

Covering Pac-8, PCAA, and southern California college track & field.
16 issues annually; Subscriptions \$4.00/year; \$5.00 air mail.
John R. Wenos, P.O. Box 11605, Santa Ana, California 92711.

(This issue only - \$1.00)

1974 NATIONAL DUAL MEET RATINGS

1974 sees UCLA repeating its top ranking, becoming the first team in the history of the ratings to capture three titles in a row. While this is not really the time to be predicting 1975's outcome, it's very likely the Bruins will make it four in a row. Only in the weight events do they appear to lose more points than will be returning in '75.

At the start of the '74 season, coach Jim Bush was not overly optimistic in public statements, preferring to give the favorite's role to arch-rival USC. The Trojans were coming off a (for them) disastrous season and were bolstered by, perhaps, the finest group of 'blue chip' freshmen in the country. The Bruins were basically young, too, but with veterans leading the way, the youngsters quickly caught the Bruin spirit and swept to nine wins without defeat over one of the nation's more imposing schedules. High point, of course was the 82 - 63 triumph over USC to decide the national title. Top-10'ers Tennessee and Oregon also were Bruin victims.

In terms of all-time greatness, this UCLA squad probably does not compare in sheer talent with '73's powerhouse - at least not on paper. Greatness is, however, a relative term, and compared to the other top 1974 college squads, the Bruins had a comfortable enough margin. This was, to my recollection, a season filled with more outstanding teams than any previous year. The statistics seem to bear this out - only UCLA among top ten teams scored less than the correspondingly placed team last year. In fact, this holds through all the way down the list to 25th place. And this with a revised scoring system that would tend to lower point totals slightly.

For sheer excitement, the UCLA - Tennessee dual was the best dual I witnessed during the year. The meet, held in a cold drizzle went down to the mile relay. Had the Bruins chosen to do a little more 'doubling' it may not have been as suspenseful, but for the 2,000 fans that braved the elements, it was well worth it.

Individually, 1974 saw many outstanding dual meet performances. All-time dual meet bests were set by BYU's Paul Cummings, 3:56.4 in the mile; UCLA's Clarence Taylor, 54-11 3/4 in the TJ, and UTEP's Peter Farmer, 227-10 in the HT. Farmer's teammate Chris Garpenborg tied the 100-yard standard at 9.2.

In the overall team picture, 1974's top 50 contested a total of 289 dual meets. In only 22 of those (7.6%) did a team lose to one rated lower, and only nine of those losses were to non-rated teams (but all received honorable mention). Several of those losses were in old, traditional rivalries, and you can usually throw out the dope sheet in those, anyway.

Perhaps the best illustration of the even competition and uncertainty in old rivalries is the Pac-8's northern division. Oregon lost a 23 point decision to Washington, then beat Washington State by a 21 point margin. Logic says Washington should handle its state rival handily, but instead the Huskies came out on the short end of an 84 - 79 score.

This also is a good illustration of what these ratings attempt to do. That is, not necessarily show who beat whom, but to show how each team compares overall to the other top teams in the country. The ratings are combination of what each team actually accomplished during the season and what each team could do in idealized competition.

Most noticeably improved team in 1974 was Washington, jumping from 27th to tenth, a mere 0.1 point out of ninth. The Huskies, another of the 'young' teams on the west coast, picked up several outstanding newcomers, and according to our northwest resident expert, Jack Pfeifer, are a good bet to challenge higher-ranking teams next year.

Actual compilation of the ratings, except for the sheer volume of work, is a fairly simple matter. Two major areas are covered, as mentioned previously, Actual performance (what the team actually did during the season) and Hypothetical performance (how each team would do against all the others in 'ideal' competition, as determined by best marks).

Actual performance is based on several sub-categories:

Winning percentage - the team's winning percentage is the total points scored in this section.

Margin of victory - The points scored in this category are one-half of the team's margin over its opponents. A minus average is scored only as 'zero'.

Schedule toughness - Each team on the schedule of each rated team is given a numerical rating according to its toughness as a dual meet opponent. All rated teams are scored from 91 to 100. Non-rated teams from 90 to a low (this year) of 27. The average rating of its opponents is the point total in this category.

Depth - The section measures each team's depth in terms of quality and quantity. Each team is allowed three men per event for scoring purposes. All marks made between Oct. 1, 1973 and the final day of the NCAA championships are eligible for scoring. Relay legs plus one second are used if that mark exceeds the athlete's best open time. Wind-aided marks are adjusted by subtracting one foot in the jumps and adding 0.2 to sprint or hurdle times.

'Quality' is scored as follows: A mark equalling or exceeding the collegiate record scores four points; a mark equalling or exceeding the tenth best collegiate performer's scores three points; a mark meeting or exceeding Track & Field News' reporting standards scores two points; a mark meeting or exceeding a slightly lower standard (as shown below) scores one point.

