
acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by John Owens - 2010/02/23 03:18

I talked to Dante Dettamanti (Stanford coach) today at our water polo class and asked him why UCLA got the bid over Stanford. The decision was made by the NCAA rules committee (a bunch of coaches, mostly). There are 6 criteria (he didn't say what they were, but I presume it's overall record, record against top teams, record against tourney teams, conference finish, etc.), and he said UCLA came out ahead in 2 of the criteria, 2 were ties, and 2 favored Stanford. The tiebreaker is head to head record. UCLA beat Stanford twice this year, and Stanford beat UCLA once, so UCLA got the bid. JDO

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by Terence Ma - 2010/02/23 03:18

the NCAA rules committee (a bunch of coaches, mostly). The NCAA Men's Water Polo Rules Committee: Kaia Hedlund, Chair, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI Edward Newland, Secretary/Rules Editor, University of California, Irvine, CA Steven Heaston, University of California, Berkeley, CA John Loughran, Queens College, Flushing, NY Russel Yarworth, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA Taken from the 1996 NCAA Water Polo Men's Rules Rule Book.

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by Scotty - 2010/02/23 03:18

I talked to Dante Dettamanti (Stanford coach) today at our water polo class and asked him why UCLA got the bid over Stanford. The decision was made by the NCAA rules committee (a bunch of coaches, mostly). There are 6 criteria (he didn't say what they were, but I presume it's overall record, record against top teams, record against tourney teams, conference finish, etc.), and he said UCLA came out ahead in 2 of the criteria, 2 were ties, and 2 favored Stanford. The tiebreaker is head to head record. UCLA beat Stanford twice this year, and Stanford beat UCLA once, so UCLA got the bid. JDO

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by John Owens - 2010/02/23 03:18

Yeah, I understand that the criterion is set by the coaches committee, it needs to be revised so that is simple. The first criterion should be place in conference tourney SIXTH place ought to be an automatic disqualifier. Only the #2 or #3 team ought to be considered. Let's say Well, I can't say I agree with the above. I think the choice of the at-large team has to be made looking at the entire season, not at a conference tournament. There is no question UCLA outplayed Stanford for the first two-thirds of the season, and that Stanford outplayed UCLA in the last third. If you were only to look at the conference tournament: What if UCLA had their hole man injured for that weekend, or their goalie out with the flu, and placed poorly because of it? You can't just look at one weekend to give the bid. I think the important point to be made here is that there is a procedure to decide the at-large team, it seems to be reasonably fair as it's based on head-to-head record, overall record, and so on, and it was followed in deciding the at-large team. If I was voting on whom I thought deserved to go, it would have been Stanford, but I can't quarrel with the process that was followed as it seems to be fair to me. JDO

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by Steven Kan - 2010/02/23 03:18

If you were only to look at the conference tournament: What if UCLA had their hole man injured for that weekend, or their goalie out with the flu, and placed poorly because of it? You can't just look at one weekend to give the bid. I think the important point to be made here is that there is a procedure to decide the at-large team, it seems to be reasonably fair as it's based on head-to-head record, overall record, and so on, and it was followed in deciding the at-large team. If I was voting on whom I thought deserved to go, it would have been Stanford, but I can't quarrel with the process that was followed as it seems to be fair to me. JDO

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by ScottyCa - 2010/02/23 03:18

If you were only to look at the conference tournament: What if UCLA had their hole man injured for that weekend, or their goalie out with the flu, and placed poorly because of it? You can't just look at one weekend to give the bid. I think the important point to be made here is that there is a procedure to decide the at-large team, it seems to be reasonably fair as it's based on head-to-head record, overall record, and so on, and it was followed in deciding the at-large team. If I was voting on whom I thought deserved to go, it would have been Stanford, but I can't quarrel with the process that was followed as it seems to be fair to me. JDO

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by John Owens - 2010/02/23 03:18

In article <58d5pu\$...@news4.snfc21.pacbell.net scott...@pacbell.net (ScottyCa) writes: You could do a lot of what ifs. Isn't the point to be your best by the seasons end? You don't know what moves Dante did early on in the season to be on top by years end. Maybe he went with young players knowing he would lose early, but he made that sacrifice (sp?) to be his best by years end. So, yes, if you are going to have a conference tourney that should count more then playing well in September. And illness and injury are part of athletics. No team is ever 100%. I have no quarrel with weighing the season ending tournaments and games more than those at the beginning of the year. I do, however, take issue with your suggestion that the conference tournament only should be the basis for the at-large bid (you, I believe, advocated a playoff between the 2nd and 3rd place teams to get the bid). Placing so much value on one tournament, in my opinion, trivializes the regular season and pre- and mid-season tournaments. JDO

