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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The pressure to win in college athletics is enormous and prevalent in each level of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Programs for women which had followed a different model of participation have changed dramatically to imitate the standards and ethics of men's programs. Winning is the game as reinforced by the behavior of sports writers, alumni, parents, players, business leaders, faculty members, political figures, and, of course, coaches.

The great drive to win has paralleled a large increase in the number of teams and players at each level of collegiate sport. It must be noted that more young people are engaged in more athletic teams than at any time in the history of sport.

There is a relationship between increased participation and winning at sport on the college level. Winning teams in so-called revenue sports (basketball and football) provide the resources to sustain the growth in the numbers of teams and participants in non-revenue sports such as track and field and baseball. The corollary is also true that losing basketball and football teams do not generate
much revenue and therefore participation in other sports is threatened due to lack of resources.

The key to a successful athletic program is to win, and the primary ingredient in winning is to find good players. Thus, a tremendous effort occurs to identify and eventually recruit and subsidize those players who will help the team win, fill the stadium, generate revenue and publicity, and sustain the athletic explosion in the country.

Setting

This dissertation involves an examination and analysis of the various means used to identify college basketball prospects. In order to place this analysis in perspective, this chapter includes a brief history of college basketball, the NCAA as a controlling agent of intercollegiate sports, financing practices, a description of the identification process, as well as the purpose and problem of the study.

Historical Development of Intercollegiate Basketball

In 1891, a young James Naismith was on the faculty at the YMCA training school in Springfield, Massachusetts. He had as his project for a class the development of a new indoor game to relieve the boredom of body building exercises. With this goal in mind, Mr. Naismith invented
the game of basketball. According to Naismith, he established an indoor game which required the use of a ball, no tackling, and a horizontal goal.¹

Naismith's game of basketball took on tremendous growth within the YMCA. Hoy reports that in 1894 Luther Gulick edited the first basketball guide under the auspices of the YMCA.² By 1897, the game of basketball had spread to fifty-eight athletic clubs, churches, Knights of Columbus, Young Men's Hebrew Associations, settlement houses, industries, the military, and foreign countries. According to Isaacs in 1904, Hiram, Wheaton, and the Latter Day Saints University competed for the world's basketball championship.³

The Intercollegiate Athletic Association of America was born in 1905. The brutality of college football fostered the development of the association. Hoy reports that in 1905, colleges broke away from the AAU and established their first basketball rules committee.⁴

⁴Hoy, op. cit., p. 171.
Rosen reports that the Ivy League dominated the early competition. Basketball was looked upon as a secondary sport called "roundball."\(^5\)

In 1906, the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of America became the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). According to Stagg, the object of the NCAA, as expressed in the constitution of 1906, was the regulation and supervision of college athletics throughout the United States. The goal of the NCAA was to maintain the athletic activities of the colleges and universities on an ethical plane and in accordance with the purpose of higher education.\(^6\)

Hoy reports that the biggest concern of the NCAA was the issue of amateurism. An amateur was defined as follows:

One who engages in sport solely for the physical, mental, or social benefits he derives therefrom, and to whom the sport is nothing more than an avocation.\(^7\)


\(^7\)Hoy, op. cit., p. 58.
In 1907, the college basketball rules committee decided to come under the NCAA. In 1908, the NCAA officially recognized college basketball. Stagg reports that by 1914, twenty-five athletic conferences in the United States had been established. According to Stagg, the recruitment and scheduling practices of intercollegiate programs had become national in scope.\(^8\) By 1915, the AAU, the YMCA, and the NCAA had established a uniform set of rules for basketball.

The 1920's have been classified as the "Golden Age" of sports. Post-war money increased the subsidization of athletes at colleges and universities. According to Martinelli, subsidization and recruiting became highly visible.\(^9\) Crowds of 10,000 people in Madison Square Garden to witness college basketball began to illustrate the financial advantages on intercollegiate athletics.


\(^8\)Stagg, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 50.

schools were reported to be involved in subsidization and recruitment. Haag states that the Carnegie Report documented grade tampering, slush funds, overzealous alumni, unethical recruiting practices, and extra pay for athletic ability as major intercollegiate athletic program violations.\(^{10}\)

By the 1930's, the NCAA was at a crossroads concerning subsidization and recruitment. The Southeastern Conference in 1935 established a grant-in-aid package for athletes. Martinelli reports that in 1940, the NCAA placed a ban on subsidization. The ban received strong resistance from the Southeastern Conference and the Southwestern Conference.\(^{11}\)

During this period of controversy, the game of college basketball began to take on new dimensions. The National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics Tournament began in Kansas City in 1937. The National Invitational Tournament at Madison Square Garden started in 1938. In 1939, the National Collegiate Basketball Tournament was established and held at Northwestern University. Hoy reports that although the NCAA Basketball Tournament was one of the newest, it proved to be very popular from the spectator point of view and most


\(^{11}\)Martinelli, op. cit., p. 39.
successful financially.\textsuperscript{12}

With the conclusion of World War II and the advent of college basketball tournaments, competition developed among colleges and universities for the services of outstanding athletes. Hoy reports that in 1947 the NCAA changed from an advisory concept to an enforcement agency.\textsuperscript{13} Benagh states that in 1948 the NCAA established the Sanity Code. All financial aid given to college athletes was to be based on their financial need. The rule proved not to be enforceable. Seven schools known to be in violation of the Sanity Code were not removed from the NCAA.\textsuperscript{14}

In 1948, another college basketball tournament was born--the National Junior College Tournament. The system of nationally ranking college basketball teams began in 1949 with the Associated Press rankings. The United Press International began to rank teams in 1951. According to Isaacs, by 1951, ninety-nine percent of all colleges and universities played organized basketball.\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Hoy, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 346.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 21.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Jim Benagh, \textit{Making it to #1: How College Football and Basketball Teams Get There}, Dodd, Mead, and Company, New York, 1976, p. 193.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Isaacs, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 15.
\end{itemize}
In 1951, the NCAA moved from Chicago to Kansas City, Missouri. Mr. Walter Byers was appointed Director. In 1952, a committee on infractions was established. Michigan State University became the first college to be placed on probation in the same year.

Isaacs reports on several prominent names which helped to develop the game of college basketball. Coach Piggy Lambert of Purdue developed the fast break. Coach Forrest "Phog" Allen pioneered recruiting and professionalism. He was a promoter and publicist. Ned Irish of Madison Square Garden promoted the concept of college basketball doubleheaders. Mr. Irish matched the best teams from the New York City area against the best teams from the rest of the country.\textsuperscript{16} Rosen reports the doubleheaders were hurt by the point shaving scandals of the early 1950's.\textsuperscript{17}

According to Isaacs, Hank Iba of Oklahoma A & M pioneered the deliberate game and went on to become an outstanding Olympic basketball coach. Ray Meyer, the legendary DePaul University basketball coach, developed the game's first outstanding big man, George Mikan. Adolph Rupp established the University of Kentucky as a consistent national contender. New England college

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., p. 55.
\textsuperscript{17}Rosen, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 35.
basketball was revived with the emergence of Bob Cousy at Holy Cross.\textsuperscript{18}

The 1950's saw a significant development in college basketball. In 1957, the NCAA established the College Division Basketball Tournament. The college division tournament made it possible for small colleges and universities to compete for a national college basketball championship within the framework of the NCAA.

The 1950's also witnessed the participation of black athletes in major college basketball. Oscar Robertson at The University of Cincinnati, Wilt Chamberlain at Kansas University, Bill Russell at San Francisco University, and Elgin Baylor at Seattle University were some of the more well known black athletes who were recruited and subsidized at colleges and universities.


