

APPLICATION PROJECT INDEX

Selected Baseball Research Projects

2027 Summer Analyst application supplement | October 2026

Independent work samples. The documents distinguish observed public facts from evaluation, proposals and unvalidated hypotheses. They are not club-issued reports or completed predictive models.

Project documents

Document	What it demonstrates	Current status
01 Prospect Evaluation Board	Selected Top 100 from original 160-player pool; team-level priorities; scouting rationale and evidence limits.	Working ranks; 17–100 provisional.
02 Dodgers Organizational Analysis	Multi-part qualitative study of offense, pitching, player development, roster flexibility and tradeoffs.	Interpretive memo; not a causal model.
03 Ninefold Product Case Study	Requirements, data modeling, multi-source normalization and coach-facing decision workflows.	Working product; integrations and validation ongoing.
04 Chase × Whiff Framework	Two-axis hitter risk categories and a proposed quantitative validation design.	Conceptual; not model-validated.

Skills demonstrated and next research priority

Current: baseball evaluation framing, data structuring, research synthesis, spreadsheet planning, product requirements, and communication for decision-makers.

Developing: Python/pandas, SQL, reproducible analysis and predictive modeling. A historical holdout-validated model, with public code and a baseline comparison, would be a more direct sample of quantitative research skill.

California Baptist University, B.A. Business Administration (Strategic Business Analysis and Insights), expected 2028. No confidential CBU data included.

ninefoldbaseball.com | [LinkedIn](#) | noah@thehempels.com

2026 PROSPECT EVALUATION BOARD

TOP 100 + ORGANIZATION PRIORITY LISTS

An independent, selected-pool evaluation using age-relative performance, strike-zone decisions, contact indicators, pitch traits, and strike-throwing as primary considerations.

160

ORIGINAL PLAYER POOL

30

ORGANIZATIONS

100

RANKED SHORTLIST

SCOPE NOTE

This working Top 100 is drawn from an initial 160-player selection across 30 organizations, with Tyler Bremner added later. It is not an exhaustive national ranking; team affiliations reflect the original pool snapshot.

NOAH HEMPEL

ninefoldbaseball.com • linkedin.com/in/noah-hempel-b95b5437a

OCTOBER 15, 2026 / APPLICATION EDITION

Methodology & evidence standard

01

Ranking criteria, evidence hierarchy, and remaining uncertainty

EVALUATION PRINCIPLES

01 / OFFENSIVE FOUNDATION

HITTERS / HIT BEFORE POWER

The evaluation gives weight to early strike-zone judgment and bat-to-ball skill, with some willingness to project future power development. Projected impact and positional demands remain important.

02 / RUN PREVENTION

PITCHERS / STRIKES + STUFF

The evaluation prioritizes competitive strike-throwing combined with usable pitch quality. Velocity alone is insufficient. Control, command, arsenal depth, and starter-role probability are considered separately.

UNCERTAINTY & EVIDENCE

Fact vs. judgment

Recorded statistical observations and public scouting grades are kept separate from individual projection and risk assessments.

Translation risk

A low minor-league strikeout rate is not proof of low chase; an ERA is not a pitch-quality measure.

Opportunity cost

Rankings balance ceiling, likelihood, position/role value, availability, and development distance.

Update triggers

A new level, changed arsenal, expanded sample, injury, or role change may lead to a revised evaluation.

Status: ranks 1-16 reflect the most-developed evaluations. Ranks 17-100 remain provisional and have not received individual player-by-player confirmation. Adjacent ranks should not imply precise value differences.

Highest-priority evaluations

Top 16 based on the most developed ranking discussions

01	Walker Jenkins	Twins	
02	Colt Emerson	Mariners	
03	Liam Doyle	Cardinals	SP1
04	Leo De Vries	Athletics	
05	Josue De Paula	Dodgers	
06	Jesus Made	Brewers	
07	Aidan Miller	Phillies	
08	Thomas White	Marlins	UP
09	Eli Willits	Nationals	
10	Kade Anderson	Mariners	
11	Max Clark	Tigers	
12	Seth Hernandez	Pirates	
13	Cam Caminiti	Braves	
14	Travis Sykora	Nationals	
15	Ryan Sloan	Mariners	
16	Charlie Condon	Rockies	

Lead rankings: Jenkins No. 1; Doyle No. 3 and top-ranked SP; White No. 8 following additional review.

