



Claremont-Mudd-Scripps

"The Athenas"

Weekly Games Report: Week of December 29, 2025

Team Overview

OUT

Record	NPI	Efficiency	Tempo	Height	Rotation Size	Returning	Experience	New Pts/30
9–2	55.172 (#71)	24.5 (#54)	72.9	68.0" (#208)	6	54.8% (#243)	3.3 (#41)	30.6 (#97)

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.

Tournament Status:

AUTO BID Projected conference champion

AT-LARGE Projected at-large selection

OUT Not currently projected for NCAA Tournament

Composite Rankings

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

Unranked

#62

#71

#54

#46

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: 12/29 - 01/11/2026

Date	Opponent	Opp Rank	Win Prob	Exp. Upside	Exp. Downside
2025-12-31	Caltech	#354	99.6%	N/A	N/A
Leverage: N/A		NPI Swing: N/A			
2026-01-03	Caltech	#354	98.0%	0.0%	-0.1%
Leverage: 9.7%		NPI Swing: +1.04			
2026-01-07	Occidental	#193	96.3%	0.4%	-0.5%
Leverage: 8.1%		NPI Swing: +1.21			
2026-01-10	Chapman	#100	61.1%	0.6%	-1.6%
Leverage: 6.5%		NPI Swing: +1.11			

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).

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.

Top Secondary Effect Games

Games in the next 7 days involving your conference opponents or past non-conference opponents. Past opponents winning big games is second largest input to your team's NPI (first largest is your own team winning games!). Sorted by Potential Win NPI (descending).

Conference Opponents

Date	Team	Opponent	Win Prob	NPI Rank	Potential Win NPI
2025-12-31	Whittier	Amherst (#15)	6.2%	#178	66.92
2025-12-29	Occidental	Gettysburg	2.9%	#193	64.77
2025-12-30	Pomona-Pitzer	Hamline	16.6%	#186	63.12

Past Non-Conference Opponents

Date	Team	Opponent	Win Prob	NPI Rank	Potential Win NPI
2026-01-03	Oberlin	Ohio Wesleyan (#16)	12.4%	#170	74.95
2025-12-30	Mary Hardin-Baylor	UW-Eau Claire (#39)	1.5%	#273	71.31
2025-12-30	Case Western	Baldwin Wallace (#23)	13.2%	#90	70.35

Potential Win NPI = The single-game NPI value if the team wins this game. Higher values indicate more impactful games for strength of schedule.

Opponent Key Players: Occidental (01/07/2026)



Player	Yr	Ht	Pts/30	Reb/30	Ast/30	Impact	Min%
Paige Yasukochi	SR	5'10	11.5	6.6	3.0	21.1	15.2%
Kayla Ikuma	SR	5'5	10.9	4.4	3.0	18.4	10.8%
Dominique Cabading	SR	5'5	10.4	3.7	3.9	18.1	13.4%
Emily Ko	SR	5'5	8.8	3.9	4.7	17.5	12.8%
Ila Giblin	SO	5'10	9.4	7.1	0.5	17.0	9.8%

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: Chapman (01/10/2026)



Player	Yr	Ht	Pts/30	Reb/30	Ast/30	Impact	Min%
Layla Woods	JR	5'10	16.3	7.9	2.2	26.5	12.7%
Maile Nakaji	JR	5'5	12.8	2.9	2.0	17.7	12.7%
Trinity Barretto	SR	5'3	5.0	7.4	3.9	16.3	8.1%
Kira Watanabe	SO	5'0	10.2	1.7	4.3	16.2	12.4%
Emerson Ludwick	SO	6'2	5.6	9.1	0.3	15.0	6.1%

