

This is a working document for the evolving quantitative rating system. Procedures are subject to change based on careful consideration and analysis of the CTCPA National Rating Committee

RATINGS

Goals

The purpose of rating each member is to provide a fair and level playing field for all members. No one should be riding with an advantage or be disadvantaged when competing with other members.

It is stressed that at any time, when determining the rating of an individual, rating committees must not consider the effect on the individual member but the effect on the membership as a whole. If the member pens like a 3 then they are rated a 3. If they pen like a 2 then they are rated a 2. The individual's age, length of time penning, existing teams or the fact they may skip a rating level altogether, simply do not enter into the equation. The penner's ability dictates what their rating should be.

When rating a penner, rating committees cannot consider personal relationships, emotions or conflicts of interest. The decision must be based solely on the individual's ability. The rate of improvement the individual has shown and the likelihood of significant improvement by the end of the year should also be considered. It is the responsibility of the CTCPA Rating Coordinator to ensure that all riders in regional associations are rated on a level playing field across the nation.

The biggest test of the ratings system is when penners across all associations compete in shows such as the National Finals and other large shows. A #4 from one association should pen similar to a #4 from any other association. If even one penner competes at a show and is incorrectly rated, he or she has been given a competitive advantage, all other penners have been disadvantaged and the integrity of the CTCPA Ratings System is put in jeopardy.

The purpose of the CTCPA Rating Coordinator position is to ensure every rider, no matter which regional association they belong to, is rated at the appropriate level.

The CTCPA is responsible for the integrity of the rating system and as such, the CTCPA AS OWNERS OF THE RATING SYSTEM will have the final say.

Procedure

An affiliate member joins a CTCPA association. Fees are taken by that association secretary, which include CTCPA fees. The association secretary submits the affiliate membership application and corresponding fees to the CTCPA office. The association secretary forwards any new member criteria form to the CTCPA Rating Coordinator. The CTCPA Rating Coordinator contacts the Regional Rating Chairperson to confirm and/or discuss the rating of the affiliate member after which the member is

issued a temporary rating number. The CTCPA Rating Coordinator will have a rating person available at each sanctioned show that will be responsible for rating any new member appearing to compete at that sanctioned show. Once their membership is received, new members' ratings will be reviewed by the CTCPA Rating Committee and a final rating issued. Ratings will be reviewed by the CTCPA Rating Committee prior to the commencement of the next year's competition. In few cases, there are those members who will undergo further review in the new competition year prior to receiving a rating for that year. It must be understood that members are constantly under review and ratings are subject to change in accordance with the CTCPA rules.

Criteria

1. [General Overview](#)
2. [Goals](#)
3. [Definitions](#)
4. [Quantitative Analysis Overview](#)
5. [Quantitative Analysis Exclusions](#)
6. [Qualitative Analysis Overview](#)
7. [Procedures](#)
8. [Administrative Ratings Structure](#)
9. [Appeals](#)

1. General

- 1.1. The CTCPA classification system is based on an 8-Rating System.
- 1.2. Ratings will be based on the quantitative data of competitors win loss fees ratio, pulled from Sort Arena, and a qualitative analysis executed by the CTCPA ratings committee, regional ratings chairs, and regional rating committees.
- 1.3. Competitors of the CTCPA can only be issued one rating at any given time. (i.e. a penner cannot have one rating for one association and one for another).
- 1.4. The CTCPA ratings system is the responsibility of the following authorities:
 - 1.4.1. CTCPA Ratings Committee
 - 1.4.1.1. The CTCPA Ratings Committee will be comprised of no less than three individuals
 - 1.4.1.1.1. CTCPA Ratings Data Manager
 - 1.4.1.1.2. CTCPA Ratings Chair
 - 1.4.1.1.3. CTCPA Ratings Member

*[*See Section 8. Administrative Ratings Structure for more details](#)*

1.4.2. CTCPA Member Associations Ratings Committee(s)

- 1.4.2.1. Each CTCPA Member Association is responsible for appointing a ratings committee chair and ratings committee.