Top 100 / ranks 01-25

03

Working prioritization from the selected pool; original team categories retained

RANK	PLAYER	ORGANIZATION	TEAM LIST
01	Walker Jenkins	Twins	#1
02	Colt Emerson	Mariners	#1
03	Liam Doyle	Cardinals	#1
04	Leo De Vries	Athletics	#2
05	Josue De Paula	Dodgers	#1
06	Jesus Made	Brewers	#1
07	Aidan Miller	Phillies	#1
08	Thomas White	Marlins	#3
09	Eli Willits	Nationals	#1
10	Kade Anderson	Mariners	#2
11	Max Clark	Tigers	#2
12	Seth Hernandez	Pirates	#1
13	Cam Caminiti	Braves	#1
14	Travis Sykora	Nationals	#3
15	Ryan Sloan	Mariners	#4
16	Charlie Condon	Rockies	#1
17	Tyler Bremner	Angels	added
18	Gavin Fien	Nationals	#2
19	Cooper Pratt	Brewers	#2
20	Gage Jump	Athletics	#1
21	Zyhir Hope	Dodgers	#3
22	Gavin Kilen	Giants	#1
23	Mike Sirota	Dodgers	#2
24	Josh Hammond	Royals	#2
25	Jacob Reimer	Mets	#1

TABLE KEY

"Team list" = original within-organization preference, not club consensus rank. "Added" = Tyler Bremner, researched after the initial selection. Ranks 17-100 are provisional editorial placements.

Top 100 / ranks 26-50

03

Working prioritization from the selected pool; original team categories retained

RANK	PLAYER	ORGANIZATION	TEAM LIST
26	Kruz Schoolcraft	Padres	#1
27	Eduardo Quintero	Dodgers	#11
28	Cam Cannarella	Marlins	#1
29	Aiva Arquette	Marlins	#5
30	Braylen Doughty	Guardians	#2
31	Gage Wood	Phillies	#2
32	Ethan Holliday	Rockies	#6
33	JoJo Parker	Blue Jays	#1
34	Michael Arroyo	Mariners	#3
35	Caleb Bonemer	White Sox	#1
36	Billy Carlson	White Sox	#2
37	Kale Fountain	Padres	#2
38	Robby Snelling	Marlins	#2
39	Daniel Susac	Giants	#5
40	Mitch Voit	Mets	#3
41	Tink Hence	Cardinals	#3
42	Jackson Ferris	Dodgers	#9
43	Chase Shores	Angels	#2
44	Brody Brecht	Rockies	#10
45	Zach Root	Dodgers	#4
46	Kellon Lindsey	Dodgers	#6
47	Xavier Neyens	Astros	#2
48	Dax Kilby	Yankees	#1
49	Caden Bodine	Rays	#7
50	Dean Curley	Guardians	#5

TABLE KEY

"Team list" = original within-organization preference, not club consensus rank. "Added" = Tyler Bremner, researched after the initial selection. Ranks 17-100 are provisional editorial placements.

Top 100 / ranks 51-75

03

Working prioritization from the selected pool; original team categories retained

RANK	PLAYER	ORGANIZATION	TEAM LIST
51	Bryce Rainer	Tigers	#1
52	Theo Gillen	Rays	#1
53	Ike Irish	Orioles	#2
54	Trey Gibson	Orioles	#1
55	Khal Stephen	Guardians	#1
56	Ethan Hedges	Rockies	#7
57	Dakota Jordan	Giants	#2
58	Brady Ebel	Brewers	#5
59	Joe Mack	Marlins	#4
60	Jonny Farmelo	Mariners	#5
61	Andrew Fischer	Brewers	#3
62	Daniel Pierce	Rays	#2
63	Brendan Summerhill	Rays	#6
64	Aidan Smith	Rays	#8
65	Slade Caldwell	Diamondbacks	#3
66	Easton Carmichael	Pirates	#3
67	Kendall George	Dodgers	#10
68	Miguel Sime Jr	Nationals	#5
69	Seaver King	Nationals	#4
70	Devin Taylor	Athletics	#6
71	Steven Echavarria	Athletics	#5
72	Gage Stanifer	Blue Jays	#2
73	Ben Hess	Yankees	#3
74	Chase Hampton	Yankees	#4
75	Bryce Cunningham	Yankees	#2

TABLE KEY

"Team list" = original within-organization preference, not club consensus rank. "Added" = Tyler Bremner, researched after the initial selection. Ranks 17-100 are provisional editorial placements.

Top 100 / ranks 76-100

03

Working prioritization from the selected pool; original team categories retained

RANK	PLAYER	ORGANIZATION	TEAM LIST
76	AJ Russell	Rangers	#1
77	Mason Morris	Reds	#4
78	Tate Southisene	Braves	#2
79	Luke Stevenson	Mariners	#6
80	Marcelo Perez	Mariners	#7
81	Jordan Yost	Tigers	#3
82	Marek Houston	Twins	#3
83	Riley Quick	Twins	#4
84	Brandon Winokur	Twins	#2
85	Dillon Head	Marlins	#7
86	Leo Bernal	Cardinals	#2
87	Hector Rodriguez	Reds	#2
88	Edwin Arroyo	Reds	#3
89	Brock Wilken	Brewers	#7
90	Nate George	Orioles	#3
91	Wehiwa Aloy	Orioles	#4
92	Tyson Neighbors	Orioles	#5
93	Vance Honeycutt	Orioles	#9
94	Enrique Bradfield Jr	Orioles	#6
95	Griff O'Ferrall	Orioles	#8
96	Cobb Hightower	Orioles	#10
97	Cutter Coffey	Blue Jays	#3
98	Jared Spencer	Blue Jays	#4
99	Cole Carrigg	Rockies	#5
100	Levi Sterling	Pirates	#2

TABLE KEY

"Team list" = original within-organization preference, not club consensus rank. "Added" = Tyler Bremner, researched after the initial selection. Ranks 17-100 are provisional editorial placements.