\textsuperscript{18} Isaacs, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 157.
Coach John Wooden's teams were characterized by having outstanding athletes who were well-coached and conditioned. Wooden's success with black athletes and the strong civil rights movement of the 1960's helped to open the doors for many black athletes to be recruited and subsidized by traditionally white colleges and universities.

The 1970's witnessed a tremendous growth in intercollegiate athletics and, in particular, college basketball. The game has become one of the more popular sports for women. The Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women sponsors a national tournament which receives nationwide media coverage. Recruitment and subsidization of women collegiate basketball players have become prevalent.

The game of college basketball became so popular that in 1973, the NCAA saw fit to establish three divisions of college basketball competition for men. They are Division I, Division II, and Division III.

According to the 1980-81 NCAA Manual, members of Division I basketball programs must sponsor twelve or more varsity intercollegiate sports. They must not schedule more than four games against non-Division I opponents. Division I basketball schools are limited to employing one head coach, two assistant coaches, and one part-time assistant coach. An uncompensated volunteer coach may
also participate in coaching. Only the head coach and the two assistant coaches are permitted to recruit off-campus. Division I schools are restricted to a maximum of fifteen athletic scholarships in basketball, and may officially visit to their campuses no more than eighteen prospects.  

Division II schools in basketball must play at least fifty percent of their games against Division II or Division I opponents. They must sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sport programs. Division II schools are limited to a maximum of twelve athletic scholarships.  

Division III schools must play at least fifty percent of their schedule against Division III opponents. Division III schools are not permitted to grant athletic scholarships. All financial aid given to athletes at Division III schools must be based on financial need. All aid offers must be made through the office of the director of student financial aid.  

---


20. Ibid., p. 110.

21. Ibid., p. 111.
The NCAA reported the following statistics concerning their basketball membership. As of October 1, 1980, there were 266 Division I schools, 193 Division II schools, and 281 Division III schools. Effective September 1, 1981, there will be 271 Division I schools, 188 Division II schools, and 281 Division III schools.\footnote{NCAA News Release to Athletic Directors, The National Collegiate Athletic Association, Shawnee Mission, Kansas, Fall, 1980.}

The three division alignment for participation in NCAA college basketball has increased the opportunities for NCAA basketball tournament play. At their January, 1981, convention, the NCAA adopted legislation to incorporate women's athletics on a voluntary basis. Increasing the number of NCAA basketball championships has made the recruitment of athletes a more justifiable pursuit to a broader spectrum of the NCAA basketball membership.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association

The National Collegiate Athletic Association was born out of the brutality of football. In 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt stated the need for reform in football. On December 9, 1905, Chancellor Henry McCraken of New York University convened thirteen eastern institutions to study the need to reform or abolish football. On December 28, 1905, a football rules committee was established, and at
the same conference, the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States was formed. In 1910, the organization adopted its present name, the National Collegiate Athletic Association. By 1910, there were sixty-nine members.23

Since its inception, the NCAA has made tremendous growth. Expansion has produced a membership in excess of eight hundred. The NCAA sponsors seventy-two national championships. In 1981-82, the NCAA will sponsor twenty-nine women's national championships. Captain Palmer Pierce of the US Military Academy, an early pioneer of the NCAA, once stated that the NCAA would become the "voice of college sports."24 His prophecy has become reality.

Article Two of the Constitution and Interpretations of the NCAA states the purposes and fundamental policy of the association. These purposes are:

1. To initiate, stimulate, and improve intercollegiate programs for student athletes and to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, and sports participation as a recreational pursuit and athletic excellence;


24 Ibid.
2. To uphold the principle of institutional control of, and responsibility for all intercollegiate sports in conformity with the constitution and by-laws of the Association;

3. To encourage its members to adopt eligibility rules to comply with satisfactory standards of scholarship, sportsmanship, and amateurism;

4. To formulate, copyright, and publish rules of play governing intercollegiate sports;

5. To preserve intercollegiate athletic records;

6. To supervise the conduct of, and to establish eligibility standards for, regional and national athletic events under the auspices of this Association;

7. To co-operate with other amateur athletic organizations in promoting and conducting national and international athletic events;

8. To legislate, through by-laws or by resolution at a Convention, upon any subject of general concern to the members in the administration of intercollegiate athletics;

9. To study in general all phases of competitive intercollegiate athletics and establish standards whereby the colleges and universities of the United States can maintain their athletic activities on a high level.25

The Fundamental Policy of the NCAA, as stated in Section 2 of Article Two, is:

1. The competitive athletic programs of the colleges are designed to be a vital part of the education system. A basic purpose of this Association is to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the education program and the athlete as an integral part of the student body and, by doing so, retain a clear line of demarcation between college athletics and professional sports.

2. Legislation governing the conduct of intercollegiate athletic programs of member institutions shall apply to basic athletic issues such as admissions, financial aid, eligibility and recruiting; member institutions shall be obligated to apply and enforce this legislation, and the enforcement program of the Association shall be applied to an institution when it fails to fulfill this obligation.26

Article Three of the Constitution and Interpretations of the NCAA states the principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics. These principles are:

1. Principle of Amateurism and Student Participation

2. Principle of Institutional Control and Responsibility

3. Principle of Sound Academic Standards

4. Principles Governing Financial Aid

5. Principle Governing Recruiting

6. Principles of Ethical Conduct

7. Principle Governing Competition in Post-season and Non-collegiate Sponsored Contests

26Ibid.
Article Four of the Constitution and Interpretations of the NCAA states the eligibility, conditions, and obligations of membership. The classes of membership in the NCAA are active, allied, associate, and affiliated. Active members are four-year colleges and universities and two-year upper-level institutions who are accredited by the regional accrediting agency. Allied members are athletic conferences or associations of colleges and universities. Associate members are educational institutions who are not eligible for membership because they are not accredited by the regional accrediting agency. Affiliated members are groups and associations related to intercollegiate athletics.\textsuperscript{28}

Article Five of the Constitution and Interpretations of the NCAA details the organization of the Association. The Council of the NCAA establishes and directs the general policy. The Council consists of twenty-two members, of which four must be women. There is a President and a Secretary-Treasurer and twenty Vice-Presidents. Of the

\textsuperscript{27}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 9.

\textsuperscript{28}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 28.
Vice-Presidents, ten must be from Division I, five from Division II, and five from Division III. 29

An Executive Committee is elected by the Council to transact the business and administer the affairs of the Association. The Executive Committee consists of twelve members including a President and Secretary. Two of the members must be women. Six of the members must be from Division I, and four from Divisions II and III. Members must hold the positions of athletic director, faculty athletic representative, chief executive officer of the institution, or primary woman administrator of athletic programs. 30

The officers of the Association consist of a President and a Secretary-Treasurer. The Association is divided into eight districts. Committees may be established as deemed necessary. The annual convention for the Association normally takes place during the second week of January. The administration of all championships within the Association are under the direction of the various sport committees. 31

______

29 Ibid., p. 31.
30 Ibid., p. 33.
31 Ibid., p. 34.
There are twelve by-law articles within the NCAA. These by-law articles are:

1. Recruiting
2. Extra Events
3. Playing and Practice Seasons
4. Eligibility Rules for In-Season Competition
5. Eligibility Rules for NCAA Championships
6. Limitations on Financial Aid Awards
7. Personnel and Squad Limitations
8. Membership
9. Membership Divisions
10. Division Membership Criteria
11. Committees
12. Amendments

The Association's Council or the Annual Convention may adopt recommended policies and practices for intercollegiate athletics. The recommended policies listed in the 1981-82 NCAA Manual are:

1. All-Star Contests
2. Governing and Scheduling Athletic Competition
3. Playing Rules
4. Eligibility Rules

\[\text{Ibid., p. 42.}\]
5. Use of Facilities

6. Personnel

7. Coaches' contracts

8. Gambling and Bribery

9. Medical Examinations

10. Nontherapeutic Drugs

11. Equipment

12. Due Process

The official procedure governing the NCAA Enforcement Program is approved and adopted by the Council and Convention of the Association. The Council designates a Committee on Infractions to administer the NCAA enforcement program. The Committee on Infractions considers complaints, formulates a statement on its operating policies and procedures, determines facts related to alleged violations, and may impose appropriate penalties on member institutions. 34

The severity of the penalties depends on the nature of the infraction. The NCAA believes the penalties should be "broad and severe" if the infractions display a general

33Ibid., p. 157.
34Ibid., p. 162.
disregard for the rules. The following list reflects some of the disciplinary measures which may be imposed on a member institution who is determined to be in violation of the rules:

1. Reprimand and censure
2. Probation for one year
3. Probation for more than one year
4. Ineligibility for one or more NCAA championship events
5. Ineligibility for invitational and post-season meets and tournaments
6. Ineligibility for any television programs subject to the Association's control or administration
7. Ineligibility of the member to vote or its personnel to serve on committees of the Association, or both
8. Prohibition against an intercollegiate sports team or teams participating against outside competition for a specified period
9. Prohibition against the recruitment of prospective student-athletes for a sport or sports for a specified period
10. A reduction in the number of either initial or total financial aid awards which may be awarded during a specified period
11. Require that an institution which had been represented in an NCAA championship return its share of net receipts
12. Require that institutions take disciplinary action against coaches or other university employees who were involved in the offense.

The Committee on Infractions treats all cases as confidential. When a penalty is imposed, an institution has fifteen calendar days to make a formal notice of appeal. The appeal is made to the Council of the Association. If a penalty is imposed and made public, there is no review of the penalty unless there is new evidence or a discovery of prejudicial error.

The NCAA is a representation of the colleges and universities which comprise the association. NCAA Officers, the NCAA Council, the Division Steering Committees, and the NCAA Executive Committee are elected by the Association members. The general administration of the NCAA National Office is directed by Mr. Walter Byers. The NCAA National Office, located in Shawnee Mission, Kansas, is divided into the areas of General Administration, Communications, Enforcement, Championships, and Publishing.

---

35 Ibid., p. 166.
36 Ibid., p. 169.
37 Ibid., p. 190.
Financing Intercollegiate Athletics

The current philosophy toward the implementation of intercollegiate athletics may be set forth by the following quote from Sugar:

Marketing is salesmanship with a scalpel. In some hands, it is an operative tool that allows for the delicate slicing up of the population into potential target audiences for goods and services; in other hands, it becomes a bludgeon, capable of destruction and even self-mutilation.... When properly used, this tightly integrated effort takes many forms, including production, distribution, customer satisfaction, and advertising. But most importantly, it translates into one proposition and one proposition alone: 'Up your sales!' 38

Block talks about the "greening" of the athletic department at the University of Michigan. In 1968, Michigan's athletic budget was two million dollars. In 1979, Michigan's athletic budget was seven million dollars. Their mailing campaign which began at 300,000 is now over 1.4 million. The Athletic Department at the University of Michigan is responsible for selling season tickets, television and radio contracts, videotapes of the games, coffee cups, T-shirts, ash trays, etc.

Mr. Don Canham, Athletic Director at the University of Michigan, predicts that pay television will be the market for the future. 39

In 1979, Davidson reports that Georgia Tech University officially became a member of the Atlantic Coast Conference. Contributions to the Alexander Tharp Scholarship Fund at Georgia Tech increased by $150,000. Membership in the Atlantic Coast Conference will generate an additional $100,000 for the basketball program. The additional revenue generated by contributions, ticket sales, and the Atlantic Coast Conference television and tournament money should make the Georgia Tech basketball program self-supporting. 40

Are big-time athletic schools on a disaster course? Is the accepted measure of success of a college football or basketball program their ability to generate income through ticket sales and television revenues? Koppett suggests the following: "The lesson which universities preach--bring in more money--is not a lesson they would be willing to teach." 41

---


Several philosophies speak toward the current state of affairs in intercollegiate athletics. Coakley argues that sport under capitalism changes from an activity to product to be consumed. It is marketed and sold as such.

Intercollegiate sport, with its exaggerated emphasis on such commercial excesses as recruiting, inducements to athletes, and immense expenditures for travel, equipment, and facilities, has in many instances taken on the mercantile temper—indeed, has become little other than a commercial enterprise itself—and so, has actively violated the spirit which virtually defines and sustains university communities.42

Hoch states that our quarrel is not with sports, but with the uses some of the most repressive forces in capitalist society would force them to serve. Hoch lists these forces as escapism, consumerism, elitism, and militarism. Contemporary sport is an aid to the maintenance of a capitalist society.43

According to Beisser, preoccupation with sports is growing.

While work diminishes, preoccupation with sport grows. In the footrace of time work led the way, with play following slowly behind; but in this century, wearing the colors of sport, play has taken the lead.44

---

Beisser feels there is a race to keep up with the results of sport. Through the role of spectator one can examine the activities which give pleasure. The spectator fan achieves mastery of the game and becomes an expert on all of the game's details.

Despite his isolation from the field of play, the fan's role is a very important one, for it is his support of the players and the game that allows the game to flourish.\textsuperscript{45}

Novak implies that sport is the essence of life. Play, not work, civilized people. Sport is a form of natural religion.\textsuperscript{46}

NCAA research would tend to support Novak's theory that play is important. The number of sports sponsored by the NCAA has increased over the last three years. During the period from 1978-79 to 1980-81, there was a net gain of eighty-nine men's sports in Division I. The women's sports gain was greater. There was a net gain of one hundred thirteen in Division I women's sports. There were also increases in both men's and women's sports at the Division III level. Division II schools remained at approximately the same level.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{45}Ibid., p. 193.


The popularity of sport combined with the effects of inflation and Title IX legislation are having a tremendous impact on the administration of intercollegiate athletics. Title IX has mandated that schools must give women an equal opportunity to compete in athletics. Title IX legislation has increased the number of women's intercollegiate sports. More monies are being appropriated to women's sport programs. Inflation has increased the costs of travel, equipment, scholarships, salaries and fringe benefits, officials fees, and facility maintenance.

The popularity of sport combined with the effects of inflation and Title IX have made the financing of intercollegiate athletics a more difficulty proposition. The NCAA has in recent years made some attempts to reduce the cost of intercollegiate athletics. Harms reports that in 1965, a special economy convention of delegates voted to eliminate supplies and incidental expenses from the scholarship package. In 1976, a convention proposal to award aid based on need was rejected. The aid based on need proposal was rejected again at the 1981 convention.

In 1975, the NCAA enacted legislation which reduced the number of scholarships which Division I and Division

---

II schools can award. Division I football was reduced to a total of ninety-five. Division II football was reduced to a total of sixty. Basketball scholarships were reduced to a total of fifteen in Division I and twelve in Division II. The number of allowable scholarships in sports other than football and basketball was set at a ceiling of eighty for Division I schools and sixty for Division II schools. 49

Harms reports that the special economy convention of 1975 also enacted legislation which reduce recruiting expenses. A maximum of three official off-campus visits was established. Legislation established the six-visit rule for recruits. A recruited player cannot accept more than six expense-paid visits to NCAA colleges and universities. Limits on the size of the coaching staffs in football and basketball were also established by the 1975 convention. 50

At the 1981 convention, the NCAA enacted legislation which puts further restrictions on off-campus recruiting in the sports of football and basketball. Reductions in scholarships was also established. In Division I, seventy scholarships total are not permitted in sports outside of football and basketball. By the 1982-83 academic year,

49 Ibid., p. 45.
50 Ibid., p. 46.
Division II must conform to fifty-five allowable scholarships outside of football and basketball.