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by Carey Heckman - 2010/02/23 03:18

I have no quarrel with weighing the season ending tournaments and games more than those at the beginning of the year. I do, however, take issue with your suggestion that the conference tournament only should be the basis for the at-large bid (you, I believe, advocated a playoff between the 2nd and 3rd place teams to get the bid). Placing so much value on one tournament, in my opinion, trivializes the regular season and pre- and mid-season tournaments. This sounds like the start of a tastes great/less filling argument. For the NCAA tournament to be perceived as just, we need participation from the legitimate contenders, whether late bloomers or consistently strong performers who had a bad weekend. No argument there, I'd guess. The problem is not the criteria, it's the four team tournament. It lacks enough seats at the table to accommodate everyone who should be given a chance to eat. If water polo is stuck for the time being with this final four mess, the next best thing, I think, would be to figure out a way to insert a regional zone competition layer. Then water polo could borrow (yet again) from basketball, and give automatic bids to conference champs plus have sufficient at-large bids to keep the final result for real despite the existence of overstrong conferences (like the ACC in basketball... now *that* should get me a flame or two). Perhaps the deal for the extra MPSF at-large participants is that, again like basketball, they would have to compete in different zones. This would strengthen water polo, I think, by giving people in other parts of the nation a chance to play against and see first-rate water polo rather than a perpetuation of the cycle of poverty. True, this would have a travel price that water polo, unlike basketball, could have difficulty affording. But where there's a will, there's a way. Often, anyway.

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by POWPAA - 2010/02/23 03:18

I talked to Dante Dettamanti (Stanford coach) today at our water polo class and asked him why UCLA got the bid over Stanford. The decision was made by the NCAA rules committee (a bunch of coaches, mostly). There are 6 criteria (he didn't say what they were, but I presume it's overall record, record against top teams, record against tourney teams, conference finish, etc.), and he said UCLA came out ahead in 2 of the criteria, 2 were ties, and 2

avored Stanford. The tiebreaker is head to head record. UCLA beat Stanford twice this year, and Stanford beat UCLA once, so UCLA got the bid. JDO

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by ScottyCa - 2010/02/23 03:18

USC i the conference tourny by 6 and UCLA was allowed to go to NCAA's. he out come the best tema in the country won... UCLA 8 USC 7 so in your eye critics Is UCLA the best team in the country? No, they won one game at the right time, a game by alrights they never should have even been in. UCLA was 1-3 vs. USC going into the tourney, now they are 2-3 vs. USC, they STILL trail in the season series. In the past two weeks (MPSF & NCAA) UCLA is 3-2, I hardly call 60% efficiency championship caliber play. I think they ought to play UCI again (who kicked the crap out of them by THREE goals seven days ago) and then play UOP (who ALSO beat them last week) again and THEN play USC one more time to see if they can pull even with USC for the season.

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by chuckb - 2010/02/23 03:18

USC i the conference tourny by 6 and UCLA was allowed to go to NCAA's. he out come the best tema in the country won... UCLA 8 USC 7 so in your eye critics Is UCLA the best team in the country? No, they won one game at the right time, a game by alrights they never should have even been in. UCLA was 1-3 vs. USC going into the tourney, now they are 2-3 vs. USC, they STILL trail in the season series. In the past two weeks (MPSF & NCAA) UCLA is 3-2, I hardly call 60% efficiency championship caliber play. I think they ought to play UCI again (who kicked the crap out of them by THREE goals seven days ago) and then play UOP (who ALSO beat them last week) again and THEN play USC one more time to see if they can pull even with USC for the season. What is the difference between the 1 game UOP won, against UCLA, or the 1 game UCLA won against USC? If you want to discount UCLA's victory, then don't get so upset that UOP victory was discounted. I will admit I was surprised that UCLA got to go to the tournament, and even more surprised they won. An article in the OC Rigister prior to the tournament, had the USC players commenting that the only way UCLA could win was to get them into a fight. I guess USC took it for granted. The school I'm the most impressed by in this discussion is Stanford. I haven't seen a lot of whining from them on not being chosen. NOW, on to Women's season.