Selected hitter evaluations

04

Public observations and individual assessment distinguished

CASE 01 WALKER JENKINS • MINNESOTA

No. 1 / contact foundation and impact potential

PUBLIC EVIDENCE [2]

MLB Pipeline reported a 15.9% strikeout rate, 13.4% walk rate and 18% miss rate in its August 2026 pre-debut report. Its scouting grades included 60 hit, 60 power and 60 arm. The same coverage documented repeated injury interruptions and an August MLB debut.

EVALUATION

Jenkins ranks first because of his hit-and-impact combination. Injuries and interrupted development are meaningful counterweights. Continued MLB exposure will provide additional evidence of how the profile translates.

CASE 02 JESUS MADE • MILWAUKEE

No. 6 / strong early evidence; longer projection horizon

PUBLIC EVIDENCE [5]

MLB reported an 81% in-zone contact rate in 2025, plus a 15.8% career walk rate and 15.5% career strikeout rate as of April 2026. At 18, he was competing against substantially older Double-A players.

EVALUATION

Made's age-relative performance is a meaningful positive indicator. His No. 6 placement reflects the remaining development horizon, future role questions, and uncertainty against major-league pitching rather than age alone.

FOLLOW-UP ANALYSIS: Compare age-adjusted walk and strikeout rates, contact quality where available, and upper-level performance. Avoid treating raw minor-league totals as equivalent across levels.

Selected pitcher evaluations

Comparing pitch quality, strike-throwing, and starter probability

DIRECT PUBLIC-GRADE COMPARISON

LIAM DOYLE

FB 70 • SPLITTER 55 • CONTROL 50

THOMAS WHITE

FB 60 • SLIDER 70 • CONTROL 45

DOYLE / TOP-RANKED STARTING PITCHER [3]

Doyle's public grades include a 70 fastball, 55 splitter and 50 control. His attack-oriented mound presence is a qualitative observation; it does not establish command consistency or project future performance on its own.

What could change the ranking: professional workload, fuller secondary-pitch usage, hard contact in the zone and whether his delivery supports efficient strikes over six or seven innings.

WHITE / FRONTLINE UPSIDE [4]

Public 2026 grades list a 70 slider, 60 changeup and 45 control. The pitch mix supports a high-ceiling projection, contingent on improved strike-throwing. Average future command remains an assumption, not an established outcome.

What could change the ranking: consistent early-count strikes, right-handed hitter results, pitch deployment and workload resilience. The comparison with Doyle centers on starter-role probability and aggregate pitch quality.

CAUTION: Source grades are ordinal scouting opinions, not measured probabilities. A 50 control grade versus 45 suggests a difference in evaluator assessment; it does not quantify MLB walk rates or guarantee which pitcher is better.

Evaluation differences & follow-up

06

Areas for additional evidence and potential ranking changes

HIGHER-PRIORITY FOLLOW-UPS

Gavin Kilen

Hit tool and contact translation [8]

Eli Willits

Young shortstop hit/defense blend [6]

Zach Root

Strike throwing, secondaries, starter viability

Dax Kilby

Hit/zone profile vs future impact

Gavin Fien

Age-relative production and contact

Daniel Susac

Catcher offensive translation and defensive role

Mike Sirota

Approach upside, injury and sample scrutiny

Xavier Neyens

Projection vs contact risk

Sean Gamble

Nonconsensus player to track

Ching-Hsien Ko

Early-stage development watch

PLAYERS WITH GREATER EVALUATION UNCERTAINTY

Max Clark, Kruz Schoolcraft, Ethan Holliday, JoJo Parker, Cam Cannarella, Aiva Arquette, Brody Brecht, Tink Hence, Chase Shores and Gage Wood. These placements reflect qualitative evaluation preferences, not measured differences from a fixed, dated consensus list.

ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT WATCHLIST

01	Sterling Patick	LHP, Dodgers / org list #7
02	Cam Leiter	Dodgers
03	Fenwick Trimble	Marlins
04	Mitch Bratt	Diamondbacks
05	Patrick Forbes	Diamondbacks

Players outside the selected Top 100 are retained for follow-up because their development traits warrant continued evaluation.

