



ASAA TENNIS STATE CHAMPIONSHIP SEEDING GUIDELINES

Philosophy

The objective of seeding is to separate players who, in the tournament committee's informed opinion, are most likely to win the tournament. These guidelines are intended to comprise an objective framework for consistent and defensible decisions. However, there will always be unique circumstances that do not fit well within this paradigm. Therefore, it is important that the tournament committee retain the flexibility to consider all available information, including other objective and subjective factors not listed below, at their collective discretion.

Process

Each coach will submit a seeding form (online) for any possible seeded athlete. A committee appointed by ASAA of knowledgeable tennis individuals will seed each division. Under normal circumstances 2 competitors will be seeded. However, up to four competitors per division may be seeded. The remaining competitors will be randomly drawn in.

Seeding Criteria - Singles.

The following criteria should generally be considered sequentially. If more than two players are being considered for a given seed, the same process is applied until one player is separated (either selected as the seed, or eliminated). The process returns to step 1 to assess the remaining players.

1. IN-SEASON HEAD-TO-HEAD RESULTS
 - 1a. win-loss record between players
(within the season, if players split multiple matches, no preference is given to sequence of the wins/losses)
 - 1b. percentage of sets won (all matches directly between players considered)
 - 1c. quality/decisiveness of wins between players, if split*
2. COMMON OPPONENTS
In general, apply criteria 1a-1c, considering all matches played between players under consideration and the common opponent(s). When considering more than 2 players, and there are common opponent(s) between 2 of the players, but not others, in general this criterion should not suffice to eliminate the other players who do not have data/matches with that opponent(s).
3. NOTABLE WINS AND LOSSES
This criterion considers match results against players/teams other than common opponents included in Criterion #3. Notable wins include those over generally-accepted strong players/teams who are not otherwise being considered for seeding in this event, due to participation in another event, non-eligibility, or other reason. Conversely, notable losses include those to players/teams who are generally considered significantly weaker than the teams being considered for seeding. The determination of "strong" and "weak" for this evaluation is intentionally vague, in order to

accommodate a wide range of potential applications, and will require careful assessment by the tournament committee.

4. REGION TOURNAMENT RESULTS

Performance in a region tournament does not necessarily provide comparative data, but typically does indicate a minimum level of accomplishment. Lacking a preponderance of other data (which is likely if the process has proceeded to Criterion #5), such accomplishment can be rewarded (akin to pro sports leagues, where division winners are rewarded with high seeds, even if they are weaker than 2nd place teams in other divisions). Preference is limited to those who reach at least the quarter-finals of their region tournament.

5. OVERALL WIN-LOSS RECORD

This criterion is not higher on the list due to problems with comparing records. For example, an “undefeated” record of 3-0 may be stronger than a 4-2 record, but weaker than an 8-4 record, or even a 2-1 record, depending on the opponents. For most circumstances, use a win-loss differential (i.e. the 3-0 record is +3, the 4-2 record is +2, and the 8-4 record is +4). This rewards players who complete many matches at that position, and also accumulate wins.

6. PREVIOUS YEAR’S STATE TOURNAMENT RESULTS

This preference is reserved for players who were champions or runners-up of the previous year’s state tournament. Only the previous year is considered.

7. OUT-OF-SEASON HEAD-TO-HEAD RESULTS

Out-of-season matches includes matches played before the season started, or outside ASAA sanctioned events (e.g. senior tournaments held during the season). Apply criteria 1a-1c, to matches played 6 months prior to season. Unlike the in-season criterion, preference is given to sequence – matches played closer in time to the ASAA season are given greater weight.

*Decisiveness is somewhat subjective, and is not the same as percentage of games won, but can generally be considered in categories – “convincing” (winner loses only a few games in the match), “compatible” (e.g. 6-3, 6-3; or 6-1, 6-4; etc.), “competitive” (e.g. 6-4, 6-4), or “even” (e.g. 7-6, 7-6 or 3 close sets)

Seeding Criteria - Doubles.

Seeding for doubles presents an additional challenge for strong teams that have not played many matches together, and thus do not have an extensive match resume. For those teams that do have match histories, the criteria for singles seeding should also be applied to doubles seeding. For teams that do not have match histories, the process will be more subjective, but should consider the following factors:

1. Doubles resumes with different partners (both players)
2. Singles resumes (both players)
3. Overall win-loss record

In general, all else being equal, preference should be given to teams that have an established record playing together.