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by heywhateve - 2010/02/23 03:18

<<<<<<Is UCLA the best team in the country? No, they won one game at the right time, a game by alrights they never should have even been in. UCLA was 1-3 vs. USC going into the tourney, now they are 2-3 vs. USC, they STILL trail in the season series. In the past two weeks (MPSF & NCAA) UCLA is 3-2, I hardly call 60% efficiency championship caliber play. I think they ought to play UCI again (who kicked the crap out of them by THREE goals seven days ago) and then play UOP (who ALSO beat them last week) again and THEN play USC one more time to see if they can pull even with USC for the season. Lets just replay the whole season...til \$C buy far the best team in the country...dosen't Choke.....UCLA got in and won....Scoreboard...sure they shouldn't be there...but they were, and they won....it happens in the NCAA in other sports...if you are the best team you win regardless of who you play...I guess the Trojans were not that team! ++++++

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by Steven Kan - 2010/02/23 03:18

The school I'm the most impressed by in this discussion is Stanford. I haven't seen a lot of whining from them on not being chosen. Thanks, but I can't take too much credit for that. I'm only a grad student; my varsity days were at Harvard, where the opinion was unanimous. Rules or no rules, we just sucked. We once were beaten by UCLA 23-1 or something like that. And our only goal was a desperation shot from half-court at the halftime buzzer. I'm also a closet

UCLA fan, since my fiance and my brother are alums, and I've worked w/Guy Baker a few times. So I can wax philosophic about Stanford all I want, because I have nothing personal at stake except school pride. I certainly can't guarantee I'd be this gracious if it were me!

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by Corbin Graham - 2010/02/23 03:18

OK first of all UCLA is the best team out there... They stepped up and beat USC who everyone thought was gods gift to waterpolo. Not only did they beat them they sent USC's croation quadruplet packing with passports in hand. When it came down to it the team with the most heart and talent won. UCLA exploded against usc 6 first quarter goals. IF USC was so great they would not have choked and let the title slip away yet again. And id like to see (USC play next year with MARco and Cheznich gone). How sweet. As far as playing UCI lets see UCLA won 2 of the 3 times they played this year. Yes they did loose to them in the mpsf ...Irvine had some great players but let season records speak for themselves.. But please dont place UCLA beneath UOP. Uop is a decent team and every dog has its day... UOP played great and beat a tired UCLA but in no way are they better than UCLA, simply look at there record. Bottom line two best teams (talent wise, record wise) meet in the finals and the best team came out on top.....

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by Corbin Graham - 2010/02/23 03:18

EXACTLY!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by ScottyCa - 2010/02/23 03:18

beat USC who everyone thought was gods gift to waterpolo. Not only did they beat them they sent USC's croation quadruplet packing with passports in hand. When it came down to it the team with the most heart and talent won. UCLA exploded against usc 6 first quarter goals. IF USC was so great they would not have choked and let the title slip away yet again. And id like to see (USC play next year with MARco and Cheznich gone). How sweet. As far as playing UCI lets see UCLA won 2 of the 3 times they played this year. Yes they did loose to them in the mpsf ...Irvine had some great players but let season records speak for themselves.. But please dont place UCLA beneath UOP. Uop is a decent team and every dog has its day... UOP played great and beat a tired UCLA but in no way are they better than UCLA, simply look at there record. Bottom line two best teams (talent wise, record wise) meet in the finals and the best team came out on top..... To those who pay attention.... my bottom line all along has been this..... What is the purpose of the MPSF tourney if a SIXTH place team gets invited over the teams that beat it in crunch time (the tourney) when you are supposed to be peaking? I can't think of ANY other sport where a 6th place team would get an at large bid over #'s 2,3,4 & 5. Can you imagine this in Pac-10 basketball? UCLA fans would scream bloody murder if they finished #2 in the Pac-10 behind Arizona the #6 got invited over them to the NCAA's. You can murmur all you want about overall record and season strength, but when they had the chance in the pool in the league championship & NCAA qualifying tourney at years end, they lost, pure and simple, not once, but they lost TWICE. Nothing will convince me that they deserved to go over Stanford, Cal, UCI or UOP. I think the teams that beat UCLA deserved more reward for their effort. And as a final disclaimer..... I am actually happy that UCLA won. I know players on MOST of the major teams in CA and I don't like USC's use of so many foreign players when we have so many deserving players here in So Cal, but that doesn't change my opinion that UCLA should have earned their way in through the tourney, that is the way it is in every other sport I know of. Scotty

