

2011 HIGH SCHOOL WRESTLING FORECAST

(40th ANNUAL EDITION)

Written By:
Brian F. Brakeman

January 26, 2011

PREFACE

The production of this report from my handwritten copy is no easy job. I forget words, use weird punctuation, and my handwriting gets worse with each successive weight class. The typists who transform such material into what you are reading today deserve tremendous accolades. Chief among them is my long-suffering cousin, Nancy Dimitris, and her colleague Vickie Billow. Next time you see them thank them and re-express my gratitude for their work.

The first of these reports was written in 1972 in what was a much different world than today. Newspaper coverage in most areas of the state was spotty and inconsistent at best, and non-existent in many places. There was no Internet (which I believe has impacted wrestling, perhaps, more than any other sport) and teams generally wrestled within a few miles of their school. At that time I was in a unique position – working for a large company that had many newspaper subscriptions, working near the wonderful Cleveland Public Library that had multiple data sources, and developing many statewide contacts via the television shows. All this provided me with an information base that was difficult to duplicate, and provided resources for printing and distributing paper copies.

Today it has all changed. Now there is a constant flow of information. I am awash in data, as teams compete not only in statewide events, but in tournaments that bring together teams from many different areas of the country. I am amazed at the efforts made by many to disseminate data and the high quality of analysis at some sites.

Finally, over the years I kept copies, at first on film and then later on ¾" tape, of virtually all of the telecasts in which I took part. I have donated that entire collection to Cable Nine Television, who will serve as a non-profit repository of that material. They are working to provide an index of what is available, and, perhaps, how best it can be obtained. I am grateful for their help in this endeavor since much of the material is irreplaceable and my attic was a less than ideal storage place. The initial cost of this material was certainly more than a million dollars in current dollars, and its preservation seems important to me.

Introduction

The object of these annual reports encompasses two basic goals. First is to acquaint everyone with the basic character of each weight class and identify the participants who are likely to play a major role in its resolution. In addition, each individual district is examined as to whom its representatives might be. Second is to stimulate interest in the whole State tournament process throughout Ohio. Naturally, accuracy is also of primary concern, so care is taken to develop the most comprehensive list possible of outstanding wrestlers, though of necessity, the evaluation of their final place is, in part, subjective. This report was written during a ten-day period ending January 23, based on the information available at that time. Because this material was written by that time (and in some cases somewhat earlier) and in the hands of the typists after that I have not included any information that may become available after that time. It's kind of a snapshot in time, with a picture that will surely change in many ways by tournament time. Certainly many of those listed at weight classes where they are currently ranked will move up or down for competitive reasons facilitated by the new rules which make it so much easier to do so. In fact, some of those moves may well be precipitated by information contained within this document.

There are several ways you can help make this report more accurate. First by sending me bracket sheets for tournaments you enter either by fax or mail – I'm especially interested in sectional and district bracket sheets this year and any tournaments for next year. Also, phone calls, or better yet, e-mail messages dealing with results, weight class selection, or whatever, are gratefully received. I especially appreciate coaches who provide an honest overview of their squad and superior wrestlers they've seen in competition. Already I get messages and information from too many people to name individually, but I appreciate it all.

Brian Brakeman
23225 Hardwick Road
Shaker Hts., OH 44122

E-mail: cherylbrake@aol.com

This report is also available on the Internet on Gary Baumgartner's website, The Ohio Wrestler, as well as Brecksville High School's website:

<http://www.baumspage.com>

<http://www.brecksvillevrestling.com>

<http://www.ohiowrestler.com>

©2006– Reproduction of this material for profit without written consent is prohibited.

**And remember, my usual fee is a wrestling T-shirt – XL.
(and that includes all you Internet readers)**

Robert's Rules For Reading Wrestling Reports

Bob Berg is a Cleveland native who moved to Atlanta, Georgia and, once there, began to write a wrestling preview organized like this one. It was bright and funny and about as accurate as these things can ever be. He decided last year to leave the forecasting business, but his legacy, at least a small portion of it bears on this document as well. I am formally naming them Berg's Rules of Reading and am reproducing them below.

