



Babson

"The Beavers"

Weekly Games Report: Week of November 24, 2025

Team Overview

Record	NPI	Efficiency	Tempo	Height	Rotation Size	Returning	Experience	New Pts/30
3-2	50.984 (#133)	20.1 (#51)	71.4	68.2" (#173)	8	59.6% (#199)	3.0 (#94)	36.5 (#59)

Record: Current year Win-Loss record vs. D3 opponents.

NPI: NCAA Power Index (NPI) value.

Efficiency: Per possession measure of a team's points scored and points allowed.

Tempo: Possessions per 40 minutes.

Height: Minutes weighted height in inches.

Rotation Size: Number of players who have played 6% of the team's minutes.

Returning: Percent of prior year scoring that returns to the roster.

Experience: Minutes played weighted class year of the team.

New Player Pts/30: The total Points/30min among players who are (a) new to the roster, (b) playing at least 6% of the team's minutes.

Composite Rankings

D3Hoops.com Top 25	Massey Rank	NPI Rank	Efficiency Rank	Current Season Results
--------------------	-------------	----------	-----------------	------------------------

Unranked	#80	#133	#51	#87
----------	-----	------	-----	-----

Rankings Sources: D3Hoops.com poll, Massey Ratings, NPI (NCAA Power Index), Efficiency ratings (adjusted efficiency margin), and Current Season Results composite ranking.

The D3Hoops.com poll is published on Monday evenings after this report has been generated, so these values will lag a week.

Games: 11/24 - 11/30/2025

Date	Opponent	Opp Rank	Win Prob	Exp. Upside	Exp. Downside
2025-11-24	Brandeis	#18	53.0%	1.1%	-2.3%
Leverage: 8.2% NPI Swing: +1.36					
2025-11-28	Pomona-Pitzer	#98	92.3%	0.3%	-0.5%
Leverage: 4.3% NPI Swing: +1.11					
2025-11-29	Claremont-Mudd-Scripps	#56	84.2%	1.7%	-1.4%
Leverage: 7.8% NPI Swing: +1.34					

Opp Rank: NPI Rank of opponent.

Win Prob: Your team's win probability based solely off current efficiency scores and home court advantage.

Exp. Upside: A combination of how much your NCAA Tournament odds change if you win and how likely you are to win.

Exp. Downside: A combination of how much your NCAA Tournament odds change if you lose and how likely you are to lose.

Leverage: The difference in NCAA Tournament odds between a win and a loss.

NPI Swing: The difference in average final NPI value between winning and losing this game (signed value: positive means winning improves NPI).

Early season Leverage is still a work-in-progress

For teams who make the NCAA Tournament in 100% of simulations, technically no game has any "leverage" or "NPI swing" since we don't have a batch of wins and a separate batch of losses to compare.

Opponent Key Players: Brandeis (11/24/2025)

Player	Yr	Ht	Pts/30	Reb/30	Ast/30	Impact	Min%
Abby Kennedy	SR	5'7	27.5	6.2	2.0	35.8	12.2%
Sofia Berisha	JR	5'10	12.7	8.9	4.3	25.9	12.0%
Katherine Vaughan	SR	6'0	11.5	10.5	2.1	24.1	11.9%
Maya Williams	SR	6'0	6.3	9.4	1.9	17.6	16.0%
Saviah Shabazz	SO	5'4	6.3	6.0	3.0	15.3	16.4%

Impact: The sum of Pts/30Min, Reb/30Min, Ast/30Min. Players sorted by Impact score with 6%+ minutes threshold players listed first.

Opponent Key Players: Pomona-Pitzer (11/28/2025)

Player	Yr	Ht	Pts/30	Reb/30	Ast/30	Impact	Min%
Avery Patricco	FR	5'7	15.5	3.0	3.7	22.2	10.8%
Abigail Homan	JR	6'0	12.9	5.5	2.1	20.5	17.3%
Sara Chicco	SO	5'10	15.4	4.9	0.0	20.3	9.0%
Emily Lee	SR	5'6	12.9	3.8	1.7	18.5	10.4%
Jadyn Lee	JR	5'9	8.6	4.9	3.2	16.7	14.8%

Impact: The sum of Pts/30Min, Reb/30Min, Ast/30Min. Players sorted by Impact score with 6%+ minutes threshold players listed first.