Despite the efforts of the NCAA to enact legislation which reduces financial costs associated with the operation of intercollegiate athletics, member institutions are finding it very difficult to maintain their athletic programs. Mr. John Fuzak, former NCAA President, expresses the following concerns:

Budget reductions in almost every sport are inevitable. Participants and coaches in sports that cannot bear a major share of the cost of their operations must recognize that the continuation of their sports at the varsity level is in jeopardy. They also must be realistic enough to realize that those sports that earn enough to help finance other sports are not likely to be so threatened. 51

Mr. Fuzak's opinions are reflected in the following developments. The University of Maryland Eastern Shore has eliminated men's football, tennis, and swimming from their intercollegiate athletic programs. The University of Colorado has dropped men's baseball, swimming, wrestling, and gymnastics, and women's swimming and gymnastics. Kansas has dropped men's and women's gymnastics. Yale has eliminated men's volleyball, gymnastics, and women's gymnastics. The University of

California Berkeley has eliminated men's wrestling, volleyball, and golf. The University of Pennsylvania has dropped men's hockey.  

In another cutback, the University of Oregon announced that it would drop four sports from their intercollegiate program. The sports to be eliminated are men's baseball and gymnastics, and women's soccer and golf.  

NCAA members have taken other measures to cope with the financial crisis in athletics. Many schools have begun to reduce scholarships in non-revenue producing sports. Schools are considering traveling their men's and women's squads together for away games. The Ivy League has proposed to reduce the size of their basketball coaching staffs to one head coach and one full-time assistant coach. Scheduling within a certain geographic region is another method suggested to reduce cost. Dividing conferences up into divisions is another method which has support. Various methods are being implemented to finance the rising costs of intercollegiate athletics. Monies  

---  

from the general funds of colleges and universities have been used to finance a large percentage of the athletic budget. Some state legislatures are considering appropriating a certain amount of dollars to each of their state schools for intercollegiate athletics. The state of Tennessee is considering this method. The state of Florida has enacted the Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Equity Act. Each of the eight state universities in Florida received 2.8 million dollars in their 1980-81 budgets for women's sports.\textsuperscript{54}

Student fees have long been a source of revenue for intercollegiate athletics. Raiborn, in a survey of six hundred fifty-five NCAA members, found that student activity fees contributed nearly ten percent of the athletic budgets. Some schools are considering increasing student fees and reducing the ticket prices for students.\textsuperscript{55}

Revenue sports have made a significant contribution to the financing of intercollegiate athletics. Revenue sports generate gate receipts. Some revenue sports have such spectator appeal that television and radio contracts are negotiated to broadcast the events. The

\textsuperscript{54}Chronicle of Higher Education, op. cit., p. 10.

seasons of some sports are climaxed by revenue producing tournaments. Alumni and interested fans are inclined to contribute their financial support to winning programs. Rothenberg reports that the University of Kentucky basketball team grossed 1.66 million dollars in 1978, the year they won the NCAA basketball championship. Approximately $250,000 came from making the final four of the NCAA Tournament. The basketball program showed a profit of nearly $700,000.56

According to Cady, the American "Big Game" is the college games of football and basketball. Pro sports do not match the college game.

Nothing in professional sport captures, for the flackery money can buy, the same glamor or intensity or significance.... It locks in symbolic combat the peoples of sovereign states: Texas-Oklahoma; Tennessee-Kentucky; Wisconsin-Minnesota. It confronts massive regional and cultural differences: Notre Dame-UCLA; Penn State-Alabama; Virginia-DePaul. It pits lifestyles and social convictions: Stanford-USC; Duke-Carolina; Rice-Arkansas. It is symbolically fratricidal: Grambling-Florida A & M; Yale-Harvard; Providence-Marquette. The whole spectra of the national life clash fraternally in the Big Game.57


Cady continues by stating that the "Big Game" is more than entertainment. "The rituals of the entire college community make the 'Big Game' a sacred festival." 58

Raiborn, in an analysis of the revenues and expenses of six hundred fifty-five intercollegiate athletic programs, found that football and basketball were the principal revenue generating sports. All other sports combined made only minor contributions to total revenues. Raiborn also reported that ticket sales was the largest contributor to total revenues. Ticket sales comprised forty-eight percent of total revenues. 59

Denlinger and Shapiro found that the success of football and basketball played a major role in the development of athletic support groups. In 1966, The Ohio State University alumni contributions fell $500,000 when the team posted a record of 4-5. Denlinger also points to the significance of athletic support groups. In 1973, the University of Maryland Foundation raised $250,000. By 1975, the same organization had raised $500,000. In 1974, North Carolina State University had sixty-six people give over $1,000 to the athletic program. 60

58 Ibid., p. 74.
59 Raiborn, op. cit., p. 72.
At some schools, the financing of intercollegiate athletics has become big business. Many NCAA member institutions have athletic budgets which exceed one million dollars. The implications of Title IX and inflation have placed additional pressures on athletic programs to win in order to survive financially.

**Recruiting Related to Finances**

Recruiting within the NCAA membership is more prevalent than ever before. Haag reports the following:

Colleges and universities across the country have become so entrenched in the recruiting process that most major institutions are unable to escape the system. Recruiting and subsidization of the college athlete is openly supported by athletic directors who believe that without the process, college athletics would experience bankruptcy. Recruiting has been labeled a necessary evil in amateur sports and absolutely essential in the system of winning athletics.61

Haag reports that travel expenses constitute the greatest cost factor associated with the recruiting process.62 Denlinger and Shapiro report that Duke

---


62 Ibid., p. 103.
University spent $12,000 recruiting Larry Miller and lost. Every year colleges and universities spend thousands of dollars in an attempt to recruit student-athletes who will bring success to their programs. Raiborn reports the following:

Recruiting is a function of effort applied and therefore expenses depends on the number of prospects contacted, distance traveled in making contacts, and related communication efforts.®

The American Heritage Dictionary defines recruiting as "to strengthen or raise by enlistment; to supply with new members or employees; to replenish." Martinelli defines athletic recruitment as "the solicitation of high school athletes with a view to inducing them to attend a college or university."® Recruiting is the method by which college and university coaches replenish or strengthen their teams.

Recruitment of intercollegiate athletes is a subject which brings anxiety to the hearts of many administrators. In a survey of five hundred ninety college and university presidents, Mason found that presidents feel athletics

plays a major role in the college or university. However, the presidents were very concerned about recruiting. The presidents felt recruiting needed special attention.  

College coaches have found themselves in a position where they must win to retain their jobs. Sanford discovered that athletic staff personnel were not granted tenure unless they were teaching. Emphasis was placed on winning, recruitment, and subsidization. Neal reports that coaches are hired to win. Some coaches are hired without regard to strength of character or personal living habits. In a survey of 1,000 coaches, Neal found that six out of ten coaches were employed at colleges and universities for less than seven years.

An Associated Press survey found that during the period from 1967-1978 only ten percent of the Division I basketball coaches stayed at the same school for over a twelve-year period. The survey also indicated that

---


coaches are changing jobs at a greater rate than ever before. There were thirty-one coaching changes for a fifteen percent rate during 1968-69; a thirty-six change over for eighteen percent during 1972-73; and fifty-four changes for twenty-seven percent during 1977-78. The Basketball Bulletin reports that only ten percent of the coaches at Division I basketball schools in 1970 are at those same schools today. The June 15th, 1981, issue of Basketball Weekly reports twenty-seven new head coaches at the Division I basketball level.