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

Claremont-Mudd-Scripps Roster

Player	Yr	Ht	Pts/30	Reb/30	Ast/30	Impact	Min%
Katie Resendiz	SR	5'10	15.2	7.0	0.8	23.0	9.4%
Haylie Wang	FR	5'10	14.3	5.1	1.6	21.0	10.9%
Caleigh Edwards	GR	5'10	10.1	7.0	1.8	18.9	16.2%
<i>TRANSFER from Chestnut Hill (CC)</i>							
Renee Chong	SR	5'5	9.6	4.2	1.8	15.5	15.5%
Tanya Ghai	JR	5'6	9.2	2.9	2.2	14.3	17.5%
Laura Strenk	GR	5'7	6.2	2.8	4.1	13.1	14.2%
<i>TRANSFER from Colorado College</i>							
Jane Hewitt	FR	5'8	15.5	2.1	1.0	18.6	1.4%
Payton Sugar	FR	5'3	12.7	3.3	1.7	17.6	5.3%
Cate Shingler	JR	6'1	7.2	7.5	1.1	15.8	5.5%
Kylie Wang	SO	5'9	0.0	12.0	0.0	12.0	0.2%
Naima Joseph	SO	6'5	1.9	7.7	1.9	11.6	1.5%
Audrey Bayless	FR	5'8	5.2	2.1	2.1	9.3	1.4%
Lauren Dex	SO	6'0	0.0	9.0	0.0	9.0	1.0%
Amanda Kerner	SO	5'6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
<i>has not played this year, possible injury</i>							
Georgeanna Dempsey	JR	6'0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
<i>has not played this year, possible injury</i>							

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 +/-
Caleigh Edwards	10	+118	+11.8
Renee Chong	9	+88	+9.8
Katie Resendiz	9	+85	+9.4
Haylie Wang	10	+89	+8.9
Jane Hewitt	4	+34	+8.5
Tanya Ghai	10	+83	+8.3
Laura Strenk	10	+72	+7.2
Payton Sugar	9	+33	+3.7
Naima Joseph	5	+7	+1.4
Cate Shingler	10	+8	+0.8
Audrey Bayless	4	-10	-2.5
Lauren Dex	4	-13	-3.2
Kylie Wang	1	-4	-4.0

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
12/28/25	Hamline	Loss	63-67	53.89	43.12
12/31/25	Caltech	Win	81-49	41.66	53.33

NPI Change Analysis

Starting NPI: 56.167 (#47) → **Ending NPI:** 55.172 (#71)
Net Change: -0.996 (dropped 24 spots)

Baseline calculated from games through 2025-12-21.

Past Opponents' Recent Results (Best Wins & Worst Losses)

These are games played since 12/21/2025 by teams you have already faced. Their results have an impact on your overall NPI

Best Wins:

Past Opponent	Their Opponent	Result	Score	Game NPI	Date
Hamline	Claremont-Mudd-Scripps	W	67-63	64.92	12/28
Case Western	Oberlin	W	68-55	59.96	12/29
Babson	Hartford	W	67-65	59.48	12/29
Hamline	Pomona-Pitzer	W	73-71	59.46	12/30
Babson	UC Santa Cruz	W	72-70	59.00	12/30

Worst Losses:

Past Opponent	Their Opponent	Result	Score	Game NPI	Date
Mary Hardin-Baylor	Trinity (TX)	L	65-74	39.35	12/29
Whitworth	Albion	L	49-71	41.66	12/22
La Verne	Nazareth	L	52-66	42.64	12/29
Caltech	Claremont-Mudd-Scripps	L	49-81	44.14	12/31
Whittier	Amherst	L	46-48	45.23	12/31

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: 9 / 15



Remaining Schedule:


- **14 games** remaining
- 4 vs Top-50 teams
- 3 vs Top-100 teams
- 7 vs Other teams

Based on simulations:

- Median finish: **20 wins** (well above threshold)
- **75%** 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 %, Win %

Areas for Improvement: None identified

Raw Values: NPI Rank #71, Efficiency 24.5, Tournament 22.1%, Win% 81.8%, SOS 48.5

Season Simulations

Tournament Stats		Season Outlook	
Metric	Value	Metric	Value
Tournament %	22.1%		
Auto Bid %	16.6%		
At Large %	5.5%	Median Wins-Losses	20-7
ALWYNI	6.6%	Median NPI Value	57.200
QF %	-	Min NPI Value	51.100
Semifinal %	10.6%	Max NPI Value	63.000
Final %	3.8%		
Top 4 %	0.0%		
Top 8 %	0.0%		
Top 16 %	0.1%		

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-

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.

large bid.

