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Section 1 – Introduction

The objective of this honors thesis is concerned with creating a tool that will allow a user to perform analysis and then to produce a ranking based on that analysis. This raises two main questions, the first of which being, “What is being analyzed so that it can be ranked?” and the second of which being, “How is this analysis being performed?”

Section 1.1 – Ranking Analytics Background

The answer to the first question is comparatively much simpler than the answer to the second: NCAA Division 1 Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) college football teams. More specifically, it is specific fields of data that pertain to all of these NCAA Division 1 FBS college football teams for a particular season. Inherent in this discussion is also the reasoning or end-goal of performing this analysis and eventual ranking. Cassady, Maillart, and Salman (2005) provide an answer in the motivation for their ranking algorithm, “Ranking sports teams in the absence of full round-robin tournaments is big business, especially for NCAA Division 1 FBS college football. The Bowl Championship Series [BCS] awards millions of dollars each year to the conferences whose teams are awarded bids.”

Because there are over 100 NCAA Division 1 FBS college football teams, it is not feasible for each team to play every other team exactly once in the duration of the season, and for this reason, there has to be a methodology that allows for teams that may have never played against each other to be compared and ranked.
However, removing all presence of subjectivity and bias in the ranking process is easier said than done, as even mathematical models inherit the bias of the designer. In its defense, currently the BCS ranking process is carried out by two main entities that use several polls and computer models in order to generate the ranking of the top teams. Even with the aid of different analysis tools, it proves seemingly impossible to rank teams with a compilation of analyses that wins the approval of every college football enthusiast. Cassady et al. (2005) references this frustration, noting that, “although the BCS is intended to eliminate controversy, every year it provokes debate among fans and members of the media.”

Section 1.2 – CMS+ Methodology

Clearly, there is an eminent need for a means of objectively analyzing teams’ performance and generating a ranking. Cassady, Maillart, and Salman realized this need, but also realized that it would not be feasible to create a method of analysis that would not reflect the bias of those who devised it. Thus, they sought to create a “a ranking methodology that (1) requires decision makers to quantify their biases, which renders our system customizable, and then (2) uses mathematical programming to apply these biases fairly across all competitors.”

In order to develop such a methodology, they developed a genetic algorithm that would govern the overall process of generating a ranking. The purpose of the genetic algorithm was to make a problem with over 100 teams manageable to solve using a quadratic-assignment framework. Essentially, the
genetic algorithm would generate a specified number of possible ranking sequences, and from that, only a specified percentage would be used, with the rest being discarded. Those that were kept remained because their ranking sequence produced an attractive value for the objective function, which gauges the effectiveness of the ranking sequence's ability to generate a sequence that best incorporates the weights of different team statistics. Then, one of two possible outcomes would occur governed by a specified percentage: either (1) when comparing the next generation of solutions to the previous generation, the ranking positions where the teams were the same would be kept or copied, and then another generation would be created; or (2) an existing ranking sequence – selected at random – would have two ranking positions randomly selected creating an interval, and the positions outside of that interval would be copied, while the positions within that interval would be reversed, or mutated. This process of copying and mutation would continue up to a certain number of generations.

After this process reaches a certain number of generations, then that final solution serves as the initial sequence for the heuristic that will ultimately yield the final ranking sequence. The heuristic works by switching the positions of two teams in the ranking sequence, and comparing the before and after switching values of the objective function in order to decide whether or to keep or disregard the change in the ranking sequence. This is done for all possible ranking sequence pairs, ensuring the selection of the best ranking sequence in terms of the best value for the objective function.
The objective function governs the heuristic, so the parameters of the solution approach, which will dictate the quality of the obtained objective value, are crucial to the procedure. In order to satisfy the need for quantifying biases and applying those biases fairly and equally across all of the teams as recognized by Cassady, Maillart, and Salman, it was important to make sure that the course of the model was tailored to the user’s preference on the effect that two parameters would have on the eventual ranking sequence. Thus the model was set up so that, “the decision-maker must specify two sets of parameters: (1) the degree of victory achieved by the winner of each game, and (2) the relative distance between every pair of ranking positions” (2005).