Michener describes the competition for the athletes as brutal. Great amounts of time and money are spent on the superstars who will turn the college program into a national contender. Michener feels the rule permitting freshmen to play has worsened the recruiting process. Many Division I football and basketball coaches are trying to get the freshman eligible rule rescinded. According to Rothenberg, coaches are almost universal in their dislike of the freshman eligible rule. Coaches feel that

---


freshmen need a year to adjust to college academics and basketball. Many do not make the adjustment or the starting line-up and decide to transfer. "Freshmen transfer so much, they need a revolving door," says Notre Dame basketball coach Digger Phelps. 73

The freshman eligible rule was an economy move. The rule reduced the number of scholarships necessary to put a team together. Junior varsity teams are almost non-existent at the Division I and II basketball levels.

Many economy moves have been made by the NCAA to reduce the costs of intercollegiate athletics. However, the pressure placed on coaches to win has not lessened. Coaches are supposed to recruit the top high school seniors or junior college players and win immediately. They are expected to fill the arenas and stadia and participate in post-season play. Many coaches have found this a difficult assignment. After several years at the University of Colorado, Coach Bill Blair resigned during the 1980-81 season. Blair stated he did not have the financial commitment necessary to recruit successfully.

College coaches must be able to make a commitment of time and money toward recruiting. Time is needed to

organize the recruiting on campus and travel off campus to evaluate and recruit the players. Money is needed to assemble a coaching staff and identify and recruit the prospects.

Recruiting has been labeled by many as a "necessary evil." It is an expensive necessary evil. The expenses of recruiting are justified by the results of winning. Winning produces increases in revenue for the athletic program and positive publicity for the college or university. All of the promotion in the world would be meaningless unless the coach produces winning teams.

The Identification Process

The ability to identify players who are prospects is a key element of an intercollegiate athletic recruiting program. In order to make economically sound use of time and money players must be identified who meet the needs of the intercollegiate athletic program.

The identification process has two phases. The first phase is the accumulation of names of potential prospects. The second phase of the identification process is the evaluation of the players to determine if they are prospects for the intercollegiate athletic program. The two phases of the identification process may be completed simultaneously or on separate occasions.
A coach may go to a game and accumulate the name of a player at the game and at the same time evaluate the player as a prospect. A coach may also accumulate the name of a player from a high school coach or friend, and at a later date go and evaluate the player's athletic ability.

Before the identification process is implemented, a thorough assessment of the team's recruiting needs should be made. Recruiting goals should be established. Responsibility within the coaching staff should be delegated.

When the recruiting goals have been established, the coaching staff must determine which methods of identifying prospects are most compatible with their programs. In the selection of identification methods, coaches will assess the time and money needed to implement the methods. There are identification methods which are expensive and involve extensive off-campus travel. There are also identification methods which are less expensive and require little, if any, off-campus travel.

When, how long, and how often a coach will use the identification methods will vary. Some coaches attempt to identify prospects throughout the year. They may start by sending a letter to high school coaches requesting names of outstanding junior or senior prospects.
Their summer months may be spent watching players in summer basketball leagues and at summer basketball sport camps.

Some NCAA basketball coaches begin the identification process in the fall. They may send out a questionnaire to high school and junior college coaches requesting names of prospects. They may spend the winter months attempting to evaluate the players who have been recommended to them by going to games or viewing films. Coaches may also subscribe to newspapers during the season in an attempt to collect names of more potential prospects.

Many coaches will continue to collect names after the regular season is completed. There are some coaches who may not even begin the identification process until the conclusion of the season. This period of time signifies the beginning of high school and junior college tournaments and all-star games. Coaches have for years relied heavily on this period to identify prospects.

In recent years, a new method of identifying college basketball prospects has emerged. College basketball coaches have begun to subsidize other individuals for the purpose of identifying college basketball prospects. Professional scouting services are now used by many of the college basketball coaches to accumulate names of players and to evaluate players' athletic abilities.
Colleges coaches pay significant fees in order to receive reports from the scouting services and attend summer basketball camps which are directed by the scouting services.

The identification process is a highly-organized system. The pressure placed on college basketball coaches to win has increased the intensity and tempo at which the process is implemented. It is in the best interests of the college coach to know which methods of identifying college basketball prospects are being used at various levels of competition.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to examine the methods used by basketball coaches to identify college basketball prospects in selected men's National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I, II, and III basketball programs.

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study is to compare the selected Division I, II, and III schools on the basis of the following:

1. The identification methods the schools use, and the methods they would prefer to use, to accumulate names of potential basketball prospects.

2. The identification methods the schools use, and the methods they would prefer to use, to evaluate the athletic ability of players.
3. The financial costs associated with the implementation of the identification methods.

Research Questions

1. Will a comparison of the percentage of schools using the identification methods to accumulate names of potential basketball prospects indicate there are meaningful differences among the selected Division I, II, and III schools?

2. Will a comparison of the percentage of use rates for the identification methods used to accumulate names of current varsity team members indicate there are meaningful differences among the selected Division I, II, and III schools?

3. Will a comparison of the preference rankings for the identification methods used to accumulate names of potential basketball prospects indicate there are meaningful differences among the selected Division I, II, and III schools?

4. Will a comparison of the percentage of schools using the identification methods to evaluate the athletic ability of players indicate there are meaningful differences among the selected Division I, II, and III schools?

5. Will a comparison of the percentage of use rates for the identification methods used to evaluate the
athletic ability of current varsity team members indicate there are meaningful differences among the selected Division I, II, and III schools?

6. Will a comparison of the preference rankings for the identification methods used to evaluate the athletic ability of basketball players indicate there are meaningful differences among the selected Division I, II, and III schools?

7. Will a comparison of the financial costs associated with the implementation of the identification methods indicate there are meaningful differences among the selected Division I, II, and III schools?

8. Will a comparison of the financial costs of the identification methods implemented on campus and the methods implemented off-campus by the selected Division I, II, and III schools indicate there are meaningful differences?

Limitations

1. This study is limited to the men's NCAA Division I, II, and III basketball programs selected for this study.

2. The schools selected for this study do not represent a random sample of the population of NCAA Division I, II, and III men's basketball programs.
3. The schools selected for this study are geographically located in the East and Midwest. There are no schools in this study from the West Coast, Southwestern, or Rocky Mountain areas.

Assumptions

The following are assumed to be true and relevant to this study:

1. The NCAA basketball coaches questioned in this study are actively involved in the area of identifying college basketball prospects.

2. The responses to the questionnaire are true and accurately recorded.

Definition of Terms

ALL-STAR BASKETBALL GAMES: Post-season basketball games which invite players to participate on an area, state, regional, or national basis. These games may be sponsored by local, state, and national agencies, or by private individuals, groups, or corporations.

AMATEUR ATHLETIC UNION (AAU) BASKETBALL TOURNAMENTS: Summer basketball tournaments sponsored by the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU). These tournaments are conducted
throughout the United States for secondary school age youth during the summer months.

AUDIO-VISUAL: The use of audio-visual equipment to identify basketball prospects.

BASKETBALL PRACTICE SESSIONS: Basketball practices scheduled by the player's coach in preparation for regular season or tournament games.

BASKETBALL PROSPECT: A basketball prospect is an individual who has been identified and evaluated as being able to meet basketball recruiting needs.