Organization priority lists

07

Original pool organization grouping; selection rank shown where applicable

DODGERS 11			ROCKIES 10		
01	Josue De Paula	#5	01	Charlie Condon	#16
02	Mike Sirota	#23	02	JB Middleton	—
03	Zyhir Hope	#21	03	Jared Thomas	—
04	Zach Root	#45	04	Jackson Cox	—
05	Ching-Hsien Ko	—	05	Cole Carrigg	#99
06	Kellon Lindsey	#46	06	Ethan Holliday	#32
07	Sterling Patick	—	07	Ethan Hedges	#56
08	Cam Leiter	—	08	Zac Veen	—
09	Jackson Ferris	#42	09	Roc Riggio	—
10	Kendall George	#67	10	Brody Brecht	#44
11	Eduardo Quintero	#27			
DIAMONDBACKS 6			CARDINALS 3		
01	Brian Curley	—	01	Liam Doyle	#3
02	Mitch Bratt	—	02	Leo Bernal	#86
03	Slade Caldwell	#65	03	Tink Hence	#41
04	Tommy Troy	—			
05	JD Dix	—			
06	Patrick Forbes	—			
PADRES 2			REDS 4		
01	Kruz Schoolcraft	#26	01	Steele Hall	—
02	Kale Fountain	#37	02	Hector Rodriguez	#87
			03	Edwin Arroyo	#88
			04	Mason Morris	#77
GIANTS 5			PIRATES 4		
01	Gavin Kilen	#22	01	Seth Hernandez	#12
02	Dakota Jordan	#57	02	Levi Sterling	#100
03	Bo Davidson	—	03	Easton Carmichael	#66
04	Jacob Bresnahan	—	04	Wyatt Sanford	—
05	Daniel Susac	#39			

APPENDIX NOTE

Team-list order reflects the original selection, not an official club ranking. Affiliations may have changed (e.g., Zyhir Hope was traded to Detroit in 2026). A dash indicates not included in the selected Top 100.

Organization priority lists

07

Original pool organization grouping; selection rank shown where applicable

CUBS

3

01	Kane Kephley	—
02	Ethan Conrad	—
03	Josiah Hartshorn	—

BREWERS

7

01	Jesus Made	#6
02	Cooper Pratt	#19
03	Andrew Fischer	#61
04	Bishop Letson	—
05	Brady Ebel	#58
06	Luke Adams	—
07	Brock Wilken	#89

NATIONALS

5

01	Eli Willits	#9
02	Gavin Fien	#18
03	Travis Sykora	#14
04	Seaver King	#69
05	Miguel Sime Jr	#68

PHILLIES

5

01	Aidan Miller	#7
02	Gage Wood	#31
03	Matthew Fisher	—
04	Alex McFarlane	—
05	Carson DeMartini	—

METS

4

01	Jacob Reimer	#25
02	AJ Ewing	—
03	Mitch Voit	#40
04	Eli Serrano III	—

MARLINS

7

01	Cam Cannarella	#28
02	Robby Snelling	#38
03	Thomas White	#8
04	Joe Mack	#59
05	Aiva Arquette	#29
06	Fenwick Trimble	—
07	Dillon Head	#85

BRAVES

4

01	Cam Caminiti	#13
02	Tate Southisene	#78
03	Lucas Braun	—
04	Eric Hartman	—

ANGELS

3

01	Johnny Slawinski	—
02	Chase Shores	#43
03	Talon Haley	—

ASTROS

3

01	Ethan Frey	—
02	Xavier Neyens	#47
03	Ryan Forcucci	—

APPENDIX NOTE

Team-list order reflects the original selection, not an official club ranking. Affiliations may have changed (e.g., Zyhir Hope was traded to Detroit in 2026). A dash indicates not included in the selected Top 100.

Organization priority lists

07

Original pool organization grouping; selection rank shown where applicable

ATHLETICS

6

01	Gage Jump	#20
02	Leo De Vries	#4
03	Jamie Arnold	—
04	Gavin Turley	—
05	Steven Echavarria	#71
06	Devin Taylor	#70

RANGERS

2

01	AJ Russell	#76
02	Seong-Joon Kim	—

MARINERS

9

01	Colt Emerson	#2
02	Kade Anderson	#10
03	Michael Arroyo	#34
04	Ryan Sloan	#15
05	Jonny Farmelo	#60
06	Luke Stevenson	#79
07	Marcelo Perez	#80
08	Charlie Beilenson	—
09	Aidan Taurek	—

GUARDIANS

8

01	Khal Stephen	#55
02	Braylen Doughty	#30
03	Joey Oakie	—
04	Cooper Ingle	—
05	Dean Curley	#50
06	Daniel Espino	—
07	Andrew Walters	—
08	Luke Hill	—

WHITE SOX

3

01	Caleb Bonemer	#35
02	Billy Carlson	#36
03	Jacob Gonzalez	—

TWINS

6

01	Walker Jenkins	#1
02	Brandon Winokur	#84
03	Marek Houston	#82
04	Riley Quick	#83
05	Dasan Hill	—
06	James Ellwanger	—

TIGERS

4

01	Bryce Rainer	#51
02	Max Clark	#11
03	Jordan Yost	#81
04	Grayson Ginsell	—

APPENDIX NOTE

Team-list order reflects the original selection, not an official club ranking. Affiliations may have changed (e.g., Zyhir Hope was traded to Detroit in 2026). A dash indicates not included in the selected Top 100.