1.4.3. Each year the CTCPA Ratings Committee and all Member Association Ratings Chairs will meet at an annual meeting as described in [Section 7. Procedures](#)

2. Goals

- 2.1. The purpose of rating each competitor is to provide a fair and level playing field for all. No one should be riding with an advantage or be disadvantaged when competing against others within their region or nationally. With the evolution of Team Cattle Penning and advancing technology, we now have the tools to quantitatively assess riders' skills based on data as qualitative measures. By using data the individuals age, length of time penning, existing teams, appearance and other factors do not dictate their rating. Rather their ability to successfully or unsuccessfully compete against their peers will dictate the individuals rating. By analyzing data, personal relationships, emotions and conflicts of interests are no longer variables.
- 2.2. Ratings will be evaluated after the CTCPA National Finals each year, with all Established Competitors as defined in [Section 3. Definitions](#) being evaluated and ranked against their peers (others within the same rating category.) Competitors will be moved according to their ranking within in their rating peer group based on their results, with oversight from the CTCPA ratings committee and regional ratings chairs. Competitors should expect more fluidity in ratings changes year over year based on their success or struggles as a competitor. Guidelines and Guardrails are established within this system to protect competitors who should not be analyzed on data alone for various reasons.
- 2.3. The CTCPA is committed to establishing and maintaining the data of all CTCPA competitors. An analysis will be provided to all member associations to ensure that every competitor, no matter which member association they belong to, is rated at the appropriate level. The CTCPA is responsible for the integrity of the rating system and as such, the CTCPA as owners of the rating system will have the final say.

3. Definitions

- 3.1. "CTCPA" means The Canadian Team Cattle Penning Association.
- 3.2. "Member Associations" means Team Cattle Penning Association that has been approved by the CTCPA board of directors to join the CTCPA.
- 3.3. "Competitor" means an individual rider that is a member of a CTCPA member association and is participating in a CTCPA Sanctioned event.
- 3.4. "Established Competitor" means riders who have ridden for more than (1) year at CTCPA Sanctioned events and have spent more than \$1,800.00 in fees in that year.
- 3.5. "New Competitor" means riders who have ridden for less than (1) year at CTCPA sanctioned events or who have not competed for more than (2) years at CTCPA will be given a rating classification based on the CTCPA qualitative rating system.

- 3.6. “Quantitative (Analysis)” means an analysis based on the data describe in [Section 3. Quantitative Analysis Overview](#). A quantitative analysis is based on objective criteria and is not subjective to any one person’s opinion or view.
- 3.7. “Qualitative (Analysis)” means an analysis based on the qualitative criteria described in [Section 4. Qualitative Analysis Overview](#). A qualitative analysis is subjective to the persons in the CTCPA ratings authority described in [Section 8. Administrative Ratings Structure](#).
- 3.8. “Upper Threshold” means the point or level within each rating that triggers riders to be moved up into the next rating category. If a rider meets or exceeds the upper threshold, they must be moved up one rating category unless a unanimous vote as described in [Section 7. Procedures](#) The process of defining the upper threshold can be found in [Section 7. Procedures](#).
- 3.9. “Lower Threshold” means the point or level within each rating that triggers riders to be moved down into the next rating category. If a rider falls below the lower threshold, they will be given the option to move down as described in [Section 7. Procedures](#) The process of defining the lower threshold can be found in [Section 7. Procedures](#).
- 3.10. Appellant means the person making the appeal either on behalf of themselves or of another competitor.
- 3.11. Appeal Board is the combination of the following authorities: the CTCPA Rating Committee and the regional ratings chairs of all member associations.

4. Quantitative Analysis Overview

- 4.1. The CTCPA will track team penning entry fees and earnings fees by each competitor through Sort Arena for all Member Association Events and any special CTCPA sanctioned events.
- 4.1.1. With this data, winnings will be divided by entry fees by each competitor. That will provide every competitor with a **win loss ratio**.
- All competitors¹ will be ranked highest to lowest by their win loss ratio within their own rating cohort.
 - Example Rider A:
 - \$8,090 (Winnings) / \$4,806 (Entry Fees) / = 168% Win loss Ratio
- 4.2. Each competitor’s win loss ratio will then only be evaluated against other competitors of the same rating. i.e. all 6’s will be ranked against each other, all 5’s, all 4’s etc.

5. Quantitative Analysis Exclusions

¹ Except for those excluded in Section 5 Quantitative Analysis Exclusions

5.1. The following is a list of exclusions in which quantitative data cannot provide a fair and complete overview of a rider's skill level for various reasons. Data will be analyzed for ALL competitors regardless of this exclusion list, however based on this list, the CTCPA Rating Committee and the regional ratings chairs will utilize qualitative measurements to rate competitors.

5.1.1. Any competitor with a win loss ratio over 100% is not eligible to be moved down regardless of their ranking within their rating or by a qualitative analysis.