100-	9.7	HJ -	6-8
220-	21.4	PV -	15-0
440-	47.8	LJ -	23-10
880-	1:51.5	TJ -	48-6
mile-	4:08.5	SP -	54-0
3 mile (or 2mi +5min)	13:55.0	DT -	165-0
stpl-	9:20.0	HT -	160-0
HH -	14.3	JT -	220-0
IH -	53.5	440 R-	41.5
		mile R-	3:13.5

In addition, one 'quantity' point is scored for each mark that is scored in this category.

The Actual performance point total is the sum of these four categories plus place comparison points, the total of each team's relative rank in the categories subtracted from 200.

Hypothetical performance is simply a series of 'paper dual meets' matching each of the teams against the other 49 rated teams. Two points are scored for each victory in this section, one point for a tie. In addition, the team scores five per cent of its margin of victory in each dual as a bonus. Thus, if a team wins by 30 points, it would gain 3.5 points for that victory.

The combined total of the two categories determines the final order of the top 50 teams. This year's ratings involved, at one time, over 115 teams under consideration. By the end of the NCAA, there were still over 60 teams in the running. A preliminary rating was done based on actual performance and the top 40 were automatically 'in' the final ratings. A mini-series of paper duals was conducted to select the final ten teams for the ratings.

Each year we cannot stress enough the appreciation we have for the great work of correspondents, coaches, and SID's in compiling the great amount of information needed to publish these ratings. Obviously, without their help, none of this would be possible. It would literally take a full page to mention each of them, but every contributor is a vital, necessary part of this project. Needless to say, I thank you all.

We invite comments and criticisms of the ratings; there are most undoubtedly areas that might be improved and your suggestions have been most helpful in the development of the ratings.

A NOTE TO POSSIBLE SUBSCRIBERS: Recent increases in postage, paper supplies, and other materials necessary to publish West Coast Track Stats are straining our budget. We've had to cut the number of 'comp' copies (except for regular contributors) and to further alleviate the strain, a price increase is likely after the first of the year. We'll hold the line until then, so if you're thinking of subscribing, the time is now.

WINNING PERCENTAGE

1. UTEP(4-0)	100.0	26. Brigham Young (6-2)	75.0
Louisiana Tech(7-0)	100.0	Cal Poly/SLO (3-1)	75.0
Navy (12-0)	100.0	Oregon State (6-2)	75.0
Northridge State(8-0)	100.0	Penn State (3-1)	75.0
UCLA (9-0)	100.0	30. Fresno State (5-2)	71.4
Western Kentucky(5-0)	100.0	31. Arizona (8-4)	66.7
Western Michigan(7-0)	100.0	Florida (4-2)	66.7
William & Mary (2-0)	100.0	Idaho State (4-2)	66.7
9. Baylor (12-1)	92.3	Oklahoma (8-4)	66.7
10. Indiana (11-1)	91.7	Washington (4-2)	66.7
11. Texas (11-1)	91.7	36. New Mexico (7-4)	63.6
12. Louisiana State(8-1)	88.9	37. Alabama (3-2)	60.0
Tennessee (8-1)	88.9	38. California (4-3)	57.1
14. Baptist (7-1)	87.5	39. Long Beach State(5-4)	55.6
Pennsylvania(7-1)	87.5	Rice (5-4)	55.6
Washington State(7-1)	87.5	41. Colorado State (6-6)	50.0
17. Manhattan (6-1)	85.7	Florida State (2-2)	50.0
18. Missouri (5-1)	83.3	Texas A&M (5-5)	50.0
19. Kansas (4-1)	80.0	Wisconsin (5-5)	50.0
Kansas State (8-2)	80.0	45. Arizona State (5-6)	45.5
Nebraska (4-1)	80.0	46. Colorado (2-3)	40.0
Southern California(4-1)	80.0	Oregon (2-3)	40.0
23. Eastern Michigan(7-2)	77.8	48. Maryland (1-2)	33.3
Los Angeles State(7-2)	77.8	Southern Illinois(2-4)	33.3
San Jose State(7-2)	77.8	50. Illinois (1-3)	25.0