Organization priority lists

07

Original pool organization grouping; selection rank shown where applicable

ROYALS

4

01	Sean Gamble	—
02	Josh Hammond	#24
03	Justin Lamkin	—
04	Cameron Millar	—

BLUE JAYS

4

01	JoJo Parker	#33
02	Gage Stanifer	#72
03	Cutter Coffey	#97
04	Jared Spencer	#98

YANKEES

6

01	Dax Kilby	#48
02	Bryce Cunningham	#75
03	Ben Hess	#73
04	Chase Hampton	#74
05	Rory Fox	—
06	Jack Cebert	—

RAYS

9

01	Theo Gillen	#52
02	Daniel Pierce	#62
03	TJ Nichols	—
04	Dean Moss	—
05	Slater de Brun	—
06	Brendan Summerhill	#63
07	Caden Bodine	#49
08	Aidan Smith	#64
09	Gary Gill Hill	—

RED SOX

3

01	Jake Bennett	—
02	Kyson Witherspoon	—
03	Justin Gonzales	—

ORIOLES

10

01	Trey Gibson	#54
02	Ike Irish	#53
03	Nate George	#90
04	Wehiwa Aloy	#91
05	Tyson Neighbors	#92
06	Enrique Bradfield Jr	#94
07	Creed Willems	—
08	Griff O'Ferrall	#95
09	Vance Honeycutt	#93
10	Cobb Hightower	#96

APPENDIX NOTE

Team-list order reflects the original selection, not an official club ranking. Affiliations may have changed (e.g., Zyhir Hope was traded to Detroit in 2026). A dash indicates not included in the selected Top 100.

References, scope & limitations

Public sources for selected examples, plus data-quality limitations

DOCUMENT STATUS

Independent working snapshot prepared in October 2026. The overall board is a selected-pool ranking, not a validated projection system or complete eligibility screen. Original organization categories are preserved for traceability and do not always reflect current affiliations; some players have debuted in MLB.

PUBLIC REFERENCES / SELECTED PLAYER PROFILES

- [1] **MLB Pipeline, 2026 prospects index**
<https://www.mlb.com/milb/prospects/2026/top100/>
- [2] **Walker Jenkins - MLB Pipeline pre-debut scouting report**
<https://www.mlb.com/pirates/news/what-to-expect-twins-prospect-walker-jenkins-mlb>
- [3] **Liam Doyle - scouting grades and report**
<https://www.mlb.com/milb/prospects/2026/top100/liam-doyle-824604/>
- [4] **Thomas White - 2026 scouting report**
<https://baseballsavant.mlb.com/savant-player/thomas-white-806258>
- [5] **Jesus Made - 2026 Double-A performance**
<https://www.mlb.com/news/brewers-jesus-made-three-hit-game-at-double-a>
- [6] **Eli Willits - 2026 player profile**
<https://www.mlb.com/milb/prospects/top100/eli-willits-816113>
- [7] **Tyler Bremner - 2026 player profile**
<https://www.mlb.com/milb/prospects/2026/top100/tyler-bremner-803285/>
- [8] **Gavin Kilen - 2026 Baseball America report**
<https://www.baseballamerica.com/players/20127-gavin-kilen/>
- [9] **Sterling Patick - 2026 player profile**
<https://baseballsavant.mlb.com/savant-player/sterling-patick-814507>
- [10] **Colt Emerson / Seattle skill grades - 2026 Pipeline**
<https://www.mlb.com/mariners/news/mariners-top-30-prospects-list-2026-preseason>
- [11] **Baseball America - prospect ranking methodology**
<https://www.baseballamerica.com/rankings/2025-top-100-prospects/>
- [12] **MLB Pipeline - Dodgers midseason affiliation update**
<https://www.mlb.com/news/dodgers-top-30-prospects-2026-midseason-update>

RESEARCH REPRODUCIBILITY

Next validation step: confirm each player's current affiliation, level and eligibility; record source dates; then compare players by age, position and level rather than raw totals alone.

RESEARCH NOTE / 02

Organizational Philosophy Analysis

Los Angeles Dodgers

Andrew Friedman era | Independent qualitative assessment | October 2026

Central interpretation. The Dodgers appear to combine player-development resources, roster flexibility, selective acquisition of established stars, and pitching depth to sustain contention across multiple seasons. This is an interpretation of observable decisions, not a statement of confidential organizational policy.

Executive summary

A recurring feature of the Dodgers under Andrew Friedman is the use of multiple pathways to build and maintain a competitive major-league roster. Internal development supplies players and replacement depth, while trades and free-agent acquisitions add established performance. The organization also makes frequent use of roster flexibility to respond to injuries, changing roles, and uncertain player outcomes.

On offense, the analysis focuses on strike-zone decisions and contact skills as acquisition and development indicators. On the pitching side, it examines pitch-level strengths and deployment choices. In both cases, player-development capacity is treated as a possible source of added value rather than proof that any single profile will improve.