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by Brad C Leedy - 2010/02/23 03:18

I've finally decided to throw my two cents into this after watching this go for a while now. When allusions to the NCAA men's basketball tournament are made, pointing out how if a #6 team is chosen over a #1 team, there would be hell to pay, are inaccurate. There are two reasons for this. Tournaments at the end of the season are meant to establish who

gets the automatic bid for the NCAA tournament. However, this does not, nor should it, be the only basis on which teams are selected for at-large bids. If you watch the ACC in basketball, you will see two of the most powerful programs ever in college basketball, Duke and North Carolina, both fall in the ACC tournament in the first or second round, which could leave them finishing somewhere around #6 in that tournament. However, it would be an outrage for a team like UNC or Duke, who finish with an outstanding regular season record, to get passed over for an at large bid. UCLA may not have had a good performance in the MPSF tournament, but if you want to talk about them peaking at the right time, apparently they did, as they beat USC in the NCAAs. Sometimes NCAA selections may not seem fair, but you have to also remember that unfortunately, weight is given to the programs with the bigger names. Who can think of a much bigger water polo name than UCLA? Either way, I think it was an outstanding season with an outstanding end to it. Now that I have found this newsgroup and have rejoined the water polo community, I'll be eagerly following along for the future!

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by Carey Heckman - 2010/02/23 03:18

Who can think of a much bigger water polo name than UCLA? Oh, I think I might be able to come up with a candidate for that distinction without committing a cardinal sin... :-)

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by Brad C Leedy - 2010/02/23 03:18

I just wanted to post a quick apology. It seems that when I said Who could think of a bigger water polo name than UCLA? , I might have been a little misled. For a long time I did not get to follow water polo, but have recently been trying to follow it as much as possible. UCLA and USC were always the two programs I remembered the most about, and thus that is where my comment stemmed from. Perhaps Stanford and Irvine are also both big names. My apologies to all!!!

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by Corbin Graham - 2010/02/23 03:18

Well I can see your logic... but here a few ideas to think about.....Dont use basketball as an analogy, they dont have a tourney for the conference at the end of the season because they let the whole season speak for it self. Another idea(hypothetical) according to your theory a undefeated team who loses first round of the mpsf touirny shouldnt go to NCAA's and for arguments sake lets say they lost to a below 500 team(for the season) who some how manages to put together 3 good games. Your telling me that the below 500 team should go over the team who is lets say 26 and 1... That doesnt make any sence.

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by ScottyCa - 2010/02/23 03:18

watching this go for a while now. When allusions to the NCAA men's basketball tournament are made, pointing out how if a #6 team is chosen over a #1 team, there would be hell to pay, are inaccurate. There are two reasons for this. Tournaments at the end of the season are meant to establish who gets the automatic bid for the NCAA tournament. However, this does not, nor should it, be the only basis on which teams are selected for at-large bids. If you watch the ACC in basketball, you will see two of the most powerful programs ever in college basketball, Duke and North Carolina, both fall in the ACC tournament in the first or second round, which could leave them finishing somewhere around #6 in that tournament. However, it would be an outrage for a team like UNC or Duke, who finish with an outstanding regular season record, to get passed over for an at large bid. UCLA may not have had a good performance in the MPSF tournament, but if you want to talk about them peaking at the right time, apparently they did, as they beat USC in the NCAAs. Oh bless you Brad, you were the only one to fall into my basketball tourney trap so we could keep this string alive one more round..... When a Duke is upset and finishes 6th in the ACC tournament in

basketball, but goes anyway, it isn't that they go over the #2,3,4 teams in their conference, they go in ADDITION to those teams because of the ACC's strength, the teams that are knocked out are from weaker conferences where maybe only their champion goes. Bringing us back to..... the NCAA water polo tourney is too small..... going back to an 8 team format would lend more legitamacy to the process AND help the other weaker conferences that used to get four teams into the tourney. It might encourage some of the club level teams to step up to varsity status if they had a chance to go to the NCAA's..... Or.... you could expand back to an 8 team format and take two teams out of the club championships to play in the NCAA's..... I'd love to see the U of A playing UCLA..... Scotty

=====

acc regular season champs basketball Why Stanford didn't get the bid

Posted by ScottyCa - 2010/02/23 03:18

who some how manages to put together 3 good games. Your telling me that the below 500 team should go over the team who is lets say 26 and 1... That doesnt make any sence. Hey Corbo, congrats on making All-American, that is AWESOME!

=====