MARGIN OF VICTORY

1. Western Michigan	29.4	26. Idaho State	13.8
2. Western Kentucky	28.4	27. Penn State	13.6
3. William & Mary	27.5	28. Arizona	12.2
4. Fresno State	26.9	29. Brigham Young	12.0
5. Navy	25.8	30. San Jose State	11.3
6. Texas	25.1	31. New Mexico	10.8
7. Baptist	24.0	32. Florida State	9.1
8. Northridge State	23.7	33. Washington	7.8
9. Pennsylvania	23.1	34. Kansas	7.3
10. Oregon State	22.1	35. Oklahoma	4.7
11. Tennessee	22.0	36. Colorado State	4.3
12. Eastern Michigan	21.3	Florida	4.3
Southern California	21.3	38. California	3.9
14. Indiana	20.6	39. Alabama	3.8
15. Los Angeles State	20.5	40. Long Beach State	3.7
16. Baylor	19.3	41. Wisconsin	3.0
17. Louisiana Tech	19.1	42. Nebraska	2.7
18. UCLA	19.0	43. Arizona State	2.4
19. Washington State	18.7	44. Southern Illinois	2.2
20. Kansas State	17.1	45. Texas A&M	0.6
21. UTEP	16.9	46. Oregon	0.0 (-3.3)
22. Missouri	15.3	47. Rice	0.0 (-4.5)
23. Cal Poly/SLO	14.6	48. Maryland	0.0 (-7.3)
24. Louisiana State	14.4	49. Illinois	0.0 (-9.1)
25. Manhattan	14.1	50. Colorado	0.0 (-10.6)

SCHEDULE TOUGHNESS

1. Oregon	98.6	26. Texas	82.9
2. UTEP	96.5	27. Wisconsin	82.8
3. Southern California	95.8	28. Oklahoma	82.2
Washington	95.8	29. Indiana	82.0
5. Nebraska	95.6	Tennessee	82.0
UCLA	95.6	31. Oregon State	81.0
7. Colorado	93.6	32. New Mexico	79.4
8. Florida	93.0	33. Missouri	79.3
Illinois	93.0	34. Washington State	77.9
10. Arizona State	92.2	35. Northridge State	74.5
11. Brigham Young	90.1	Cal Poly/SLO	74.5
California	90.1	37. Colorado State	71.8
13. Alabama	89.4	38. Baylor	70.8
14. San Jose State	89.1	39. Manhattan	69.3
15. Southern Illinois	88.7	40. Idaho State	69.0
16. Arizona	88.6	41. Navy	68.8
17. Florida State	88.3	42. Baptist	66.4
Kansas State	88.3	43. Los Angeles State	66.2
19. Long Beach State	88.1	44. Fresno State	65.6
20. Maryland	88.0	45. Eastern Michigan	65.0
21. Kansas	87.4	46. William & Mary	64.5
22. Louisiana State	87.1	47. Western Kentucky	59.0
23. Texas A&M	86.5	48. Pennsylvania	58.4
24. Rice	86.1	49. Western Michigan	57.7
25. Penn State	83.0	50. Louisiana Tech	53.6

DEPTH

1. Oregon State	104	26. Florida	50
2. UCLA	103	27. Colorado State	48
3. Southern California	94	28. Oklahoma	46
4. Texas	90	29. Baylor	45
Oregon	90	30. Manhattan	44
Tennessee	89	Missouri	44
7. Washington State	84	32. Illinois	43
UTEP	84	Wisconsin	43
9. Indiana	81	34. Florida State	42
10. Washington	79	Maryland	42
11. Brigham Young	75	36. Eastern Michigan	41
12. Pennsylvania	73	William & Mary	41
13. Kansas State	71	38. Texas A&M	40
14. Arizona	67	39. Rice	39
15. San Jose State	66	40. Idaho State	38
16. Arizona State	65	41. Long Beach State	36
17. Western Kentucky	64	Baptist	36
18. Kansas	62	Northridge State	36
19. Alabama	59	Western Michigan	36
California	59	45. Cal Poly/SLO	35
21. Southern Illinois	58	New Mexico	35
22. Navy	56	47. Fresno State	32
Penn State	56	48. Nebraska	30
24. Louisiana State	54	49. Los Angeles State	27
25. Colorado	51	Louisiana Tech	27

ACTUAL PERFORMANCE

1. UCLA	491.6	26. Florida	313.0
2. UTEP	466.4	27. Baptist	309.9
3. Southern California	454.1	28. Alabama	304.2
4. Texas	443.7	29. California	304.1
5. Tennessee	423.9	30. Manhattan	302.1
6. Oregon State	414.1	31. Nebraska	294.3
7. Indiana	413.3	32. Arizona State	291.1
8. Washington State	390.7	33. Eastern Michigan	289.1
9. Kansas State	387.4	34. Louisiana Tech	282.7
10. Western Kentucky	384.4	35. Oklahoma	277.6
11. Navy	381.6	36. Fresno State	270.9
12. Brigham Young	375.1	37. Cal Poly/SLO	270.1
13. Washington	372.3	38. Florida State	265.4
14. Pennsylvania	369.0	39. Los Angeles State	261.5
15. Louisiana State	362.4	40. Colorado	256.6
16. San Jose State	362.2	41. Southern Illinois	254.2
17. Northridge State	349.2	42. Idaho State	250.5
18. Missouri	348.9	43. New Mexico	244.8
19. William & Mary	347.0	44. Long Beach State	244.4
20. Arizona	345.5	45. Wisconsin	237.8
21. Kansas	344.7	46. Colorado State	233.1
22. Baylor	335.4	47. Rice	231.7
23. Oregon	331.6	48. Texas A&M	230.1
24. Western Michigan	331.1	49. Illinois	222.0
25. Penn State	327.6	50. Maryland	213.3