The primary tradeoff is that system-wide resilience can introduce individual uncertainty. Frequent role changes, roster movement, substantial payroll commitments, and the need for continuous player-development results create costs that must be evaluated alongside performance.

Analytical framework

Decision area	Observed approach / interpretation	Main unresolved question
Offense	Value zone judgment and contact as indicators of a potentially repeatable offensive foundation.	How much independent predictive value do those traits carry after age, level, and impact are controlled?
Pitching	Identify strong individual pitches and consider changes in pitch mix and role.	Can a pitch-level advantage be preserved across workloads and opponent adjustments?
Roster construction	Use depth, flexibility, and optionable players to replace missing performance.	What is the cost of churn, role disruption, and 40-man constraints?
Acquisitions	Combine internal production with major trade and free-agent investments.	When is buying established performance preferable to prospect risk?

1 | Offensive acquisition and development

This evaluation places particular emphasis on hitters who demonstrate strike-zone judgment, manageable swing-and-miss, and the ability to produce competitive plate appearances. These traits may support a more predictable offensive baseline, but walk and strikeout rates cannot independently establish chase rate, contact quality, or future productivity.

Max Muncy: a useful case, but not proof of exclusive Dodgers development

Muncy's move from Oakland to Los Angeles illustrates the possible value of pairing an existing plate-discipline foundation with changes in offensive approach. Contemporary reporting documents mechanical work Muncy undertook with his father before joining the Dodgers and subsequent refinements to his offensive approach within the organization [1]. It would therefore overstate the evidence to attribute his entire power transformation to Dodgers coaching.

The broader principle remains relevant: an evaluator may find players whose underlying skills are better than their current outcomes. Whether improvements are attributable to coaching, player-led changes, health, opportunity, or all of the above must be established rather than assumed.

Will Smith and the role of internal development

Will Smith provides a separate example of a homegrown player whose offensive contribution became an important part of the major-league roster. His progression can be examined as evidence that established organizational development processes may contribute to both floor and ceiling. Without a comparative study, however, it cannot establish that the club systematically develops power more effectively than every other organization.

2 | Pitching acquisition and deployment

A pitch-level approach identifies characteristics such as velocity, movement, release properties, extension, location, and a pitch's ability to generate misses or weak contact. Rather than treating a pitcher's prior ERA as a complete description, an evaluator can ask whether a different mix or deployment would better exploit existing strengths.

Evan Phillips is an illustrative hypothesis: his success as a Dodgers reliever invites a closer look at sweeper/slider usage, pitch quality, and role fit. A validated case study would compare season-by-season usage and performance against a relevant baseline before crediting a specific pitch-mix adjustment with the improvement.

Durability still matters. The organization can value pitchers capable of providing a stable workload while also building replacements for periods of injury or inconsistent performance.

3 | Risk management and organizational depth

A 162-game season creates exposure to injury, workload limits, performance regression, and uneven prospect development. Carrying an optionable group of pitchers and versatile position players gives an organization more ways to respond to those events without making a full roster reconstruction.

Minor League options allow eligible players to move off the active roster without being removed from the 40-man roster, subject to existing rules and limits [2][3]. This is a capacity-management tool, not a literal expansion of the 26-man active roster.

Mechanism	Potential benefit	Associated cost or risk
Optionable depth	Access to replacement innings and short-term positional coverage.	Player role uncertainty, restrictions on options, development continuity.
Defensive versatility	Ability to cover multiple positions without a one-for-one replacement.	Possible performance tradeoffs at less familiar positions.
Injured list management	Maintains roster functionality during medically necessary absences.	Availability cannot be planned precisely; roster rules still constrain decisions.
High-end talent acquisition	Higher current expected contribution in key lineup/rotation roles.	Payroll, aging, injury risk and foregone alternatives.

4 | How the model has evolved

The working interpretation is one of expansion rather than replacement: the Dodgers continue to develop players while also using financial capacity to acquire established stars. The acquisitions of Mookie Betts, Freddie Freeman, Shohei Ohtani and Yoshinobu Yamamoto show the prominence of the latter channel in the current roster-building mix.

Sustained success generally reduces access to the top of the amateur draft. That does not imply a decline in scouting or development quality. The organization’s ability to sustain a pipeline while making expensive major-league acquisitions is a central feature of this interpretation. The club’s official front-office profile also describes an emphasis on farm-system and organizational development [4].

5 | Tradeoffs and failure modes

- Roster churn: movement between roles or levels may affect player routine, preparation, and confidence. This is a plausible cost, not an established causal explanation for any one player’s results.
- Development dependence: a model built around extracting more from players requires sustained coaching, data quality, and organizational continuity.
- Pitcher availability: replacement depth reduces exposure but does not eliminate the cumulative cost of injuries.
- Postseason uncertainty: consistent decision quality cannot guarantee outcomes in short series.