5.1.2. Any foreign competitors, defined as a competitor that rides primarily in an association outside of Canada will be assessed using the CTCPA qualitative rating system as defined in [Section 6. Qualitative Analysis Overview](#), they will not be eligible to be moved based on an upper or lower threshold quantitative line.

5.1.3. Any "new" competitors as defined in [Section Definitions 3.5](#) will be given a rating based on the CTCPA qualitative rating system. The process of rating new competitors is defined in [Section 7.2 New Competitor Procedures](#).

5.1.4. Any established competitors whose entry fees were **less than \$1,800** over the course of one year will not be quantitatively evaluated against their peers, rather they will be assessed using the CTCPA qualitative rating system as defined in [Section 6. Qualitative Analysis Overview](#).

6. Qualitative Analysis Overview

6.1. A qualitative assessment is done for new competitors when sufficient data is not available to do a quantitative analysis. All new competitors will be responsible for completing a self-assessment. This assessment will be distributed to the member association rating chair for review as well as the CTCPA Rating Committee. The member association rating chair will be responsible for rating new competitors based on the following qualitative criteria:

6.1.1. "N" This penner is new to riding, penning, or both. Well below average in penning skills and needs to develop in all areas of penning. This penner does not make meaningful contributions to the success of most runs without the consistent and constant support from a higher-rated rider on the team. This penner may also be a former seasoned penner who can no longer be competitive riding above this rating because of age, health, or physical ability.

- Has very limited or no experience in penning or sorting.
- Requires continuous direction and assistance from teammates during runs.
- Little to no understanding of penning strategy or team roles.
- Uncertain and hesitant when approaching or handling cattle.
- Unlikely to contribute effectively to the team without direct guidance.

- Needs extensive coaching on all aspects of riding, positioning, and cattle handling.
- Minimal arena awareness and reaction time during a run.
- Minimal understanding of pen positions.

6.1.2. “1” This penner is below average in penning skills and is likely a newer penner who needs to develop in most areas of penning. This penner can sometimes contribute to a team’s success but does so inconsistently. This penner may also be a former seasoned penner who can no longer be competitive riding above this rating because of age, health or physical ability.

- Might display shaky riding skills or a lack of confidence when riding at higher speeds.
- Lack of efficiency when sorting or trying to control a cow, most likely needs help pulling or finishing a cow to completion of task.
- Slow to no reaction time to situations in a run.
- Relies on other team members for instructions.
- Most likely limited to playing one position in the herd.
- Needs coaching on positions at the pen in a run.
- Uncertain about strategy and struggles with changing things up in a run.
- Inability to add speed with any accuracy.
- Little arena awareness and needs coaching on what is happening in a run as it unfolds.

6.1.3. “2” This penner is developing their skills in all areas of penning where they are no longer a beginner yet are not achieving overall average penning skills. This penner can consistently contribute to the team’s success.

- Would tend to show adequate riding skills and should be displaying some confidence at higher speeds.
- Has developed some ability to sort and control a cow but may still need help finishing.
- Seeing some increased reaction time to situations in a run.
- Starting to make some decisions without coaching.
- Most likely playing one position in the herd but developing in other positions.
- At the pen, most likely to know what position to ride to.

- Basic knowledge of strategy and position but still needs coaching.
- Increasing speed but not consistent in accuracy.
- More arena awareness about how a run is setting up.

6.1.4. “3” This penner is average in most areas of penning. This penner regularly consistently provides meaningful contributions to a team’s success with their penning knowledge and skills and shows a solid understanding of the sport.

- A good rider who has confidence at riding at speed.
- Able to pull cattle with control with more consistency however may pull cattle too quickly or slowly than the situation dictates.
- Good reaction time to situations in a run.
- Should be able to assist other riders in some situations.
- Should show some confidence in playing every position in the herd but shows strength in one position.
- Knows where to be at the pen and adapts to changing situations.
- Should be able to strategize and read the play.
- This rider may be too aggressive or timid in certain situations that would warrant a different reaction.

6.1.5. “4” This penner is above average in most areas of penning. This penner can provide above average contributions to a team’s success. Showing above average skills in pulling cows, turning cattle and likely displays an above average understanding of the sport.

- A good rider able to ride with confidence at speed.
- Able to play any position and has more control over cattle/herd with little help.
- Better reaction time to adapting to situations in a run.
- More proactive to developing situations.
- Should be confident in playing any position in the herd.
- Knows where to be at the pen with appropriate speed and adapts quickly to changing situations.
- Able to strategize and read the play. Can adjust to arena situations while coaching.
- Uses appropriate speed in most situations.

