.0231	0.0331	0.7339	4.51%	0.9030	8.9030
8	Andre Poljanec	UNI	5.40	8	0.9800	<b>1.0000</b>	1.0131	0.0000	0.0100	0.0231	0.0331	0.7339	4.51%	0.9030	8.9030
8	Mitch Greeley	Clemson	5.40	8	0.9800	<b>1.0000</b>	1.0131	0.0000	0.0100	0.0231	0.0331	0.7339	4.51%	0.9030	8.9030
11	Whitney Neves	BYU	5.38	5	0.9764	0.9963	1.0094	0.0000	0.0063	0.0194	0.0257	0.7339	3.50%	0.6998	5.6998
11	Mark Johnson	Auburn	5.38	5	0.9764	0.9963	1.0094	0.0000	0.0063	0.0194	0.0257	0.7339	3.50%	0.6998	5.6998
13	Matt Weirich	BYU	5.33	3	0.9673	0.9870	1.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0100	0.0100	0.7339	1.36%	0.2725	3.2725
13	Michael Hogue	Tennessee	5.33	3	0.9673	0.9870	<b>1.0000</b>	0.0000	0.0000	0.0100	0.0100	0.7339	1.36%	0.2725	3.2725
13	Jarno Kivioja	UNI	5.33	3	0.9673	0.9870	<b>1.0000</b>	0.0000	0.0000	0.0100	0.0100	0.7339	1.36%	0.2725	3.2725
13	Tyson Byers	WashingtonSt.	5.33	3	0.9673	0.9870	<b>1.0000</b>	0.0000	0.0000	0.0100	0.0100	0.7339	1.36%	0.2725	3.2725
17	Jordan Scott	Kansas	5.32	1	0.9655	0.9852	0.9981	0.0000	0.0000	0.0081	0.0081	0.7339	1.11%	0.2214	1.2214
17	Mike Landers	UCLA	5.32	1	0.9655	0.9852	0.9981	0.0000	0.0000	0.0081	0.0081	0.7339	1.11%	0.2214	1.2214
19	Scott Martin	Oklahoma	5.3	0.8	0.9619	0.9815	0.9944	0.0000	0.0000	0.0044	0.0044	0.7339	0.60%	0.1191	0.9191
19	Seth Burney	Nebraska	5.3	0.8	0.9619	0.9815	0.9944	0.0000	0.0000	0.0044	0.0044	0.7339	0.60%	0.1191	0.9191
19	Gable Baldwin	Nebraska	5.3	0.8	0.9619	0.9815	0.9944	0.0000	0.0000	0.0044	0.0044	0.7339	0.60%	0.1191	0.9191
22	Nick Mossberg	Arizona	5.27	0.5	0.9564	0.9759	0.9887	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.5000
22	Bob Low	BYU	5.27	0.5	0.9564	0.9759	0.9887	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.5000
24	Adam Sarafian	Arkansas St.	5.26	0.3	0.9546	0.9741	0.9869	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.3000
25	Matt Adkisson	Sam Houston St.	5.24	0.2	0.9510	0.9704	0.9831	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.2000
26	Jeremy Brading	Kent State	5.22	0.15	0.9474	0.9667	0.9794	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.1500
26	Andy Lane	Tennessee	5.22	0.15	0.9474	0.9667	0.9794	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.1500
28	Kyle Ellis	E. Illinois	5.21	0.1	0.9456	0.9648	0.9775	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.1000
28	Mark Langlois	Michigan St.	5.21	0.1	0.9456	0.9648	0.9775	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.1000
28	Andrew Park	Princeton	5.21	0.1	0.9456	0.9648	0.9775	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.1000
31	David Murphy	UCLA	5.2	0.04	0.9437	0.9630	0.9756	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.0400
31	Elliott Haynie	Gardner-Webb	5.2	0.04	0.9437	0.9630	0.9756	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.0400
31	Joshua Ghaly	Robert Morris	5.2	0.04	0.9437	0.9630	0.9756	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.0400
31	Chris Ashcraft	Texas Tech	5.2	0.04	0.9437	0.9630	0.9756	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.0400
31	Mike S. Morrison	Florida	5.2	0.04	0.9437	0.9630	0.9756	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.0400
31	Jeff Coover	Indiana	5.2	0.04	0.9437	0.9630	0.9756	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.0400
31	Dan McKenzie	S. Carolina	5.2	0.04	0.9437	0.9630	0.9756	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.0400
31	Bryce Bergman	Kansas State	5.2	0.04	0.9437	0.9630	0.9756	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.0400
31	Jordan Thull	Northeastern	5.2	0.04	0.9437	0.9630	0.9756	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.0400
31	Joe Samaniuk	Virginia Tech	5.2	0.04	0.9437	0.9630	0.9756	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.0400
31	Matthew Hurley	Fla St.	5.2	0.04	0.9437	0.9630	0.9756	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.0400
31	Dan Imlach	Sac State	5.2	0.04	0.9437	0.9630	0.9756	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7339	0.00%	0.0000	0.0400