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.

Rooting Guide

Games this week where other teams' losses help you most. Your ALWYNI%: **6.6%**

Date	Root For	To Beat	ALWYNI%	ALWYNI%	Win Prob
Sat 01/03	UW-La Crosse	UW-River Falls	51.9%	12.5%	62%
Sat 01/03	Bethel	Gustavus Adolphus	95.8%	19.8%	69%
Sat 01/03	Allegheny	Pitt-BRADFORD	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Sun 01/04	William Paterson	Medgar Evers	45.4%	0.0%	100%
Sat 01/03	Rowan	Medgar Evers	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Sat 01/03	Franklin	Earlham	0.4%	0.0%	100%
Sat 01/03	Roger Williams	Wentworth Tech	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Fri 01/02	Cortland	Rivier	65.1%	0.0%	100%
Sat 01/03	Western New England	Gordon	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Sat 01/03	Smith	Bridgewater St.	99.0%	0.0%	100%

Root For: The team you want to win this game.

To Beat: The team whose loss would help your NCAA Tournament chances.

ALWYNI%: At Large When You Need It - % chance of getting an at-large bid when not winning conference tournament.

Win Prob: Probability that the "Root For" team wins this game.

Teams with ALWYN!% close to yours are your direct bubble competitors. When they lose, your relative position improves. Teams above you matter slightly more—their losses create space for you to move up.

Simulated Loss Totals and Their Outcomes

When this team did **NOT** win their conference tournament auto-bid, how often did they receive an at-large bid based on their final loss total?

Current Loss Total: 2

Losses	Sims w/o Auto Bid	Got At-Large	At-Large Rate
2 ← You are here	—	—	<i>not observed in sims</i>
3	21	21	100.0%
4	230	219	95.2%
5	829	301	36.3%
6	1,642	11	0.7%
7	2,189	0	0.0%
8	1,863	0	0.0%
9	1,054	0	0.0%
10	375	0	0.0%
11	119	0	0.0%
12	14	0	0.0%
13	3	0	0.0%
14	—	—	<i>not observed in sims</i>

Note: Since this data excludes simulations where the team won their conference tournament auto-bid, **every row shown includes at least one loss in the conference tournament.** Teams needing an at-large bid must have lost in their conference tournament.

SCIAC NCAA Tournament Bids Chances

Based on 10,000 season simulations, here's the probability of how many SCIAC teams make the NCAA Tournament:

Teams	Chance	Distribution
1 team	41.9%	<div style="width: 41.9%; background-color: #007bff; height: 10px;"></div>
2 teams	51.3%	<div style="width: 51.3%; background-color: #007bff; height: 10px;"></div>
3 teams	6.8%	<div style="width: 6.8%; background-color: #6c757d; height: 10px;"></div>

Each conference gets 1 automatic bid (conference tournament champion). Additional bids are at-large selections based on NPI ranking.

Conference Standings

Team	Overall	Non-Conf	Conf
Redlands	8-1	7-1	1-0
Cal Lutheran (#35)	8-1	6-1	2-0
Claremont-Mudd-Scripps	9-2	6-2	3-0
Chapman	6-3	5-2	1-1
Pomona-Pitzer	6-5	5-4	1-1
Occidental	4-4	4-4	0-0
Whittier	4-5	4-3	0-2
La Verne	2-4	2-3	0-1
Caltech	1-6	1-3	0-3

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