Interpretation & remaining tests

Working conclusion. A large component of sustained contention may come from having several viable ways to replace or improve roster value, rather than expecting individual players to remain healthy or develop on schedule.

What would strengthen this analysis

- Create a comparable dataset of plate-discipline metrics for Dodgers acquisitions versus league or peer-team baselines.
- Measure pitcher pitch-mix changes before and after acquisition, accounting for role, handedness, velocity and sample size.
- Track player option usage, injured-list days, depth replacements and corresponding team performance by season.
- Compare payroll allocation and prospect outputs with other consistent contenders using a common time window.

Scope and limitations

This is qualitative organizational analysis developed from public information and the author's interpretation. It is not an internal operations document, a validated causal study, or a claim of access to proprietary Dodgers practices. Stronger causal conclusions require a specified sample, comparator, and alternative explanations.

References & document basis

- [1] MLB (2018), Muncy development and adjustments
<https://www.mlb.com/news/how-max-muncy-has-become-a-sluggish-for-dodgers-c281819544>
- [2] MLB Glossary, Minor League options
<https://www.mlb.com/glossary/transactions/minor-league-options>
- [3] MLB Glossary, 40-man roster
<https://www.mlb.com/glossary/transactions/40-man-roster>
- [4] Dodgers official profile, Andrew Friedman
<https://www.mlb.com/dodgers/team/front-office/andrew-friedman>

PRODUCT CASE STUDY / 03

Ninefold Baseball Evaluation Data & Decision Workflows

Product design and information architecture | Independent project | October 2026

Research question. How can publicly scattered JUCO player information be standardized into a coherent discovery, comparison and evaluation workflow for college baseball decision-makers?

Project scope

Ninefold is an independent baseball software project focused initially on California JUCO player discovery and recruiting support. The current work combines product requirements, data organization, player comparison concepts and coach-facing evaluation workflows. Broader conference coverage and staff analytics integrations are in development.

The related Program Hub concept is intended to help authorized staff organize their own performance files and evaluations. TrackMan and Rapsodo import workflows, derived performance summaries and other private-data features are product objectives; they should not be interpreted as a fully validated or broadly deployed analytics system.

Core user questions

User question	Information/workflow required
Which players fit an immediate recruiting need?	Search by position, school, class, handedness and playing-time thresholds.
How do two players compare?	Consistent stat definitions, comparable season/level context, side-by-side views.
Which candidates need another look?	Saved candidates, notes, follow-up questions and evaluation status.
Can the staff trust the numbers?	Provenance, refresh metadata, missing-value flags, parser checks and review workflows.

1 | From raw records to evaluator-facing data

A player-discovery workflow needs reliable entity identification. Players may appear with different name formats, school labels, position abbreviations, statistics, or reporting schedules across public sources. Each discrepancy can compromise filters or comparisons if not addressed.

Data layer	Design responsibility	Current evidence/status
Identity	Normalize player and school names; identify suspected duplicates.	Specified and included in pool/data-quality workflow design.
Performance	Distinguish raw source counts from calculated rates; record denominators.	Core stat definitions and reporting fields defined.
Context	Record season, competition, position, role and last updated date.	Structured as intended player/profile attributes.
Review	Make missing or conflicting records visible for manual verification.	Review/status workflow and administrative health concepts designed.
Staff-only data	Restrict imports, team information, and evaluations to authorized users.	Access and permission requirements specified; not independently security-audited.

2 | Evaluation output

The intended user experience follows a repeatable decision process: discover a group of players, apply eligibility and performance filters, inspect a player’s profile, compare candidates, record uncertainties, and update the recruiting board. The value proposition is reduced time searching and reconciling information, not a claim that software can replace scouting judgment.

Example evaluator workflow

Select LHP candidates from California JUCO schools → apply minimum innings filter → compare strikeout and walk indicators → review age, role, level and missing information → flag players for video or live evaluation.

No individual candidate is recommended by this case study. The example illustrates the information and review sequence the system is designed to support.

3 | Product decisions and tradeoffs

Decision	Rationale	Unresolved risk
California-first coverage	Allows a smaller initial source scope and closer data-quality checks.	Source completeness and school-by-school formatting variation.
User-adjustable columns	Different evaluators prioritize different inputs.	Poor defaults can overwhelm new users.
Public Scout / restricted Hub	Separates discovery workflows from team-owned information.	Entitlement checks and access controls require dedicated testing.
Scheduled refresh visibility	Shows when source data may be stale or incomplete.	A successful run does not guarantee source correctness.
Missing-value transparency	Prevents apparent precision from fabricated fill values.	Some comparisons remain impossible without better inputs.

4 | Evidence of work completed

- Structured a defined JUCO player discovery product and the required data fields across hitting, pitching, fielding, team and game-level contexts.
- Developed search/filter, comparison, shortlist, saved evaluation and reporting requirements around practical staff tasks.
- Specified administrative refresh health, data-quality review and restricted staff-access workflows.
- Iterated on usability and presentation requirements after considering feedback from baseball staff and testing needs.