One word about the "rankings," as they are oftentimes misunderstood. If it turns out that our #17 wrestler beat our #8 wrestler during the year, there may be several explanations as to why we have the winner at #17 and the loser at #8:

- a) We may not have that particular result in our database. Our bad, but even in this era of incredible technology and information flow, we just don't have all the results, so we operate with something less than full information. As Hyman Roth said in *Godfather II*, "this is the business we've chosen."
- b) We may have known the result, but discounted it (a very important technique in the prognosticator's bag of tricks – if a result appears to be aberrant or we don't like it, we just ignore it!) for any number of reasons, including injuries, weight issues, conditioning issues (e.g., for those wrestlers coming out after football season), SAT forfeits, etc.
- c) We may have known the result, but trumped it based on each wrestler's full body of work, rather than just that one result. As we've all come to learn, the transitive property of inequities (if $A > B$, and if $B > C$, then $A > C$) may work in algebra, but "if A beats B, and B beats C, then C will beat A" is a formula for disaster in the wrestling prognostication business.
- d) Similarly, we may know the results but, especially if it was prior to the first of the year, we may believe that the loser of that particular bout has improved substantially and would win the rematch.
- e) Or, finally (and, in all probability, most likely), we may just have gotten it wrong. To paraphrase Forest Gump, "stuff happens." That's ok, we will live with our mistakes, hope they are infrequent and, most importantly, continue to understand that, ultimately, the outcomes of wrestling contests are determined on the mats, not on the pages of this report.

BRAKEMAN REPORT AUDIT
(How first choices fared)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Won Title	27	28	29
Finished Second	7	6	5
Third	5	4	5
Fourth	1	0	0
Lower than Fourth	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>
Total	42	42	42

BRAKEMAN REPORT AUDIT
(Won State Title)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Ranked First	27	28	29
Ranked Second	7	3	6
Ranked Third	2	6	3
Ranked Fourth	2	2	1
Ranked Lower Than 4 th	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u> *
	42	42	42

*Gordon 5th, Matacic 7th, and Oney ranked 9th.

CHAMPIONSHIP ROUNDS STATE VICTORIES % ANALYSIS
(Only Inter-District Bouts)

<u>2008</u>		<u>2009</u>		<u>2010</u>	
1	Mentor/Harding 59.3%	1	Perry 60.7%	1	Ashland 67.0%
2	Perry 57.7%	2	Firestone 54.3%	2	Goshen 58.5%
3	Ontario/Fostoria 55.1%	3	Goshen 54.2%	3	Maple Hts. 57.8%
4	Firestone 53.9%	4	Fairmont 53.5%	4	Marion Harding 52.9%
5	Fairmont 52.9%	5	Maple Hts. 52.6%	5	Fairmont 51.9%
6	Heath 52.7%	6	Owens 51.5%	6	Owens 50.0%
7	Goshen 50.0%	7	Fairfield 50.0%	7	Firestone 50.0%
8	Owens 46.9%	8	Mentor 48.0%	8	Mentor 47.4%
9	Maple Hts. 46.9%	9	Heath 45.4%	9	Darby 44.9%
10	Steubenville 40.0%	10	Fostoria 44.8%	10	Heath 38.2%
11	Darby 39.8%	11	Steubenville 41.7%	11	Fairfield 36.8%
12	Fairfield 38.4%	12	Darby 38.6%	12	Claymont 36.4%

2010 STATE VICTORIES % BY DISTRICT ANALYSIS
(Only Inter-District Bouts)*

	<u>Ashland</u>	<u>Mentor</u>	<u>Darby</u>	<u>Fairfield</u>
Championship Rounds	67.0%	47.4%	44.9%	36.8%
Consolation Rounds	<u>49.3%</u>	<u>48.9%</u>	<u>54.5%</u>	<u>46.8%</u>
Total	60.2%	48.1%	49.7%	42.0%

	<u>Firestone</u>	<u>Harding</u>	<u>Claymont</u>	<u>Goshen</u>
Championship Rounds	50.0%	52.9%	36.4%	58.5%
Consolation Rounds	<u>61.5%</u>	<u>51.1%</u>	<u>39.8%</u>	<u>47.5%</u>
Total	55.4%	52.0%	38.1%	53.8%

	<u>Maple Hts.</u>	<u>Owens</u>	<u>Heath</u>	<u>Fairmont</u>
Championship Rounds	57.8%	50.0%	38.2%	51.9%
Consolation Rounds	<u>51.9%</u>	<u>42.7%</u>	<u>52.1%</u>	<u>53.3%</u>
Total	55.3%	46.6%	45.4%	52.6%

*Does not include intra-district bouts.

