28-Jan-2009 12:15 AM

Newcastle Orienteering Club
2007/2008 Summer Street Series
CONSISTENCY Results

Are you consistently performing to your own capability? Earn up to 20 points per event. Still up to 0 points for the taking. See below ...

Rank	Competitor	Admin Event	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	Number of Events Entered	Number of Contributing Events	Total Points	Rank
1	Nicole Haigh		1	16	8	10					18	17				16	18			15	8	**104**	1
2	Karen Blatchford	11	2	19	9	14	9			16	12	10			3					15	9	**94**	2
3	Carolyn Matthews			6	2	9	19		10			8	14			5	11	9		16	10	**93**	3
4	Tony Hayes	8		16	8	19		18					3			9	19			15	7	**92**	4
5	Tim Tew			4	17	12	15		5	17						5	11	3		16	9	**89**	5
5	Colin Bailey	15						16		8	5	15	11	8		13		13		15	8	**89**	5
7	Geoff Peel		13		6			4		18	8	5	17					17		14	8	**88**	7
8	Ian Dempsey		12								10	17	9	20			17			13	6	**85**	8
9	Stuart Kurtz					15		8				19	7		14	2	12	7		14	8	**84**	9
10	Andrew Haigh		18	5	18						3	11		2	7	6	13			15	9	**83**	10
10	Tamara Orr		20			2	13	7	18							14	7	2		12	8	**83**	10
10	Bob Gilbert	9		12			1						14	14		20	20	2		14	7	**83**	10
13	Geoff Todkill					8	18	2		16		4	9	7		3	3	12		15	10	**82**	13
14	Kathryn Vaughan			20	14				4	11			12	14				5		15	7	**80**	14
15	Emily Harper		8		3			17	20	19							1	11		15	7	**79**	15
16	Graeme Taplin	3		11				5	1	7	16		6	14	15					14	8	**75**	16
17	Craig Kentish			14					19		2	19				19				14	5	**73**	17
17	Elissa Anderson				13	18	13	19	10											9	5	**73**	17
17	Jim Lee					16					17					19	2	19		14	5	**73**	17
20	Kim van Netten			14	1	20			16				2			17				15	6	**70**	20
21	Mick Kavur		11	3			20		8			9	5	1		10				16	8	**67**	21
22	Russell Rigby	1							18				18	6	18					13	4	**60**	22
23	Alex Massey										15	12	10				6	15		14	5	**58**	23
24	Josh Blatchford		19							6							14	16		14	4	**55**	24
25	Robert Vincent		3		19	17		14												8	4	**53**	25
26	Nicola Blatchford	11		11	11		7		13						9					12	5	**51**	26
26	Lewis Vincent				20	6	10	15												10	4	**51**	26
28	Alexander Orr		16			4	14							16						14	4	**50**	28
29	Dom Isberg, Peter Holz		17	8						13	9		2							15	5	**49**	29
30	Brett Golledge						4				11		4	9	20					12	5	**48**	30
30	Caroline Taurany		10			11				14	13									12	4	**48**	30
32	Damian Welbourne	5	5								14			3	8		16			12	5	**46**	32
33	Jeremy Welbourne	5	9											18		11	5			9	4	**43**	33
34	Relene Fenrich	5											15	10		15				10	3	**40**	34
35	Daniel Orr		6				2	12				2	16							16	5	**38**	35
36	Leigh Hoy							10	4						13	8				11	4	**35**	36
36	Peter Orr			2					14						1			18		14	4	**35**	36
38	Kelly Kurtz					1		9				7					9	8		14	5	**34**	38
38	Glenn Burgess	14						14				20								10	2	**34**	38
40	Brock Smith						7			3	4	3			16					14	5	**33**	40
41	Ben Reuter	3	16	1						1				14						13	4	**32**	41
41	Carolyn Rigby	7				13					19									12	2	**32**	41
43	Ian OBrien				16									15						13	2	**31**	43
44	Jamie van Netten			17	5	7														7	3	**29**	44
44	Carolyn Chalmers			18				11												9	2	**29**	44
44	Nigel Thompson									10				19						11	2	**29**	44
47	Bert van Netten	8				5			15								8			13	3	**28**	47
48	Margaret Peel		7								1	13						6		13	4	**27**	48
49	Louise Hayes													4				20		10	2	**24**	49
49	Thomas Bunn	16	4								20									7	2	**24**	49
51	Matt Westwood						11								12					6	2	**23**	51
52	Maria Orr									2			20							14	2	**22**	52
52	Martyn Boyd														10	12				5	2	**22**	52
54	Lisa Tennyenhuis											1	20							6	2	**21**	54
54	Malcolm Roberts	13							12	9										12	2	**21**	54
56	Nikki Brown														6			14		7	2	**20**	56
56	Ian Rigby	7						20												8	1	**20**	56
56	Stu Adams									20										7	1	**20**	56
59	Arthur Kingsland	6			15												4			13	2	**19**	59
59	Lewis Berkholz														19					6	1	**19**	59
61	Justin Fraser														17					6	1	**17**	61
61	Kerry Bacon	4					17													7	1	**17**	61
61	Louise Cherry, Sonia Brown													17						4	1	**17**	61
64	Matt Hayes						16													13	1	**16**	64
65	Steven Todkill																15			13	1	**15**	65
66	Allan Wright			9											5					9	2	**14**	66
66	Bill Chalmers											14								7	1	**14**	66
66	Liz Bunn	16	14																	5	1	**14**	66
69	Graham Fowler									12										2	1	**12**	69
69	Kate Dynon				12															4	1	**12**	69
71	David Messenger											6		5						8	2	**11**	71
71	Greg Bacon	4			4						7									10	2	**11**	71
71	Juleigh Cook, Lianne Dean								11											3	1	**11**	71
71	Peter Newton														11					3	1	**11**	71
71	Steve Guy																	11		2	1	**11**	71
76	Josh Roberts				10															7	1	**10**	76
77	Shane Trotter														2	7				4	2	**9**	77
78	Kellie Stolk, Paul Stolk							3										5		9	2	**8**	78
78	Wes Dose					3	5													3	2	**8**	78
78	David Kitchener			8																10	1	**8**	78
78	Linda Vincent						8													6	1	**8**	78
78	Rhiana Roberts	13							8											3	1	**8**	78
83	Eleanor Ross							6												7	1	**6**	83
83	Peter Cox										6									10	1	**6**	83
83	Robert Lewin	2							6											3	1	**6**	83
86	Robert Preston								4							1				9	2	**5**	86
86	Glen Peters									5										5	1	**5**	86
86	Nathan Berkholz, Peter Berkholz														5					4	1	**5**	86
89	Nicholas, Pili, Peter Gordon	12								4										7	1	**4**	89
90	Steve Guy, Trish Guy						3													9	1	**3**	90
91	Stuart Todd							1												4	1	**1**	91