BASKETBALL SCOUTING SERVICES: Publications which provide information on potential basketball prospects. These publications may be national, regional, or local in nature. There is normally a fee for subscription to the service. Information provided by the scouting services may consist of names of potential basketball prospects, evaluations or the prospect's basketball ability, the names of the players' high schools or junior colleges, the names of players' coaches, academic information, ethnic backgrounds, or desired majors in college.

CONTACT INITIATED BY PROSPECT: The potential basketball prospect informs the college coach of an interest in the basketball program without having received
prior contact from the college coach.

**FORM LETTERS:** The mailing of form letters to resources who may provide information which will assist in identifying basketball prospects. These form letters ask for names of potential basketball prospects. High school and junior college coaches frequently receive letters of this nature from college coaches.

**IDENTIFICATION PROCESS:** The process of identifying the basketball players who meet particular recruiting needs. The identification process consists of two phases: (1) accumulating names of potential basketball prospects and (2) evaluating basketball players to determine if they are prospects.

**NEWSPAPERS OR MAGAZINES:** The subscription to newspapers or magazines for the purpose of generating names of potential basketball prospects.

**OFF-CAMPUS IDENTIFICATION METHODS:** Identification methods administered by the basketball coaching staff and implemented by traveling off-campus to identify college basketball prospects.

**ON-CAMPUS IDENTIFICATION METHODS:** Identification methods administered by the basketball coaching staff from the college campus to identify college basketball prospects.

**PIPELINE:** The use of communication systems, namely telephone calls to friends, alumni, coaches, etc.,
who may help generate names of potential basketball prospects or evaluate the athletic ability of players.
CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to examine the identification methods used by the selected NCAA Division I, II, and III schools to identify college basketball prospects.

Chapter II will summarize literature which has been reported on recruiting in business and recruiting in intercollegiate athletics. This chapter will also report on literature pertaining to the historical development of recruiting, procedures for recruiting, the National Letter of Intent, recruiting violations and penalties, and the identification of prospects.

Recruiting in Business

For over a hundred years, colleges and universities have been involved in the business of recruiting athletes for their intercollegiate athletic programs. Martinelli lists two basic reasons for the support of the recruitment and subsidization of intercollegiate athletics: (1) the American desire to win and (2) the need for good athletes
The recruitment of athletes has paralleled the growth of the technological and industrial development of the American society. Americans have a strong desire to compete, to be competitive when competing, and to win more often than lose. The consequences of being successful have reinforced the theory of recruitment.

Recruiting is essential for the continued growth and prosperity of our businesses and industries. The business industry has used many different approaches to recruiting in their search for outstanding employees. It takes players with good physical and mental abilities to win in athletics. Success in business also depends on the quality of the performers.

Business Week reports that companies are becoming more selective in their recruiting processes for MBA graduates. Corporate executives are scouring the business schools. A record three hundred sixty employers registered to interview business graduates at Long Beach State University. The most marketable MBA schools are Stanford University, Harvard University, and the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton MBA school.

74Martinelli, "History of Subsidization," p. 16.

Business Week describes General Motors' earnest effort to recruit. The company decided to develop a new recruiting program called "Key Institution Program." The company sent recruiting teams to more than fifty engineering and business schools. General Motors felt it may be suffering from a poor image. Money was contributed to the schools in the form of gifts and scholarships. General Motors is reporting success with their new recruiting program. Other companies seem to be tracking General Motors' successful recruiting program. ⁷⁶

Business Week reports on the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company. Massachusetts Mutual is the insurance industry's tenth largest company. They have established a new recruiting policy which is characterized by elaborate screening techniques. The new recruiting policy has increased the staying rate of their employees. Massachusetts Mutual's retention rate of twenty-seven percent is more than double the national average for an insurance company. ⁷⁷

In The National Underwriter, Mr. Lester Korn describes how to plan a recruiting effort. Mr. Korn is president of a major executive search firm. Korn lists five steps


for recruiting: (1) defining the job; (2) assessing the environment; (3) organizing the search; (4) interviewing; (5) negotiating the agreement. 78

In another article, Mr. Korn speaks of the importance of knowing what you are looking for when recruiting. Mr. Korn feels it is important to seek out someone who is compatible with the company's style and needs. 79

Management Review reports the Aetna Life and Casualty Company has begun a new method of recruiting. Aetna gives referral fees of up to five hundred dollars to their employees who refer candidates who are hired. Aetna reports it rarely uses employment agencies. 80

The competition for high caliber employees has become so intense that a strong market for search firms has developed. These firms are often referred to as "headhunters." Executive search firms have grown twenty-five percent in recent years. 81

Forbes reports on a different approach to recruiting in the business world. The "jump-ship bonus" is a method

78 Lester Korn, "How to Plan a Recruiting Effort," The National Underwriter, September 14, 1979, p. 35.
of luring away talent from competition. It is not uncommon for payments of $100,000 to be made. Forbes suggests that although such payments may be an ego boost, the money may blind the employee to the shortcomings of the new employer. 82

The similarities of recruiting in the business world and in athletics are vivid. Highly-trained executives and coaches are hired to produce winning teams. The recruitment and subsidization of employees is commonplace. There is a thorough development of a recruiting plan. There is the distribution of recruiting teams carrying with them a positive image of the company and the institution. There is selectivity in the recruiting process. Recruiters try to sign up the cream of the crop. There is the subsidization of outside firms to assist with the recruiting. The lure of the dollar is sometimes used to finalize the contract.

Recruiting in Intercollegiate Athletics

Historical Development of Recruiting

Many of our games which we play were imported from Europe. The Pilgrims brought with them a preference for play. According to Cady there was an anti-Puritan

quality from the beginning.\textsuperscript{83}

Play was not recorded well in early Colonial life. Play was restricted to the lives of children for several generations. There were many regulations against sport and amusements. In the 1870's, more regulations were passed to control sports. Spears and Swanson report that sport became a function of class. There were games such as dancing, fencing, fowling type games, handball, and cock fighting.\textsuperscript{84}

From 1776-1840, more leisure time developed for Americans. Sports became an entertainment. Horse racing, boxing, rowing, and yachting were popular. There was more prosperity and a greater middle class. Colleges continued to discourage play and games.

Spears and Swanson report that in 1843, Yale had the first intercollegiate rowing club. Modern baseball was established in 1845. In 1861, the first physical education program was developed at Amherst College. Tennis was introduced to the United States in 1874.\textsuperscript{85}


\textsuperscript{85} Ibid.
This period of time also marked the beginning of many intercollegiate sport programs. According to Staag, Yale and Harvard competed in rowing in 1852; Williams and Amherst, in baseball in 1859; Rutgers and Princeton, in football in 1869; Harvard and Brown, in ice hockey in 1896; Pennsylvania and Columbia, in swimming in 1897; and Yale, Columbia, Pennsylvania, and Princeton, in wrestling in 1905.86

The organization and conduction of the athletic events of the colleges was left up to the students. In the late 1800's, the rules of play were inconsistent. Fighting and gambling were prevalent. According to Martinelli recruiting and subsidization were prominent. Athletes sold themselves to the highest bidder. These athletes were known as "Ringers."87 In 1906, Dr. Dudley Sargent noted the following:

The basis for athletic success is to secure at the start an athlete of acknowledged ability, one who possesses the natural proclivities to perform on a high level. If the prospective athlete's means of living do not incline him toward the institution that most desires his athletic ability, then superior social advantages, indirect assistance, or even pecuniary

---


inducements are sometimes held out to him.\textsuperscript{88}

Associations and conferences were formed to help control and enforce the rules of play, recruitment, and subsidization. According to Stagg, the following associations and conferences were established on these dates:

- 1870 Rowing Association
- 1875 Intercollegiate Association for Amateur Athletics of America
- 1876 Intercollegiate Football Association
- 1879 1st Baseball League formed by colleges
- 1879 National Association of Amateur Athletics of America
- 1882 Intercollegiate LaCrosse Association
- 1888 Amateur Athletic Union
- 1894 Southern Athletic Conference
- 1895 Associations for intercollegiate wrestling, football, and swimming
- 1895 Western Athletic Conference \textsuperscript{89}

According to Denlinger and Shapiro in 1905, the president of Stanford University suggested that college athletics be professionalized. He felt that colleges and universities should no longer stand behind a

\textsuperscript{88}Ibid., p. 18.