**Section 1.3 – CMS+ Validation**

Using their model, they identified a set of parameter values that gave them rankings similar to those produced by the BCS in past years, and then used that “best” set of parameters to weigh in on some controversial ranking decisions made by the BCS. Comparing their rankings to past rankings and to a select few ranking decisions allowed them to validate the accuracy of their model. With a successful and validate mathematical model, Cassady et al. (2005, p. 507) summarized their procedure saying, “We developed a novel ranking methodology and demonstrated its potential for use in intercollegiate athletics.”

**Section 1.4 – Application Motivation**

One aspect missing from their work was a user interface that would make this ranking algorithm as attractive as possible to being used by a committee who will most likely not have any familiarity with algorithms and software
implementation. Thus, the goal in creating a user interface was to provide a means for initializing the algorithm and heuristic and executing it without having to edit lines of code, as well as for presenting the ranking output in an aesthetically pleasing and familiar layout. As far as basic functionality was concerned, the user interface would allow a user to upload a file containing the various statistics of every team for that season, view that uploaded file, set the values of the different parameters to be used in the actual algorithm, execute the algorithm in order to generate a unique ranking, and finally to view the ranking.

Section 2 – Application Design

However, before the user interface could even be designed, some consideration had to be given to some other factors that would ultimately determine the success and effectiveness of the user interface. The first of those factors was deciding through what platform to build and design the user interface, and the second of which was incorporating basic user interface graphic design conventions and principles.

Section 2.1 – Platform Selection

Initially, using Visual Basic (VBA) in Microsoft Excel was the prime candidate for providing the programming foundation to build the user interface. There were two problems with using VBA that were eventually identified: first, the layout, appearance, functionality, and feel of a Visual Basic application in Microsoft Excel did not seem to meet the expectations of what was envisioned for the user interface. The purpose of the user interface was after all to remove the presence of technical components and to provide an illusion to the user that
he or she was simply just clicking in order to make decisions. Those two purposes would be violated by a user interface created in VBA and Microsoft Excel. With minimal aesthetic capabilities, the layout and feel of it would not be able to escape the underlying motif of Microsoft Excel, and, after generating the ranking, the user would have to view it in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Requiring the user to perform manual manipulation and deletion of Excel spreadsheets was something that needed to be avoided if the presence of technical components was to be eliminated. Second, there was a mismatch of programming languages. The algorithm was written in C++, as it would allow for much faster processing and execution than VBA. So if the user interface was written and developed in Microsoft Excel using VBA, then how would it be able to interact with an algorithm that was written in C++? There are probably solutions to this mismatch problem that exist, but taken in conjunction with the first problem, the underlying uncertainty of spending a large amount of time on developing an application that may not even be able to interact with the back-end algorithm ruled out VBA and Microsoft Excel as a possible platform on which to build the application.

After coming to the realization that VBA and Microsoft Excel would not provide the capabilities that this application required, it was back to the drawing board. After a search for viable system alternatives and investigating the different functionalities of several platforms, the one that provided the best fit for the design of this user interface was Qt Creator (Digia, 2013). It would allow the designer to work with drag-and-drop design functionality instead of having to
write code for every aspect of the user interface. However, the designer could still write code that would work in conjunction with any of the drag-and-drop functionality. The only immediate obstacle to beginning to work with this platform was learning its unique language and constructs. Qt has its own programming language that is based exclusively off of C++.

**Section 2.2 – Integration of User Interface Design**

After deciding that Qt would be the platform that was used to design and create this application, the design phase began. Importance could now be given to making sure to integrate the second factor of incorporating basic, user interface graphic design conventions and principles. After reading several articles that each listed ten, similar, important design conventions to consider in user interface design, it was evident that the ones that most applied to the creation of this application were paying attention to patterns of design, consistency of design, efficiency of design, and simplicity of design (Nielsen, 1995, Sollenberger, 2012, and Vogel, 2012).