HYPOTHETICAL PERFORMANCE

1. UCLA (49-0)	444.7	26. Pennsylvania(24-24-1)	125.8
2. Southern Cal (46-3)	420.1	27. Wisconsin (21-28)	82.1
3. Texas (48-1)	380.8	28. Florida State(20-29)	71.5
4. Tennessee (47-2)	373.8	29. Long Beach State(17-32)	70.9
5. Oregon State (44-5)	362.9	30. Maryland (17-32)	68.3
6. Oregon (45-4)	351.2	31. Illinois (16-33)	59.6
7. Washington (43-6)	294.7	32. New Mexico (16-33)	58.5
8. UTEP (41-8)	280.0	33. Rice (16-33)	57.6
9. Washington State(42-7)	276.4	34. Eastern Michigan(16-33)	56.9
10. Indiana (39-10)	263.2	35. Baylor (15-33-1)	56.5
11. Brigham Young (40-9)	259.6	36. Oklahoma (15-34)	55.5
12. Arizona (35-14)	217.5	37. Missouri (16-33)	54.9
13. San Jose State (35-13-1)	215.3	38. Northridge State(13-35-1)	52.6
14. Arizona State(36-13)	212.6	39. Idaho State (14-35)	49.6
15. Western Kentucky(35-14)	195.9	40. Colorado State(12-37)	42.3
16. Kansas (33-15-1)	190.9	41. Cal Poly/SLO (10-39)	39.6
17. Kansas State (33-15-1)	182.0	42. Baptist (11-38)	39.5
18. California (30-18-1)	174.3	43. Texas A&M (6-43)	22.6
19. Alabama (29-20)	150.9	44. Nebraska (6-43)	18.4
20. Louisiana State(29-20)	150.2	45. Manhattan (6-43)	18.4
21. Colorado (29-19-1)	147.1	46. William & Mary (4-45)	17.1
22. Florida (28-21)	145.5	47. Fresno State (5-43-1)	15.6
23. Navy (27-22)	143.3	48. Los Angeles State(4-45)	14.9
24. Penn State (27-22)	139.8	49. Western Michigan(2-47)	5.3
25. Southern Illinois(26-21-2)	134.6	50. Louisiana Tech(1-47-1)	4.5

FINAL STANDINGS

1. UCLA	936.3
2. Southern California	874.2
3. Texas	824.5
4. Tennessee	797.7
5. Oregon State	777.0
6. UTEP	746.4
7. Oregon	682.8
8. Indiana	676.5
9. Washington State	667.1
10. Washington	667.0
11. Brigham Young	674.7
12. Western Kentucky	580.3
13. San Jose State	577.5
14. Kansas State	569.4
15. Arizona	563.0
16. Kansas	535.6
17. Navy	524.9
18. Louisiana State	512.6
19. Arizona State	503.7
20. Pennsylvania	494.8
21. California	478.4
22. Penn State	467.4
23. Florida	458.5
24. Alabama	455.1
25. Missouri	403.8
26. Colorado	403.7
27. Northridge State	401.8
28. Baylor	391.9
29. Southern Illinois	388.8
30. William & Mary	364.1
31. Baptist	349.4
32. Eastern Michigan	346.0
33. Florida State	336.9
34. Western Michigan	336.4
35. Oklahoma	333.1
36. Manhattan	320.5
37. Wisconsin	319.9
38. Long Beach State	315.6
39. Nebraska	312.9
40. Cal Poly/SLO	309.7
41. New Mexico	303.3
42. Idaho State	300.1
43. Rice	289.3
44. Louisiana Tech	287.2
45. Fresno State	286.5
46. Maryland	281.6
47. Illinois	279.6
48. Los Angeles State	276.4
49. Colorado State	275.4
50. Texas A&M	252.7

HONORABLE MENTION: Harvard, Occidental, Air Force, Michigan State, South Carolina, Ohio State, Southern California College, Stanford, Minnesota, Michigan, Eastern New Mexico, Drake, Purdue, Kent State, North Texas State, Bowling Green State, Utah, Cal Poly/Pomona, San Diego State; Pittsburgh & Texas Southern, only one dual meet.