# 2010 USTFCCA Track & Field Team Rankings — NCAA Division I Accuracy Data

## A Week Out...

These charts show the accuracy of the rankings when compared with final national finish for the week entering the NCAA Championships.

All Seasons (8 trials)							
Final Predicted	Top 3	Top 5	Top 8	Top 10	Top 15	Top 20	Top 25
Top 3	71%	<b>75%</b>	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Top 5		68%	<b>85%</b>	93%	98%	98%	98%
Top 8			73%	<b>84%</b>	95%	97%	97%
Top 10				80%	<b>89%</b>	95%	95%
Top 15					81%	<b>94%</b>	94%
Top 20						80%	<b>85%</b>
Top 25							79%

2009 Indoor & Outdoor Seasons (4 trials)							
Final Predicted	Top 3	Top 5	Top 8	Top 10	Top 15	Top 20	Top 25
Top 3	75%	<b>75%</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Top 5		65%	<b>85%</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%
Top 8			72%	<b>91%</b>	100%	100%	100%
Top 10				85%	<b>93%</b>	100%	100%
Top 15					80%	<b>97%</b>	97%
Top 20						83%	<b>88%</b>
Top 25							82%

Indoor Seasons (4 trials)							
Final Predicted	Top 3	Top 5	Top 8	Top 10	Top 15	Top 20	Top 25
Top 3	58%	<b>75%</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Top 5		65%	<b>95%</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%
Top 8			77%	<b>90%</b>	97%	100%	100%
Top 10				85%	<b>90%</b>	97%	97%
Top 15					81%	<b>93%</b>	93%
Top 20						78%	<b>81%</b>
Top 25							73%

Men's Seasons (4 trials)							
Final Predicted	Top 3	Top 5	Top 8	Top 10	Top 15	Top 20	Top 25
Top 3	67%	<b>92%</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Top 5		75%	<b>85%</b>	90%	100%	100%	100%
Top 8			78%	<b>88%</b>	94%	97%	97%
Top 10				80%	<b>85%</b>	98%	98%
Top 15					82%	<b>97%</b>	97%
Top 20						83%	<b>85%</b>
Top 25							80%

Outdoor Seasons (4 trials)							
Final Predicted	Top 3	Top 5	Top 8	Top 10	Top 15	Top 20	Top 25
Top 3	83%	<b>92%</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Top 5		70%	<b>75%</b>	85%	95%	95%	95%
Top 8			69%	<b>78%</b>	94%	94%	94%
Top 10				75%	<b>88%</b>	93%	93%
Top 15					82%	<b>95%</b>	95%
Top 20						83%	<b>89%</b>
Top 25							85%