Paying attention to patterns of design focuses on making the user feel comfortable while using the application. It encompasses the idea that it is okay and encouraged for the application to borrow or follow the patterns and conventions used in interfaces that users would be familiar with, would interact with, or be exposed to on a frequent basis, such as social networking applications like Facebook, or applications that come standard with Mac or PC operating systems (Sollenberger, 2012). One article proposed that during the design phase, when considering how to design a certain function of the
application in the user interface, the designer should ask himself, “How would Microsoft do it?” (Vogel, 2012). This further references the fact that most users of any application will be familiar with and accustomed to the patterns of design that are used in Microsoft applications. Thus, it follows that using patterns similar to those in a user interface design is in the best interest of the designer in terms of accomplishing the goal of making the user feel comfortable.

Consistency of design stresses the importance of ensuring that the user can expect and trust that words, phrases, buttons, functionalities, etc. that appear the same actually perform the same action. If the same action or type of action is not being performed, then the user needs to have a clear distinguishing indicator that a particular word, phrase, button, function, etc. does not perform the same action as another (Nielsen, 1995). Additionally, the point of designing the functionalities within the interface to be consistent is to also quicken the learning curve of the user. If he or she can learn how to perform a certain action and then trust that he could perform the same action or a similar one again simply by the relying on the consistency of functionality design, then he feels more comfortable with the interface and is able to use it more effectively and efficiently (Sollenberger, 2012).

Efficiency of design broadly encompasses two more specific principles that should be considered in the design of the user interface: error prevention and logical flow of the design itself. In regards to error prevention, error messages are appropriate, but more for the designer rather than the user. The designer or developer does not want the responsibility of being present and
readily available for troubleshooting whenever his user interface is in use. Therefore, it is crucial that he take the time to enumerate all possible erroneous situations within the functionality confines of the system and do his best to eliminate the possibility of those errors (Nielsen, 1995).

It could also be unrealistic for the designer to have the necessary time to debug and create new code or logic that prevents errors left in the back-end system by its designer. In those instances, it is the responsibility of the designer to create a user interface that essentially directs the user around these potentially error-prone instances. For example, this could be achieved through the use of directions and confirmation messages that ask for the ultimate approval of the user before executing an action. Additionally, the designer could restrict the ability of the user to make certain choices where errors are likely to occur, although this requires assuming that the user has the same desired goal in mind as the designer when executing a particular action. This kind of error prevention needs to be paired with a successful backtracking capability in case of a miscommunication between the user and the designer's intended use of a functionality (Nielsen, 1995).

Concerning logical flow of the design, information presented in the user interface should appear naturally and appeal to the common sense ordering of a typical, generic user of the system. The terminology used and the way that prompts and functionalities are arranged or displayed should directly correlate to how the users would set it up if they themselves were arranging the prompts and functionalities. Also, the designer should make sure that the layout of various
actions follows the logical or sequential flow of how those actions would be executed by the user (Nielsen, 1995). For example, if there are three actions that would normally be executed in the order of action one – action two – action three, then their appropriate layout should be either in a top-to-bottom layout or a right-to-left layout.

Finally for simplicity of design, the designer should make sure to base all of his design decisions on the question, “What are the goals of the user?” In order to make the user interface as effective as possible in executing actions of the application, the designer cannot lose vision of the goals of the user. He should create functionalities that allow the user to execute specific and streamlined actions, rather than adding unnecessary extras that clutter up the efficiency of the interface (Nielsen, 1995, Sollenberger, 2012, and Vogel, 2012).