\textsuperscript{89}Stagg, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 15.
masquerade. Alumni were subsidizing athletes with slush funds.90

In 1906, the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of America was formed. Later to be named the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the formation of this association was an attempt by the colleges to gain control of the sports. There was a need to eliminate the brutality of football and the tramp athletes and ringers.

The formation of the NCAA was followed by the development of conferences. According to Benagh, football became a "big-time" sport.91 The recruitment and subsidization of athletes became even more apparent in the 1920's. Rosen reports that in 1920 a basketball game between CCNY and NYC drew 10,000 fans. The financial advantages of athletics began to support the theory of subsidization.92

Recruiting and subsidization of intercollegiate athletics was documented by the 1929 Carnegie Foundation Report. The Carnegie Report took a close look at the history of college athletics, recruiting, and subsidization.

---


Recruiting and subsidization were documented at over sixty percent of the colleges and universities which were examined. According to Denlinger and Shapiro, the Carnegie Report said:

The fundamental causes of the defects of American college athletics are two: commercialism and a negative attitude toward the educational opportunity for which the college exists.\(^{93}\)

The effects of the depression and World War II slowed the growth of intercollegiate athletics only temporarily. The impact of technology and industrial development on intercollegiate sports has been tremendous. The development of interstate highways, more and varied airline routes, increased radio and television coverage, and bigger stadia and arenas have taken the games of our colleges and universities to larger audiences.

The recruitment of athletes has now become national in scope. Durso talks about Coach Bear Bryant's Air Force. On national signing day, Coach Bryant's football coaching staff resembles a crew of Air Force officers flying around the Southeast trying to sign football players.\(^{94}\) Denlinger and Shapiro report that the University of Maryland spent $20,000 recruiting Moses Malone, and that a University of New Mexico assistant coach lived in Malone's hometown for

\(^{93}\) Denlinger and Shapiro, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 29.

three months. Malone signed with Maryland. Before the season started, Malone signed a pro contract with the Utah Stars. 95

Emphasis on the recruitment of athletes in the NCAA has not been restricted to the Division I schools. Schools in Division II and III also spend a great deal of time and money on the recruitment of athletes. Many small college coaches are encouraged by their admissions officers to recruit as many athletes as possible. The athletes may help to fill up the freshman class. Many of these student-athletes may be paying their own expenses for college.

According to Cady, the practice of recruiting athletes to our colleges and universities is older than our colleges themselves. Cady feels the elimination of athletic recruitment is an escapist dream. The popularity and love of sport by the American people have reinforced the theory of recruitment or athletes at our colleges and universities. 96

Procedures for Recruiting

The procedures for recruiting in the National Collegiate Athletic Association are described in detail

95 Denlinger and Shapiro, op. cit., p. 257.

96 Cady, The Big Game, p. 165.
in the NCAA Manual 1981-82 under By-law Article I. The rules for recruiting are divided into ten sections (See Appendix A).

Section 1 concerns itself with "offers and inducements." Member schools cannot offer aid other than that which is permitted by the NCAA. Members cannot offer employment to relatives, gifts, loans to athletes or relatives, cash, or free or reduced services for housing or purchases of any kind.97

Section 2 concerns itself with "contacts." A contact is defined as any face-to-face contact with a prospective student-athlete, parents, or legal guardian in excess of a greeting. Division I and II members can have three contacts with the prospective student-athlete prior to and on the occasion of the National Letter of Intent. This includes contacts with relatives or legal guardians.98

The 75th NCAA Convention held in January of 1981 adopted a new contact rule effective August 1, 1981. Three additional contacts may be made by NCAA member schools with prospective student-athletes. These contacts may be held only at the prospective student-athlete's high school or junior college. All contacts

98 Ibid., p. 43.
for football must take place between December 1 and March 1. All contacts for basketball must occur during the periods of August 1 through October 1 and March 1 through May 15. Contacts with prospective student-athletes cannot occur until the completion of the junior year in high school.  

Section 3 of By-law Article 1 deals with evaluation periods. Evaluation periods are considered to be times when a coach or coaches travel off-campus to evaluate the athletic abilities of prospects. Evaluation periods for basketball are restricted to the periods of June 15 through August 1 and December 1 through March 1 (or the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college game). The evaluation period for football is August 1 through December 1 (or the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college game) plus the month of May. The evaluation period rules apply only to Division I and Division II members.  

Section 4 concerns itself with rules governing publicity. NCAA members are not permitted to publicize the visits of prospective student-athletes to the campus. Publicity concerning signing is restricted to the prospective student-athlete signing a letter of admission.

---

\[99\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 46.}\]

\[100\text{Ibid.}\]
or the financial letter of assistance.101

Section 5 covers rules concerning use of funds. Funds which are used for recruiting must be deposited with the member institution. Funds cannot be paid to talent scouts for the purpose of evaluating talent. Member institutions must not allow outside groups to expend funds for the purpose of entertaining, transporting, or providing services to prospective student-athletes or their relatives.102

Section 6 forbids the "trying out" of prospective student-athletes. Student-athletes are not permitted to demonstrate their athletic abilities in any phase of any sport while visiting a college.103

Section 7 prohibits college coaches from being involved in the direction or promotion of all-star games in which prospective student-athletes are participating.104

Section 8 deals with rules concerning transportation, visitations, and entertainment. Member schools are only permitted to finance one visit per prospective student-athlete. The visit cannot exceed more than forty-eight

101Ibid., p. 47.
102Ibid.
103Ibid., p. 48.
104Ibid., p. 49.
hours. In Division I football is permitted ninety-five total visits per year. Division I basketball is permitted eighteen total visits per year. Prospects cannot accept expense-paid visits until their senior year begins. Prospects may visit schools at their own expense as often as they want. On such visits, prospective student-athletes may only be given one meal and three complimentary tickets to an athletic event.\textsuperscript{105}

Members are not permitted to pay for transportation of the prospective student-athlete for a summer job, for enrollment, or for relatives to visit the college. Entertainment or prospective student-athletes may only take place on campus. If dining hall or residence facilities are not available, prospective student-athletes and their parents may be fed and housed off-campus at comparable prices. A student host may be given a maximum of $10.00 per day to entertain the prospect. A car cannot be provided the prospect or the student host for the purpose of entertainment.\textsuperscript{106}

High school and junior college coaches cannot be entertained by NCAA member coaches. The only thing which can be given to high school or junior college coaches is

\textsuperscript{105}Ibid., p. 50.