Not presented as completed

No claim is made here of production-scale completeness, accuracy guarantees, an independently verified player-projection model, or complete TrackMan/Rapsodo integration. These remain distinct validation or development tasks.

5 | Proposed evaluation plan

- Measure source coverage and missing-field rates by JUCO school before and after parser changes.
- Test duplicate identification and player matching against a manually reviewed sample.
- Time staff completion of player-discovery and comparison tasks using a standard checklist.
- Validate calculations, access-control paths and error handling before extending private data access.

Project link

<https://ninefoldbaseball.com> | Independent product project; not an MLB-affiliated platform.

RESEARCH FRAMEWORK / 04

Hitter Risk Assessment

Chase Rate × Whiff Rate

Interpretable evaluation framework | Conceptual work, not a trained model | October 2026

Research question. How can an evaluator distinguish strike-zone decision risk from bat-to-ball risk without treating every high-strikeout hitter as the same type of prospect?

Why separate these behaviors?

Chase rate describes how frequently a hitter offers at pitches outside the strike zone. Whiff rate describes the frequency of misses among swings. They reflect different behaviors: a hitter can be selective but miss when swinging, or make frequent contact while extending the zone. Strikeout rate alone combines several paths to the same outcome.

This framework uses the two measures as screening dimensions, not as a complete measure of hitting ability. Definitions and denominators must remain consistent across tracking vendors, levels, and seasons.

Conceptual 2 × 2 matrix

	Lower whiff rate	Higher whiff rate
Lower chase rate	Selective + contact-oriented Potentially stable swing-decision/contact foundation. Examine impact and zone attackability.	Selective + contact-risk May recognize the zone but miss hittable pitches. Examine pitch-type vulnerabilities and impact.
Higher chase rate	Contact + decision-risk May put the bat on more pitches while expanding the zone. Examine quality of contact and count leverage.	Decision + contact-risk Two potential sources of swing-and-miss exposure. Evaluate compensating power or defensive value.

Matrix quadrants describe potential risk profiles, not fixed scouting grades. “Lower” and “higher” must be defined relative to the population under study.

1 | Evidence needed for interpretation

Measure	What it can indicate	What it cannot establish alone
Chase / O-Swing%	Swing decisions on out-of-zone pitches.	Pitch recognition, intent, or damage potential in isolation.
Whiff%	Swing-and-miss exposure.	Whether the misses occur in-zone or on particular pitch types.
Zone contact	Ability to hit strikes when swinging.	Approach quality or total offensive value.
BB%, K%	Plate-appearance outcomes and trends.	A measured chase rate or pitch-level contact skill.
Exit velocity / contact mix	Present impact and batted-ball distribution.	Consistent future power or complete offensive value.

2 | Follow-up questions by profile

- Lower chase / lower whiff: Is the player aggressive enough on strikes to prevent pitchers from attacking the zone? Does the contact quality meet positional expectations?
- Lower chase / higher whiff: Are misses concentrated against fastballs, breaking balls, or certain pitch locations? Can selection offset the contact risk?
- Higher chase / lower whiff: Does expansion produce productive contact, or mostly weak balls in play? Does the player improve swing decisions against better pitching?
- Higher chase / higher whiff: Is there sufficient impact, speed, defense or development runway to justify the offensive risk?

3 | Important confounders

Sample size, age-relative level, opponent pitch quality, handedness, count, zone definition, and tracking coverage can all shift apparent chase or whiff rates. They should be examined before classifying a player’s underlying skill. A prospect’s rate in Rookie ball is not directly comparable with one in Triple-A.

4 | Proposed quantitative validation

The current matrix is a descriptive framework. A quantitative extension could test whether combining chase and whiff rates helps predict future offensive production beyond simpler indicators such as age, level, walk rate, strikeout rate, and current batted-ball quality.

Step	Planned research operation
Cohort	Choose a historical minor-league hitter sample with sufficient plate appearances and consistent public tracking coverage.
Outcome	Define an out-of-sample future measure, such as subsequent level-adjusted offensive production or probability of reaching MLB.
Baseline	Fit a simple comparison model using age, level, BB%, K% and current production.
Extended model	Add chase, whiff, their interaction, and impact variables; check whether they improve holdout performance.
Evaluation	Use season-based train/test separation and report calibration, error and uncertainty rather than only in-sample fit.

Testable hypothesis

For players with similar age, level and present production, the joint chase/whiff profile may add predictive information about future offensive outcomes. This is a hypothesis to test, not an established finding from this project.

Limitations

This framework has not been fitted to a labeled historical dataset. It has no validated thresholds, error rates, predictive accuracy or causal interpretation. It is useful for organizing scouting follow-up questions and outlining a reproducible test.

Reference material

FanGraphs Library: [Plate Discipline](#) - metric definitions and interpretation.

Baseball Savant: [Swing/Take](#) - pitch-decision context and definitions.