- Very good arena awareness.

6.1.6. “5” This penner is proficient in all areas of penning. This competitor can make consistent above average contributions to a team’s success and shows a thorough understanding of the sport. This rider regularly displays an ability to be the most meaningful contributor on teams in rated classes and excels alongside their peers (other pro riders) in the open class.

- Confident and proficient in all areas of riding.
- Can handle and control any type of cattle in most situations.
- Reaction time very efficient for top results.
- Able to lead and coach a team through a run while doing their job.
- Can pull cattle with control, timing and appropriate speed most of the time.
- Precise and correct with speed in all situations at the pen.
- Adept at strategizing, reading the play and adjusting to changing situations while coaching the team.
- Proficient and confident in all areas of penning with speed and accuracy.
- Excellent arena awareness.

6.1.7. “6” This penner has elite skills, is highly proficient in all areas of penning and is highly competitive. This penner regularly displays an ability to be the most significant contributor on rated teams and can display the same skills on teams with other pro level penners. This penner shows a comprehensive understanding and excels in their knowledge of most or all areas of the sport.

- Confident and proficient in all areas of riding with speed.
- Excellent reaction time with small margin of error.
- Able to lead and coach a team while mastering their own task and can change the dynamics of a run.
- Can pull and control cattle with perfect timing and speed.
- Precise and correct with speed in all positions at the pen.
- Most accurate at reading the play and managing runs at top speed.
- This rider is confident, accurate, and efficient with speed in all areas of penning with little to no assistance.
- Riding and horse ability becomes secondary to arena awareness, strategy, reaction time and winning ratio.

- Wins money regularly in all classes.

6.1.8. “7” This penner is a topnotch penner who has exceptional skills and excels in all areas of penning. This penner regularly displays an ability to be the most significant contributor on rated teams and can display the same skills on teams with other pro level penners. This penner shows a comprehensive understanding and excels in their knowledge of most or all areas of the sport.

- The very best penners in the nation.
- Has reached the pinnacle in all areas of penning.
- An exclusive category that is only achieved by a handful of penners at any time.

6.1.9. “8” This penner is an internationally rated penner whose penning skills exceed the top domestically rated penners. Any rider who is rated a 7 or higher by any other rating system other than CTCPA will be designated a #8 until rated by the CTCPA National Rating Committee.

7. Procedures

7.1. Established Competitor Procedures

7.1.1. For all established competitors a quantitative analysis as described in [Section 4. Quantitative Analysis Overview](#) will be done annually at the completion of the CTCPA National Finals. So long as the competitor is established as defined in [Section 3. Definitions](#), and they are not excluded from such an analysis as described in [Section 5. Quantitative Analysis Exclusions](#); they will be ranked against their peers.

7.1.2. Competitors data will be analyzed against their peer group (rating group) only.

7.1.3. The riders that exceed the “upper threshold” within their respective ratings groups will be moved up based on their Win Loss Ratio whereas the bottom riders that do not exceed the “lower threshold” will be moved down.

7.1.4. The “upper threshold” and the “lower threshold” will be determined each year based on the recommendation of the CTCPA Ratings Committee and regional ratings chairs; motioned by the CTCPA Board of Directors, no later than 21 days after the Canadian National Finals

7.1.5. Establishing the “upper threshold” and the “lower threshold”

7.1.5.1.1. The “upper threshold” shall be a win-loss ratio of 80% or greater, whereas the “lower threshold” shall be a win-loss ratio of 10% or less. The thresholds have the option to vary from year to year based on the discretion of the CTCPA national rating committee.

- Example: Rider B has a win-loss ratio of 98%, they exceed the “upper threshold” and shall move up
- Example: Rider C has a win-loss ratio of 77%, they do not exceed the “upper threshold”, therefore, they shall not automatically be moved up

7.1.6. Once thresholds are motioned by way of the CTCPA board vote, no later than 21 days after nationals, the CTCPA Ratings committee will identify the competitors who fall within the “top threshold” of each rating based on their win-loss ratio; these riders will be moved up based on the quantitative data unless there is a two thirds vote against a competitor being moved up. This vote will take place at the annual ratings chairs meeting. It will be the responsibility of the members’ home club’s regional rating chairs to propose a case, based on quantitative evidence and/or qualitative evidence, for a rider not to move up if that rider falls within the 80% win-loss ratio. Each rating chair that is involved with the ratings has 1 vote towards the decision. If a rating chair decides to abstain from voting, their vote will be recognized as a null vote and will not count in favor or in opposition.