Section 3 – Application Implementation

After downloading Qt Creator and making sure to keep the above user interface design principles their due diligence, the actual design of the application and it’s user interface began. To reiterate, the end goal of this process was to create an application and user interface that would allow a user to perform the following four actions: upload a file containing the various statistics of every team for a particular season, view that uploaded file, set the values of the different parameters to be used in the actual algorithm, execute the algorithm in order to generate a unique ranking, and finally to view the ranking. A description and explanation of the completed application are contained in the pages that follow.
Figure 1 – CMS+ Start Window

Figure 1 – “CMS+ Start Window” shows the start window of the CMS+ application. The user will notice that the layout and overall appearance of the application match those that he or she would encounter when using an application native to his or her respective operating system. For example, on a Macintosh with an iOS operating system, any of the Microsoft suite applications will have the same grey header bars as well as the red, yellow, and green
buttons and the double arrow in the header bar. The buttons and the double arrow function exactly as they would in any other application on that operating system: close, minimize, and restore, and manually resize the window, respectively. By using the mouse pointer to click and hold the bottom right corner of the window, the user can also manually resize the window. The color and styling of the action buttons are also consistent with the grey theme of many familiar applications. The theme, styling, and general window functionality just described is consistent across all of the windows in this application.

In the start window, the user has the ability at first to perform three of the desired actions of this application. By clicking the “Load Season Information” button, he can initiate the process of selecting a file with the season data for all of the teams and then loading that file so that it can be used in the algorithm. By clicking the “Set Ranking Parameters” button, the user can open a separate window that will allow him to set the parameters that govern the way the algorithm will process and evaluate the season data that ultimately affects the ranking that is produced. Finally, by clicking the “Rank Teams” button, he can execute the algorithm, generate a ranking, and then view that ranking, which is displayed in a tabular format, in a separate window.
Section 3.1 – Loading Season Information

Figure 2 – Load Data Window

Figure 2 – “Load Data Window” shows the open file dialog box that appears after the user clicks the “Load Season Information” button from the start window. Consistent with the styling of any application inherent to an operating system, the user will notice that this open file dialog box looks identical that he would find in opening a file in Microsoft Word, for example. In the same token, the user can expect the functionality of the open file dialog box to behave exactly
as he would expect it to when interacting with one in application like Microsoft Word. Thus, the user can browse for a file to load and then select that file by either highlighting it in blue by clicking on the file and then pressing the “Open” button, or by double-clicking on the file. The “Open” button is not enabled for clicking until the user has selected a file. If the user does not want to open a file, he can press the “Cancel” button at any time to close the open file dialog box. After pressing the “Open” button of the “Cancel” button, the user will return to the start window. It is important that the user load the correct type of file so that the algorithm can interact with it appropriately in order to generate a ranking. The loaded file that contains the season data needs to be formatted as a tab-delimited text file, meaning the file should end in the “.txt” prefix and that each of the individual text strings in each line of the file is separated by a tab character.
Section 3.3 – Viewing Season Information

As previously mentioned, after either clicking the “Open” button or the “Cancel” button in the “Load Data” open file dialog box, the user will be brought back to the start window. If the user clicked the “Cancel” button, the start window will appear as it did when the application was first opened. However, as shown in Figure 3 – “Start Window After Loading File”, if the user clicked the “Open” button, the start window will now include a fourth button titled “View Season Information”. By clicking on this button, the user can view in a tabular format the
data that he loaded during the execution of the “Load Season Information” action. Hiding the “View Season Information” button until the user has successfully loaded a file helps to guide the user through the flow of the application and encourages him to load a file before wanting to view the data that the file contains. This prohibits him from attempting to view data that he has not yet specified from where to obtain.