Click here to provide feedback or make enquiries regarding these results.

This is a new competition and scoring feature, and new way of measuring every competitor's performance from event to event and across the whole season.
It is still in prototype form, so if your name is at the top of the list in any week, please don't anticipate winning a home theatre system or an all expenses paid overseas holiday.
Any results displayed are subject to change for the moment, but this is a chance to take a peek and share any thoughts that you may have.

This new results category is all about trying to seek out our most CONSISTENT competitor.
Measuring consistency in this context has at least the following aims:
- recognition for competitors that don't win events (i.e. more than 95% of us);
- recognition for regular attendees;
- recognition for consistent performance, irrespective of capability.

Here's a brief summary of the current rules:
1. "Consistency points" will be awarded to the most consistent competitors in each event (the most consistent performer will receive maximum points).
2. For each competitor, "consistency points" earned in each event will be aggregated over the season.
3. Competitors will then be ranked, with the highest season "consistency points" tally determining the most consistent orienteer for the series.
4. Allocation of "consistency points" in an event will be based on each eligible competitor's calculated "consistency score".
5. To be eligible for a "consistency score" in an event, a competitor must not have a result of 100 in the event, and must have also entered the previous event.
6. A competitor's "consistency score" for an event is the difference between their (adjusted) overall result for that event, and their (adjusted) overall result for the previous event.
7. Results are adjusted ("normalised") in an attempt to level the playing field and increase the validity of comparisons of results between events. There are two main reasons for this, and a separate adjustment is made for each:
   a) Since your overall result for an event is derived via a comparison with the winner, an inconsistency is evident when trying to measure consistency, as the same competitor doesn't win every event.
   b) Course setter style and characteristics of each map are inconsistent across events. This in part contributes to the differing patterns in the distribution of results from event to event.
8. In this competition, a competitor is an event entrant, which may be an individual or a team.

Note that your handicap is not used in calculating your "consistency score", and your "consistency score" doesn't affect your handicap.

If you have any thoughts on this new interpretation of our results, please feel free to email me with your feedback, or come and discuss it at an event.
If you are mathematically inclined and have any views on how to improve the "consistency score" calculation algorithm to make it fairer across the board, then please don't hesitate ... I'm happy to further explain the details.

Thanks,
Peter