7.1.7. The CTCPA will also identify the “bottom” percentage of competitors of each qualifying rating based on their win-loss ratio. The CTCPA will recommend that these riders be moved down based on the quantitative data.

7.1.7.1. Regional ratings chairs will offer competitors the option to move down for the following competition season based on quantitative data. Moving down will not be mandatory to begin with.

- Example: Rider D has a win loss ratio of 8%, they fall within the “lower threshold” therefore the option to move down for the 2026 season
- Example: Rider E has a win loss ratio of 15%, they do not fall within the “lower threshold” therefore they do not automatically move down

7.1.8. Though the CTCPA will identify the upper and lower thresholds, additional competitors can be moved by majority vote at the annual ratings meeting.

7.1.9. All rating changes will be established at the culmination of one season and set for the following season.

7.1.10. Quantitative data analysis will only be executed one time per year at the culmination of the season. As such early early-season and mid-season ratings changes are discouraged unless absolutely necessary. Should a regional ratings chair feel an early-season ratings change is appropriate, they must notify the CTCPA Ratings committee no later than the competitor’s second show of the season. Ratings changes will not be allowed after competitors have competed in more than three shows in any one season.

7.2. New Competitor Procedures

7.2.1. New Competitor joins a member association. Fees are taken by that association secretary, which include CTCPA fees. The member association secretary submits the competitor's application and corresponding fees to the CTCPA office. The member association secretary forwards any new member criteria form to the CTCPA Rating Committee. The CTCPA rating committee contacts the regional rating chairperson to confirm and/or discuss the rating of the competitor after which the competitor is issues a temporary rating number. New competitors are to be rated based on the qualitative criteria outline in section 6. Qualitative Analysis Overview. The regional rating chairperson will be responsible for observing any new competitor appearing to compete at the sanctioned show. Once a competitor's fees are received, new competitors rating will be reviewed by the CTCPA Rating Committee, and a final rating will be issued. Competitors will be ranked against their peers at the culmination of the competition year so long as they meet the minimum threshold. For competitors that do not meet the minimum threshold, the CTCPA Ratings committee and the regional ratings chairs will review the competitor at the culmination of the year based on qualitative measures.

7.3. New Competitor Procedures & Qualitative Analysis Procedures for competitors excluded from a quantitative analysis.

7.3.1. Any competitor who is being rated qualitatively will be rated by the member association rating chair and committee.

7.3.2. Qualitative assessment will be done based on the criteria defined in Section 6. Qualitative Analysis Overview

7.3.3. Once assessed the ratings will be presented to the CTCPA rating committee for approval either at the yearend ratings meeting, or at the time the new competitor is requesting a rating.

7.4. Annual Rating Review Meeting

7.4.1. An annual meeting will be hosted by the CTCPA Rating Committee each year. All regional ratings chairs will be invited to this meeting. The goal of the meeting is to review the quantitative data analysis and finalize the competitors' ratings for the following competition season.

7.4.1.1. The annual meeting will be hosted after the culmination of the CTCPA National Finals and after the compilation of the current seasons quantitative data. It is the goal of the CTCPA to host this meeting prior to the commencement of the new season

