



# Claremont-Mudd-Scripps

*"The Athenas"*

Weekly Games Report: Week of December 15, 2025

## Team Overview

AUTO BID

Record	NPI	Efficiency	Tempo	Height	Rotation Size	Returning	Experience	New Pts/30
8-1	56.123 (#43)	25.6 (#44)	71.9	68.0" (#202)	6	54.8% (#243)	3.3 (#39)	30.0 (#95)

**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 #51 #43 #44 #39

**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: 12/15 - 12/21/2025

No games scheduled for this week.

## 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	10.4%
Haylie Wang	FR	5'10	13.5	5.5	1.6	20.6	10.3%
Caleigh Edwards	GR	5'10	10.8	6.7	1.9	19.5	15.9%
<i>TRANSFER from Chestnut Hill (CC)</i>							
Tanya Ghai	JR	5'6	9.9	3.1	2.4	15.5	17.6%
Renee Chong	SR	5'5	8.9	4.4	1.8	15.1	15.2%
Laura Strenk	GR	5'7	5.7	2.6	4.0	12.3	14.5%
<i>TRANSFER from Colorado College</i>							
Jane Hewitt	FR	5'8	16.7	2.2	1.1	20.0	1.5%
Payton Sugar	FR	5'3	14.5	3.4	1.7	19.6	4.8%

Player	Yr	Ht	Pts/30	Reb/30	Ast/30	Impact	Min%
Cate Shingler	JR	6'1	7.3	7.9	1.3	16.4	5.1%
Kylie Wang	SO	5'9	0.0	12.0	0.0	12.0	0.3%
Naima Joseph	SO	6'5	1.9	7.7	1.9	11.6	1.7%
Audrey Bayless	FR	5'8	5.2	2.1	2.1	9.3	1.6%
Lauren Dex	SO	6'0	0.0	9.0	0.0	9.0	1.1%
Georgeanna Dempsey	JR	6'0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%
Amanda Kerner	SO	5'6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0%

*has not played this year, possible injury*

*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	9	+110	+12.2
Renee Chong	8	+90	+11.2
Tanya Ghai	9	+97	+10.8
Haylie Wang	9	+87	+9.7
Katie Resendiz	9	+85	+9.4
Jane Hewitt	3	+27	+9.0
Maya Roberts	1	+9	+9.0
Laura Strenk	9	+66	+7.3
Payton Sugar	8	+39	+4.9
Cate Shingler	9	+15	+1.7
Naima Joseph	5	+7	+1.4
Audrey Bayless	4	-10	-2.5
Lauren Dex	4	-13	-3.2
Kylie Wang	1	-4	-4.0
Maura Schorr	1	-6	-6.0

*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).*

## NPI Change Analysis

**Starting NPI:** 55.686 (#50) → **Ending NPI:** 56.123 (#43)  
**Net Change:** +0.437 (moved up 7 spots)

*Baseline calculated from games through 2025-12-07.*

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

*These are games played since 12/07/2025 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
Oberlin	Kalamazoo	W	58-52	<b>53.74</b>	12/10
La Verne	Westminster (MO)	W	66-55	<b>51.97</b>	12/15
UC Santa Cruz	Caltech	W	67-57	<b>49.94</b>	12/13
UC Santa Cruz	Cal Lutheran	L	42-61	<b>45.30</b>	12/14
Mary Hardin-Baylor	George Fox	L	47-48	<b>42.95</b>	12/14

#### Worst 5 Performances:

Past Opponent	Their Opponent	Result	Score	Game NPI	Date
Oberlin	Adrian	L	48-66	<b>40.32</b>	12/13
Mary Hardin-Baylor	Texas Lutheran	L	52-68	<b>40.70</b>	12/10
Whitworth	Benedictine	L	60-72	<b>41.02</b>	12/14
Mary Hardin-Baylor	George Fox	L	47-48	<b>42.95</b>	12/14
UC Santa Cruz	Cal Lutheran	L	42-61	<b>45.30</b>	12/14

## 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: 8 / 15**



### Remaining Schedule:


- **16 games** remaining
- 3 vs Top-50 teams
- 2 vs Top-100 teams
- 11 vs Other teams

### Based on simulations:

- Median finish: **23 wins** (well above threshold)
- **90%** 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 #43, Efficiency 25.6, Tournament 78.6%, Win% 88.9%, SOS 47.9*

## Season Simulations

Tournament Stats		Season Outlook	
Metric	Value	Metric	Value
Tournament %	<b>78.6%</b>	Median Wins-Losses	<b>23-4</b>
Auto Bid %	<b>45.5%</b>		Median NPI Value
At Large %	<b>33.1%</b>		<b>60.000</b>
ALWYNI	<b>60.7%</b>		Min NPI Value
QF %	-		<b>53.000</b>
Semifinal %	<b>61.1%</b>		Max NPI Value
Final %	<b>59.5%</b>		<b>65.400</b>
Top 4 %	<b>0.0%</b>		
Top 8 %	<b>0.3%</b>		
Top 16 %	<b>13.1%</b>		

**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.*

## 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?

Losses	Sims w/o Auto Bid	Got At-Large	At-Large Rate
<b>1</b>	—	—	<i>not observed in sims</i>
<b>2</b>	24	24	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>3</b>	103	103	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>4</b>	159	144	<b>90.6%</b>
<b>5</b>	130	56	<b>43.1%</b>
<b>6</b>	86	4	<b>4.7%</b>
<b>7</b>	26	0	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>8</b>	14	0	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>9</b>	2	0	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>12</b>	1	0	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>13</b>	—	—	<i>not observed in sims</i>

*This data shows at-large bid outcomes only when the team did NOT win their conference tournament. Teams that won their auto-bid are excluded to provide a clearer picture of at-large selection thresholds.*

## Conference Standings

Team	Overall	Non-Conf	Conf
Cal Lutheran (#37)	6-0	4-0	2-0
Claremont-Mudd-Scripps	8-1	6-1	2-0
Redlands	4-1	3-1	1-0
Chapman	3-2	2-1	1-1
Pomona-Pitzer	5-4	4-3	1-1
Occidental	1-1	1-1	0-0
Whittier	2-4	2-2	0-2
La Verne	1-3	1-2	0-1
Caltech	0-5	0-3	0-2

Generated on December 16, 2025 at 02:46 PM

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