

I Simmed CFB 27 to Year 10

What Do XP Sliders Actually Change?

A player-and-AI collaboration examining Dynasty progression, player attrition, and position balance using read-only roster exports.

Bottom Line

For the broadest practical match to the Current Roster's 90+ population, 250% XP for non-specialists with kickers and punters at 100% performed best in our tests. It did not recreate the Current Roster's 95+ tier, senior depth, physical profile, or position balance.

The generated Dynasty becomes younger, awareness improves much more than physical ratings, and some highly rated players remain in the raw save without a team assignment. XP sliders are therefore only one part of the result.

Definitions

Current Roster means the live/default roster extracted at the beginning of Dynasty Year 1. It is the comparison target, not a claim that the Year-1 roster is a perfect long-term design target.

100% Control means default XP settings. Flat 250% means 250% XP for non-specialists, with K/P at 100%. Targeted XP means a separate diagnostic run with different XP settings by position. Elite development is the game's potential label; it is not the same as being a 95+ overall player.

Test Design

We created new post-update Dynasties and stopped them at consistent preseason checkpoints. Each roster contained 11,730 players across 138 teams. Extractions were read-only and did not modify the original saves.

The comparison included the Current Roster, a 100% control, flat 250% tests at Years 5 and 10, and an annual Targeted XP series from the starting preseason through Year 5.

Main Results

Roster / Test	Mean OVR	90+ OVR	95+ OVR
Current Roster	71.63	116	10
100% Control, Year 5	70.57	65	0
Flat 250%, Year 5	70.77	125	0
Flat 250%, Year 10	Not compared	105	0

The practical result is that 250% helped preserve the 90+ tier without clear runaway inflation by Year 10. It did not restore the 95+ tier.

Physical Ratings

Measure	Current	250% Year 5	250% Year 10
Speed	77.78	76.74	76.72

Strength	70.09	67.40	67.32
Acceleration	82.30	79.58	79.62
Jumping	79.52	74.79	74.71
Awareness	70.74	72.73	72.20

League averages moved below the Current Roster early, then mostly plateaued. Matched returning players generally improved: awareness gained roughly 7 to 9 points per year, while speed gained about 0.3 to 0.4, strength about 0.6, and acceleration about 0.4 to 0.5.

The data does not prove that players broadly lose physical ratings. The better-supported explanation is league-level decline caused by turnover and weak physical progression. Returning players usually gained small amounts physically, but those gains did not offset the departure of older players and their replacement by a younger population with a lower physical profile.

Roster Age

Roster	Freshmen	Seniors
Current Roster	3,195	2,991
Flat 250%, Year 5	4,780	2,018

Class mix explains part of the rating shift, but not all of it. Class-standardized comparisons still showed lower strength, acceleration, and jumping in the generated league.

Possible Elite-Player Attrition

Across five year-to-year transitions, we tracked 90+ players and checked whether they appeared on the following preseason roster.

- 403 players rated 90+ disappeared from the next visible preseason roster.
- 15 players rated 95+ disappeared from the next visible preseason roster.
- Six of those 15 95+ players were still present in the next raw Player table but had no actual team assignment.
- All six were juniors.
- Several retained or increased their overall rating, including Jeremiah Smith (99 to 99), Leonard Moore (97 to 98), and Malachi Toney (98 to 99).

This means the lack of elite players cannot automatically be described as an XP progression problem. We have not proven that these players entered the transfer portal, were rejected because of NIL demands or dealbreakers, or were removed by a specific roster rule. The evidence identifies an elite-player attrition signal, not a solved transfer-portal mechanism.

Community Comparison

Recent post-patch community tests independently point toward position-specific XP. One study proposed lower settings for QB, HB, WR, and CB and higher settings for TE, interior offensive line, edge, defensive tackle, and linebacker groups. Another used 200% as a starting point and pushed slower-developing positions higher. These are useful comparison points, not controlled confirmations.

Position Balance

Position-specific XP changes did not restore the Current Roster's positional ratios. The generated league had materially different position supply, including fewer tight ends, centers, defensive tackles, and free safeties,

and substantially more LOLBs in the Targeted XP series. XP sliders can change progression, but they cannot directly control how many players the game generates at each position.

What the Data Supports

- Default 100% XP produces too few 90+ players by Year 5 compared with the Current Roster.
- Flat 250% is the best broad setting tested for maintaining the 90+ population.
- The physical difference appears early and then largely stabilizes.
- Awareness improves much faster than physical ratings for matched returning players.
- The generated league becomes younger and has fewer seniors.
- Some missing elite players remain in the raw save without a team assignment.

What the Data Does Not Establish

- That the game is definitely bugged.
- That the CPU favors cheap awareness upgrades.
- That every missing elite player entered the transfer portal.
- That NIL, dealbreakers, or board limits caused the unassigned players.
- Whether the starting roster is intentionally curated to be more exciting.

Next Test

The next useful test is a focused one-offseason capture at both 100% and 250% XP, followed by one conservative position-specific test. Save and extract at Postseason, Players Leaving, portal resolution, and the following preseason. Track 90+ and 95+ players, departure labels, progression fields, physical ratings, class mix, and unassigned raw players. That will separate confirmed pro departures, confirmed transfers, unassigned players, and unresolved removals.

Source and Disclosure

The player created and simulated the Dynasties and preserved the saves. AI helped organize the read-only exports, compare rosters, test alternative explanations, and keep conclusions tied to the data. Community lead: catcatcat1, EA Forums discussion, “Transfer Portal Logic Bugs.”

All numbers in this report come from read-only roster, recruiting, team, and annual-save exports from the tested Dynasty saves. No original save file was modified.