Figure 4 – View Season Information Window
After clicking the “View Season Information” button in the start window, a window titled “View Season Information” will open. This window is shown in Figure 4 – “View Season Information Window”. The data taken from the text file loaded during the “Load Season Information” action is presented in a tabular format that the user will notice both appears and functions similar to cells in Microsoft Excel. For example, the user can sort columns in either ascending or descending order by clicking on the numbered column headers. He can also resize or automatically resize columns and rows by placing his cursor on the column or row dividing line and clicking and dragging the column or row to the desired width, or double-clicking, respectively. The user can select individual cells by clicking on them, but he cannot edit the contents of any cells. The user can also scroll side-to-side and up-and-down through the table by placing his cursor in the table window to activate the scroll bars, and then using them as they would normally be used on any other application. Finally, he can close or restore the window by clicking the red or green button in the top left corner of the window, respectively. Closing the window will return the user to the start window.
Section 3.4 – Setting Ranking Parameters

After clicking the “Set Ranking Parameters” button from the start window, a window titled “Set Ranking Parameters” appears. This window is shown in Figure 5 – “Set Ranking Parameters Window”.

From this window, the user has the ability to change the values of any or all of the parameters that govern the back end algorithm. Initially, the user will notice that the parameters are set to their default values, which were set by the designers of CMS+. In order to change the value of a parameter, the user can either click the vertical scroll buttons to increment or decrement it, or he can click inside the box where the value is displayed and manually edit the value as he
would edit text in an application like Microsoft Word. The increments and
decrements of the individual parameters are fixed and depend on the feasible
range of values for that parameter. Values changed by manual editing still obey
the increment, decrement, and feasibility ranges placed on that parameter. After
making any changes, the user can press the “Save” button in order to set the
values of the parameters to the new values he specified, or he can press the
“Cancel” button to disregard his changes and restore the parameter values to
their defaults. He can also load the last set of parameters that were saved by
pressing the “Load Last Used” button, or he can return the parameters to their
default values by pressing the “Load Default” button. By pressing either the
“Save” button or the “Cancel” button, the user will close the window and return
the start window.
Section 3.5 – Ranking Teams

Finally, after clicking the “Rank Teams” button from the start window, a window titled “Rank Teams” appears. This window is shown in Figure 6 – “Rank Teams Window”. From this window, the user can view the ranking generated by the algorithm using the data and parameters that he loaded and specified, respectively. As in the “View Season Information” window, the ranking is presented in a tabular format. However, the user cannot sort the columns, because this allows him to essentially break the sequential order of the ranking, making the act of ranking counterproductive. He can still highlight cells and
manually or automatically resize the rows and columns, as he is able to in the “View Season Information” window, but he may not edit the contents of any of the cells. Additionally, the user can still scroll side-to-side and up-and-down through the table, as in “View Season Information” by placing his cursor in the table window to activate the scroll bars, and then using them as they would normally be used on any other application. Finally, he can close or restore the window by clicking the red or green button in the top left corner of the window, respectively. As always, closing the window will return the user to the start window.

**Section 4 – Future Development & Conclusion**

As far as future development is concerned, something that would make this application more attractive as a decision tool is a functionality that would allow the user to perform both a comparative analysis of multiple rankings and a sensitivity analysis of the effect of changing different parameters. Effectively, he would be able to simultaneously execute and view multiple rankings side-by-side that were each based on different parameter sets. Another area of future work is platform flexibility. To create exposure for CMS+ and its application as a ranking decision tool, it is imperative that the application become online and mobile capable. Qt is already compatible with HTML and iOS, meaning that the potential for this ranking decision tool to become both an online and mobile application is feasibly and practically realizable.

In conclusion, the application and its user interface effectively allow its user to perform the four basic functional goals of its creation, which are uploading a file containing the various statistics of every team for that season, viewing that
uploaded file, setting the values of the different parameters to be used in the actual algorithm, executing the algorithm in order to generate a unique ranking, and finally, viewing that ranking. It ensures that the user is able to quantify his ranking biases when working with the algorithm and ranking heuristic, and provides a means of interacting with them that supports the design conventions of paying attention to patterns of design, consistency of design, error prevention, logical flow of design, and simplicity of design. The application should make the algorithm and ranking heuristic more attractive to being used by a decision making entity that needs all of its attention devoted to making decisions – not manually editing and executing lines of code.
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