2010 STATE CHAMPIONSHIP ROUND ANALYSIS
(Inter-District Bouts Only)

		<u>First Round</u>			<u>2nd/3rd/4th Round</u>			<u>Overall</u>		
		W&L			W&L			W&L		
		Record	%	Rank	Record	%	Rank	Record	%	Rank
1	Ashland	36-20	64.3%	1	39-17	69.6%	1	75-37	67.0%	1
2	Goshen	30-26	53.6%	5	32-18	64.0%	2	62-44	58.3%	2
3	Maple Hts.	*33-22	60.0%	2	30-24	55.6%	3	63-46	57.8%	3
4	Harding	31-25	55.4%	3	23-23	50.0%	5	54-48	52.9%	4
5	Fairmont	30-26	53.6%	5	24-24	50.0%	5	54-50	51.9%	5
6	Owens	*26-29	47.3%	9	24-21	53.3%	4	50-50	50.0%	6
7	Firestone	29-27	51.8%	7	23-25	47.9%	7	52-52	50.0%	7
8	Mentor	27-29	48.2%	8	19-22	46.3%	8	46-51	47.4%	8
9	Darby	31-25	55.4%	3	13-29	31.0%	12	44-54	44.9%	9
10	Heath	22-34	39.3%	10	12-21	36.4%	10	34-55	38.2%	10
11	Fairfield	18-38	32.1%	12	14-17	45.2%	9	32-55	36.8%	11
12	Claymont	22-34	39.3%	10	10-22	31.3%	11	32-56	36.4%	12

*One Bye

TOTAL STATE VICTORIES % BY DISTRICT ANALYSIS

(Championship and Consolation Rounds)

<u>2008</u>		<u>2009</u>		<u>2010</u>	
1	Perry 56.9%	1	Perry 60.6%	1	Ashland 60.2%
2	Firestone 55.0%	2	Maple Hts. 60.0%	2	Firestone 55.4%
3	Heath 54.0%	3	Mentor 52.8%	3	Maple Hts. 55.3%
4	Mentor/Harding 53.4%	4	Firestone 51.7%	4	Goshen 53.8%
5	Goshen 52.4%	5	Fairmont 51.1%	5	Fairmont 52.6%
6	Fairmont 57.3%	6	Fostoria 50.7%	6	Harding 52.0%
7	Ontario/Fostoria 50.8%	7	Goshen 50.5%	7	Darby 49.7%
8	Maple Hts. 49.5%	8	Heath 46.8%	8	Mentor 48.1%
9	Darby 46.3%	9	Owens 46.5%	9	Owens 46.6%
10	Owens 44.6%	10	Fairfield 46.1%	10	Heath 45.4%
11	Fairfield 42.4%	11	Steubenville 40.9%	11	Fairfield 42.0%
12	Steubenville 41.3%	12	Darby 39.1%	12	Claymont 38.1%

STATE QUALIFIERS BY SECTIONAL

Mentor

Fitch	16
Maple Hts.	14
Hoover	13
N. Royalton	13

Firestone

West Branch	17
Walsh	16
Hoover	12
Lake Catholic	11

Maple Hts.

Brooklyn	25
Salem NW	13
Rootstown	7
Beachwood	6

Ashland

Wadsworth	27
Southview	18
Rogers	6
Harding	5

Harding

Shelby	19
Highland	14
Wauseon	13
Shawnee	10

Owens

Huron	15
Archbold	14
Plymouth	14
Elmwood	13

Darby

Watkins	19
Westerville	16
Centerville	14
Pickerington	7

Claymont

Clearcreek	17
Buckeye Local	16
Licking Hts.	14
Meadowbrook	9

Heath

Barnesville	18
Utica	17
Cardington	11
Jackson	10

Fairfield

Elder	21
Moeller	17
Centerville	10
Western Brown	8

Goshen

Tipp City	20
Eaton	15
Chillicothe	14
Goshen	7

Fairmont

Leman	23
Clinton-Massie	16
Lima CC	9
Carey	8