8. **Administrative Ratings Structure**

8.1. The CTCPA as owners of the rating system will hold ultimate say on all CTCPA competitors' ratings.

8.2. The CTCPA board of directors will elect The CTCPA Ratings Committee

- 8.2.1. The CTCPA Ratings Committee will be comprised of no less than three individuals.
 - 8.2.1.1. CTCPA Ratings Data Manager
 - 8.2.1.2. CTCPA Ratings Member
 - 8.2.1.3. CTCPA Ratings Chair
- 8.2.2. The CTCPA Ratings Committee are responsible for maintaining a master list of competitors and their respective ratings.
- 8.2.3. The CTCPA Ratings Committee is to be made up of at least one current CTCPA Director, the other individuals can be an active Director, member association member, or hired individual. It is recommended that the active CTCPA Director(s) do not hold an executive roll in addition to this role.
 - 8.2.3.1. A role on the CTCPA Ratings Committee, does not give one a voting director seat on the CTCPA board unless they are a voting director by way of appointment as one of the Canadian Six or an acting Member Association Director.
- 8.2.4. Members of the CTCPA Ratings Committee will be evaluated every two years by the CTCPA Board of Directors
- 8.3. The CTCPA Ratings committee is responsible for managing ratings and the data associated. They are to coordinate any issues that arise from the rating process (procedure issues, communication etc.)
- 8.4. All member associations are responsible for electing and selecting their own ratings chair.
 - 8.4.1. It is requested that the ratings committee chairs serve a minimum two years in the role.
 - 8.4.2. The elected Regional Ratings Chairs are responsible for selecting their own ratings committees.
 - 8.4.3. It is recommended that the ratings committee chairs are individuals that hold a minimum rating of a “3” or have held a minimum rating of “3” in the past. Should the selected ratings chair be rated less than a “3” the member association will need to provide a detailed explanation of the qualifications.
 - 8.4.4. The CTCPA Rating committee shall approve the selected Regional Ratings Chairs unless there are legitimate and identifiable concerns with respect to experience, objective or past poor performance. The CTCPA Rating committee can remove a Regional Ratings chair for the same reasons. All refusals of approval or notice of removal of such a chair is required to be provided in writing to not only the regional ratings chair, but the Member Association as well with specifics for the reasoning.
- 8.5. The CTCPA Ratings committee is responsible for hosting and managing an annual ratings meeting inclusive of all regional ratings chairs.

Appeal

8.5.1. The following section defines the process in which a competitor can request a review of their own rating or that of another competitor. There are two types of appeals; the process for the two appeals is the same.

8.5.2. Personal Appeal

8.5.2.1. At any time, but not more than once per calendar year, a penner may appeal his or her own rating.

8.5.3. Competitor Appeal

8.5.3.1. At any time, any penner may appeal another penner's rating. The same penner's rating may not be appealed more than once per calendar year.

8.5.3.2. In the case of an appeal, the CTCPA Office, shall alert ALL regional rating chairs along with the CTCPA Ratings Committee of the appeal. The appeal will be heard by both authorities of the CTCPA rating system; the CTCPA National Rating Committee and the regional rating chairs. The two authorities previously mentioned will comprise the Appeal Board. While the appeal will be heard and deliberated on by the Appeal Board, the CTCPA regional rating chairs will be solely responsible for the appeal vote. For an appeal to be accepted, there must be a super-majority (2/3) vote in favor of the appeal to be accepted.

8.6. Appeal Process

8.6.1. The Appellant is to send written communication addressed to the CTCPA with the appeal. The appeal is to include the following:

8.6.1.1. their individual rating or the rating of the individual whom they are appealing

8.6.1.2. Outline their reason for filing an appeal

8.6.1.3. Explaining what their key points are as to why it is incorrect

8.6.1.4. Explain what they see as reasonable solution

8.6.1.5. The appeal must be accompanied by fee of \$350.00

8.6.2. Once the CTCPA receives the appeal, they will set up an appeal date with the rest of the Appeal Board.

8.6.3. Appeal Meeting Process

8.6.3.1. The Appeal Board will hear the evidence provided by the Appellant.

- The Appellant should be prepared to have an interactive conversation with the Appeal Board. The appellant may speak to the concerns how their rating or that of another competitor's will affect their ability to compete but must be aware and informed that the rating chairs will be basing their decisions heavily on the data collected.

- The Appellant has the right to ask questions of the Appeal Board and have a clear understanding of the goals and objectives of the rating committee.
- 8.6.3.2. The Appeal Board Chair, who will be one of the CTCPA Rating Committee members, will then ask the Appellant to leave the room/phone and the Appeal Board will deliberate on the appeal.
- 8.6.3.3. The regional rating chairs shall ALL vote either INFAVOR or OPPOSED to the appeal based off evidence provided by the appellant, fellow rating chairs, and the Quantitative Data.
- 8.6.3.3.1. Each regional rating chair that is involved with the Appeal has 1 vote towards the decision. If a person decides to abstain from voting; their vote will be recognized in favor of the decision the quantitative data analysis that all other members are evaluated by.
- 8.6.3.4. The appeal board can only review evidence as it pertains to the Quantitative Data. Under no circumstances can it give any substance to:
- Age
 - Effect on teams/high point calculations
 - Petitions
 - Personal reasons
 - Political reasons (i.e. sponsorship, the penner will quit, etc.)
- 8.6.3.5. The CTCPA National Rating Committee will give its decision which can only be:
- Accept the appeal
 - Deny the appeal

8.7. Appeal Fees

- Appeals will cost an upfront fee of \$350.00 due upon receipt of appeal

If the appeal is successful, the Appellant will receive \$300.00 back and \$50.00 will be retained by the CTCPA as an administration fee.