Opponent Key Players: Claremont-Mudd-Scripps (11/29/2025) CMS

Player	Yr	Ht	Pts/30	Reb/30	Ast/30	Impact	Min%
Katie Resendiz	SR	5'10	15.7	6.5	0.5	22.7	10.8%
Caleigh Edwards	GR	5'10	10.3	5.9	2.5	18.6	15.4%
<i>TRANSFER from Chestnut Hill (CC)</i>							
Haylie Wang	FR	5'10	10.4	5.8	1.5	17.8	9.6%
Renee Chong	SR	5'5	9.4	4.5	1.0	14.9	14.9%
Tanya Ghai	JR	5'6	9.1	2.8	1.9	13.8	16.8%

Impact: The sum of Pts/30Min, Reb/30Min, Ast/30Min. Players sorted by Impact score with 6%+ minutes threshold players listed first.

Babson Roster

Player	Yr	Ht	Pts/30	Reb/30	Ast/30	Impact	Min%
Emily Flynn	GR	5'10	17.5	9.1	5.0	31.7	12.5%
Alyssa Hopps	FR	5'10	13.6	12.3	0.4	26.3	7.3%
Samantha Reale	JR	5'8	12.9	9.1	2.3	24.3	14.2%
Chloe Perreault	SR	5'9	10.4	7.1	2.2	19.6	13.6%
Rylie Rosenberg	SO	5'3	11.5	4.3	3.3	19.1	9.1%
<i>TRANSFER from Merrimack (D1)</i>							
Molly Donovan	FR	5'10	11.4	4.7	0.8	17.0	7.6%
Julia St. Laurent	SO	5'11	5.5	4.7	1.6	11.7	11.5%
Allessia Carlo	SR	5'4	4.1	2.0	3.0	9.1	13.2%

Player	Yr	Ht	Pts/30	Reb/30	Ast/30	Impact	Min%
Gianna Langone	SR	6'0	6.7	6.7	3.3	16.7	0.9%
Sophie Mahar	FR	5'4	0.0	15.0	0.0	15.0	0.2%
Brooke Canty	S0	5'10	8.5	4.6	1.5	14.6	3.9%
Mary Kate Flynn	S0	6'0	2.4	7.2	1.2	10.8	2.5%
Alessa Mendoza	S0	5'6	6.0	0.9	2.6	9.4	3.5%
Madison Hart	S0	5'5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
Kayli Vesterholm	FR	5'10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
Devon Burke	FR	5'10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%

Note: For players whose year and/or height are not specified on the team's website, we use the placeholder values of FR and 5'7".

Impact: The sum of Pts/30Min, Reb/30Min, Ast/30Min. A quick way to sort the top contributors.

Players are sorted by Impact score. Those meeting the 6% minimum minutes threshold are listed first, followed by others.

Player Plus/Minus

Player	Games	Total +/-	Avg +/-
Emily Flynn	5	+46	+9.2
Julia St Laurent	2	+16	+8.0
Samantha Reale	5	+34	+6.8
Alyssa Hopps	5	+27	+5.4
Brooke Cantly	4	+17	+4.2
Chloe Perreault	5	+21	+4.2
Rylie Rosenberg	5	+21	+4.2
Alessa Mendoza	5	+20	+4.0
Allessia Carlo	5	+18	+3.6
Mary Kate Flynn	5	+13	+2.6
Sophie Mahar	1	+2	+2.0
Gianna Langone	2	+3	+1.5
Molly Donovan	5	+6	+1.2

Plus/Minus tracks the point differential when each player is on the court. A positive value means the team outscored opponents while that player was playing.

Players are sorted by Average Plus/Minus (highest to lowest).

Past Week Results

Date	Opponent	Result	Score	Opp NPI	Game NPI
11/18/25	Tufts	Loss	63-67	52.49	41.99
11/22/25	Albertus Magnus	Win	74-50	43.12	54.50

Efficiency Metrics: Week Over Week Change

Metric	Current	Previous	Change (Δ)
Efficiency Margin	20.1	20.1	0.00

Efficiency (Margin) is "the number of points (per 100 possessions) by which the team in question would be expected to beat an average team."

Explanation and data pulled from the wonderful [D3Datacast](#)

NPI Change Analysis

Starting NPI: 53.655 (#90) → **Ending NPI:** 50.984 (#133)

Net Change: -2.671 (dropped 43 spots)

Baseline calculated from games through 2025-11-16.