Women's Seasons (4 trials)							
Final Predicted	Top 3	Top 5	Top 8	Top 10	Top 15	Top 20	Top 25
Top 3	75%	<b>75%</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Top 5		60%	<b>85%</b>	95%	95%	95%	95%
Top 8			68%	<b>81%</b>	97%	97%	97%
Top 10				79%	<b>92%</b>	92%	92%
Top 15					81%	<b>91%</b>	91%
Top 20						78%	<b>85%</b>
Top 25							79%



## 2010 USTFCCA Track & Field Team Rankings — NCAA Division I

# Accuracy Data

### At Midseason ...

These charts show the accuracy of the rankings at midseason when compared to finish at the NCAA Championships.

#### All Seasons (8 trials)

<i>Final Predicted</i>	Top 3	Top 5	Top 8	Top 10	Top 15	Top 20	Top 25
Top 3	67%	<b>83%</b>	92%	96%	100%	100%	100%
Top 5		63%	<b>80%</b>	88%	95%	95%	95%
Top 8			70%	<b>78%</b>	86%	92%	92%
Top 10				73%	<b>84%</b>	92%	92%
Top 15					79%	<b>89%</b>	90%
Top 20						77%	<b>82%</b>
Top 25							76%

#### 2009 Indoor & Outdoor Seasons (4 trials)

<i>Final Predicted</i>	Top 3	Top 5	Top 8	Top 10	Top 15	Top 20	Top 25
Top 3	67%	<b>75%</b>	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Top 5		55%	<b>80%</b>	95%	100%	100%	100%
Top 8			69%	<b>84%</b>	88%	97%	97%
Top 10				78%	<b>85%</b>	98%	98%
Top 15					78%	<b>92%</b>	92%
Top 20						79%	<b>81%</b>
Top 25							76%

#### Indoor Seasons (4 trials)

<i>Final Predicted</i>	Top 3	Top 5	Top 8	Top 10	Top 15	Top 20	Top 25
Top 3	67%	<b>83%</b>	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Top 5		65%	<b>80%</b>	90%	95%	95%	95%
Top 8			74%	<b>84%</b>	90%	94%	94%
Top 10				74%	<b>82%</b>	92%	92%
Top 15					80%	<b>86%</b>	86%
Top 20						74%	<b>77%</b>
Top 25							72%

#### Men's Seasons (4 trials)

<i>Final Predicted</i>	Top 3	Top 5	Top 8	Top 10	Top 15	Top 20	Top 25
Top 3	67%	<b>83%</b>	92%	92%	100%	100%	100%
Top 5		65%	<b>80%</b>	90%	95%	95%	95%
Top 8			66%	<b>75%</b>	84%	94%	94%
Top 10				73%	<b>83%</b>	95%	95%
Top 15					78%	<b>90%</b>	90%
Top 20						76%	<b>80%</b>
Top 25							76%

#### Outdoor Seasons (4 trials)

<i>Final Predicted</i>	Top 3	Top 5	Top 8	Top 10	Top 15	Top 20	Top 25
Top 3	67%	<b>83%</b>	92%	92%	100%	100%	100%
Top 5		60%	<b>80%</b>	85%	95%	95%	95%
Top 8			66%	<b>72%</b>	81%	91%	91%
Top 10				73%	<b>85%</b>	93%	93%
Top 15					78%	<b>92%</b>	93%
Top 20						80%	<b>86%</b>
Top 25							80%

#### Women's Seasons (4 trials)

<i>Final Predicted</i>	Top 3	Top 5	Top 8	Top 10	Top 15	Top 20	Top 25
Top 3	67%	<b>83%</b>	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Top 5		60%	<b>80%</b>	85%	95%	95%	95%
Top 8			74%	<b>81%</b>	87%	90%	90%
Top 10				74%	<b>85%</b>	90%	90%
Top 15					80%	<b>88%</b>	90%
Top 20						78%	<b>83%</b>
Top 25							77%