Past Opponents' Recent Results (Top 5 & Worst 5 Game NPI)

These are games played in the past week by teams you have already faced. Their results have an impact on your overall NPI

Top 5 Performances:

Past Opponent	Their Opponent	Result	Score	Game NPI	Date
Endicott	Nichols	W	65-59	61.51	11/19
Tufts	Roger Williams	W	68-57	60.95	11/21
Tufts	Babson	W	67-63	60.79	11/18
Roger Williams	Curry	W	68-44	55.34	11/19
Endicott	Bates	L	44-56	50.16	11/22

Worst 5 Performances:

Past Opponent	Their Opponent	Result	Score	Game NPI	Date
Curry	Emmanuel	L	63-79	38.93	11/22
Albertus Magnus	Babson	L	50-74	40.79	11/22
Albertus Magnus	Springfield	L	48-71	43.72	11/19
Tufts	Scranton	L	42-73	49.06	11/23
Endicott	Bates	L	44-56	50.16	11/22

NPI Minimum Wins Threshold Impact Tracker

The NPI formula wants to allow teams to not count a win if it hurts your NPI (a win over a weak team might get you a fairly low single game NPI score). However, a team has to have 15 wins (errr, 16!) before they are eligible to potentially drop a low-counting win.

This Minimum Wins Threshold is named fairly poorly. It is NOT the minimum number of wins to be postseason eligible.

Current Wins: 3 / 15



Remaining Schedule:


- **20 games** remaining
- 6 vs Top-50 teams
- 4 vs Top-100 teams
- 10 vs Other teams

Based on simulations:

- Median finish: **19 wins** (well above threshold)
- **70%** chance to reach 15 wins

Team Performance Radar

Multi-dimensional view of team performance across key metrics, normalized to 0-100 scale and compared to national average.



Strengths: NPI Rank, Efficiency, Tournament %, Strength of Schedule

Areas for Improvement: None identified

Raw Values: NPI Rank #133, Efficiency 20.1, Tournament 12.7%, Win% 60.0%, SOS 48.7

Season Simulations

Tournament Stats		Season Outlook	
Metric	Value	Metric	Value
Tournament %	12.7%		
Auto Bid %	4.8%		
At Large %	7.9%		
ALWYNI	8.3%	Median Wins-Losses	19-8
QF %	2.2%	Median NPI Value	56.300
Semifinal %	4.6%	Min NPI Value	49.400
Final %	23.2%	Max NPI Value	62.000
Top 4 %	0.0%		
Top 8 %	0.0%		
Top 16 %	0.2%		

Tournament %: Percentage of 1000 simulations where the team makes the NCAA Tournament.

Auto Bid %: Percentage of sims where the team wins their conference tournament.

At-Large %: Percent of sims where the team gets an at-large (Pool C) bid.

ALWYNI: At Large when you need it, % of sims where the team doesn't win their conference tournament and gets an at-large bid. This is more useful than At Large %, since we really only care about the number of times you got an at-large when you were ELIGIBLE for one. If you won your conference tournament then the sims never even check if you would've gotten an at-large bid.

QF %: Percent of sims where you lose in your conference tournament's quarterfinals and get an at-large bid.

Top 4 %: Percent of sims where the team ends in the top 4 of NPI.

Top 8 %: Same as above, but for top 8.

Top 16 %: Same as above, but for top 16.

Median Wins-Losses: The median number of wins and losses across sims.

Median NPI Value: The median NPI value across all sims.

Δ (Delta): Week-over-week changes from snapshot.

Semifinal %: Same as above, but for when you lose in the semis.

Final %: Same as above, but for when you lose in the finals.

Simulations are NOT predictions. These simulations help provide an idea of the median of the range of outcomes for your team, based on (a) their current Efficiency Margin, (b) the rest of their schedule (and THOSE team's current Efficiency Margin).

The displayed data from these Simulations often reflects the median of a range of outcomes. In reality, once a team plays a game that wide range of potential outcomes over 1,000 simulations becomes set in stone as a Win or a Loss.

Simulations are no replacement for playing the games. They are merely a way to illustrate the possible range of outcomes for a team, using all currently known data.

Conference Standings

Team	Overall	Non-Conf	Conf
Clark	6-0	5-0	1-0
Smith (#4)	4-0	4-0	0-0
Emerson	4-2	4-2	0-0
Springfield	4-2	4-2	0-0
WPI	2-2	2-1	0-1
Babson	3-2	3-2	0-0
Coast Guard	3-2	3-2	0-0
Wellesley	2-2	2-2	0-0
Wheaton (MA)	2-3	2-3	0-0
Salve Regina	2-5	2-5	0-0
MIT	1-4	1-4	0-0
Mt. Holyoke	0-6	0-6	0-0

Generated on November 24, 2025 at 04:30 PM

This report generated by [TheD3StatLab](#), with no affiliation to the NCAA or the school