\textsuperscript{106}Ibid., p. 53.
two complimentary tickets to an athletic event. 107

Section 9 forbids the payment of pre-college expenses. NCAA members cannot provide financial assistance to pay for educational expenses prior to enrollment. This rule is to keep colleges from financing a prospect to prep school for a year. 108

Section 10 covers the rules dealing with specialized sport camps, coaching schools, and clinics. If NCAA members sponsor such events, they cannot employ or give reduced rates to high school or junior college athletic award winners. 109

The National Letter of Intent

The National Letter of Intent (See Appendix B) is administered by the Collegiate Commissioners Conference. The Collegiate Commissioners Conference was formed in 1939 to promote uniformity in football officiating. The Collegiate Commissioners Conference now represents twelve major university conferences. Its fields of interest have expanded to include the administration of the National Letter of Intent program. 110

107 Ibid.
108 Ibid.
109 Ibid., p. 54.
The history and purpose of the National Letter of Intent is detailed in the Collegiate Commissioners Association Directory. The program was born out of the need to police the vicious recruiting tactics of many college athletic recruiters.

The National Letter of Intent was first called the Inter-Conference Letter of Intent. The plan worked well for those conferences which adopted it. On a given date, the athlete would sign the letter of intent. After that signing no other university would make an effort to recruit the athlete. There were shortcomings with the Inter-Conference Letter of Intent. Not all conferences adopted the plan. Not all institutions belonged to a conference.

A proposal at the 1961 NCAA convention to adopt the plan for all member schools was defeated. The NCAA then proceeded to adopt a voluntary plan which would permit conferences and independents to participate.

The National Letter of Intent specifies that on a given date a prospective student-athlete is permitted to sign a National Letter of Intent. The signing date for football is 8:00 a.m., February 18 to May 15. The signing date for basketball is 8:00 a.m., April 8 to May 15. For all other sports, the signing date is 8:00 a.m., April 8 to August 1.
The signing of the National Letter of Intent binds the prospective student-athlete to the institution. If the prospective student-athlete prior to enrollment or completion of one academic year elects to go to another institution which subscribes to the National Letter of Intent, the prospective student-athlete will not be eligible for practice or competition at the second institution during the first academic year of residence and shall have no more than three remaining seasons of competition. This would be considered a mutual release. If the institution decides not to release the student-athlete from the agreement, the student-athlete would be ineligible for competition until two years of residence have been established at the second institution.

The National Letter of Intent intends to bind the prospective student-athlete to the institution for one academic year. After one year of residence, the student-athlete is automatically released from all obligations of the National Letter of Intent.

The program began in 1964 with seven conferences and eight independent institutions for a total of sixty-eight schools. By 1980, the program had grown to twenty-seven conferences and sixty-nine independent institutions for a total of two hundred ninety-one NCAA members.\(^{111}\)

\(^{111}\)Ibid., p. 15.
According to the Collegiate Commissioners Conference
the primary purpose of the National Letter of Intent program
is:

...to reduce recruiting time and
expense for the institution and to
reduce extended recruiting pressure
on the prospective student-athlete.
The program is simple and workable
because it is a voluntary program
and the participating conferences
want to make it work. Many of the
problems of competitive recruiting
have been eliminated or minimized.112

Recruiting Violations and Penalties

Robert Evans takes a critical look at intercollegiate
athletics. Evans reports the following:

The central problem around which
all others seem to rotate in inter-
collegiate athletics is a combination
of the troubles associated with
recruitment and scholarship, with
recruitment more toward the center
of the problem than scholarships.113

Many college coaches are in a win-or-be-fired situation.
The fear of losing their jobs sometimes leads them to go
astray of the NCAA rules governing the recruitment of
prospective student-athletes. The predicament of many
college coaches may best be described by John Dickinson.

112 Ibid.
113 Robert J. Evans, Blowing the Whistle on Inter-
collegiate Athletics, Nelson-Hall Company, Chicago, 1974,
p. 40.
The essential concept to understand is that behavior is currently the product of inadequately planned contingencies.... The problems in behavior are problems that have arisen, not because of freedom of choice, but because of inadequacies in the controls that are currently exercised.114

In order to win and retain their positions, some college coaches have violated the NCAA rules governing recruitment. History has recorded recruiting violations in intercollegiate athletics. Denlinger and Shapiro point out that recruiting rules have been violated in the following areas:

1. Changing admission test scores
2. Having substitutes take tests
3. Promising one package of aid and delivering another
4. Offering jobs to parents
5. Paying athletes
6. Offering cars and apartments
7. Getting grades for athletes
8. Getting athletes in junior colleges and getting them grades
9. Paying athletes exorbitant salaries for questionable jobs. 115

---


Reece reports that between 1952 and 1965 the NCAA acted upon four hundred forty-nine cases. Thirty-six percent of the cases required disciplinary action. Over 1,000 infractions occurred during each year of Reece's study from 1970-1974.\textsuperscript{116}

Spink reports that since 1952, the NCAA has examined nine hundred ninety-five cases of illegal recruiting. Of those cases there have been two hundred nine public penalties and two hundred forty-one private reprimands. Fourhundred forty-five cases were cleared. According to Spink, forty-two of sixty-two members of major football conferences have been caught cheating. Presently on probation are the University of Alaska, Auburn University, The University of Cincinnati, East Carolina University, Howard University, Southwest Missouri State University, and Western Colorado University. Spink concludes that there may be more violations than ever before. The NCAA enforcement staff seems to be too small.\textsuperscript{117}

The Basketball Bulletin states that since September, 1979, the following has happened in intercollegiate athletics:


\textsuperscript{117} C. C. Johnson Spink, "Cheating in the Colleges," The Sporting News, Vol. 188, No. 10, September 8, 1979, p. 18.
1. The basketball coach at the University of New Mexico was indicted on mail fraud charges. The indictment alleges that athletes were given counterfeit academic transcripts to keep them eligible.

2. Eight major universities have been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the NCAA, or conference probes on charges they accepted credit for phony extension or correspondence courses.

3. About thirty to thirty-five NCAA Division I schools are being investigated by the NCAA Enforcement Division.\footnote{Basketball Bulletin, The National Association of Basketball Coaches, Branford, Connecticut, Fall, 1980.}

Rothenberg reports the following violations of NCAA recruiting rules. The University of Nevada—Reno signed Edgar Jones who was later found to be scholastically ineligible by the NCAA. Nevada—Reno used a high school transcript which omitted Jones' failing grades. Centenary College was placed on probation for six years because they converted Robert Parish's ACT test scores to SAT scores to make him eligible. Southeast Louisiana lost its basketball program during 1973-75 seasons because of a record one hundred eighteen violations involving gifts of money and clothing. The recruitment of David Thompson placed both Duke and North Carolina State on probation. A Duke alumnus bought Thompson a sport coat and North Carolina State gave him an illegal tryout.\footnote{Fred Rothenberg, "Recruiters, NCAA Can't Keep Up with Jones Boy," Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Wednesday, December 20, 1978, p. 17.}
Some coaches who are involved in violations of NCAA recruiting rules go on to get jobs at other NCAA schools. Rothenberg reports that Tates Locke was caught providing money and plane fares to some of his Clemson players. Tates Locke left Clemson and accepted a position as head coach at Jacksonville University. 120

Some coaches who are caught violating the rules are not so fortunate. *Sports Illustrated* reports that the University of New Mexico fired the head basketball coach, Norm Ellenberger. Ellenberger was fired because of his involvement in the provision of phony academic credits to his players. The University of New Mexico was placed on three years probation for recruiting, eligibility, and other rule violations. They were forced to return $34,000 earned in the 1978 NCAA Basketball Tournament. They were also barred from post-season play and NCAA television appearances through the 1981-82 basketball season. 121

*Sports Illustrated* reports that in August of 1980, the Presidents and Chancellors of five Pacific 10 Conference schools penalized their athletic programs. The schools affected were USC, UCLA, Oregon, Oregon State, and Arizona State University. The schools were

---

120 Ibid.

ruled ineligible for the 1980 conference football title, Rose Bowl Game, or other post-season games. The penalties were for unearned academic credits and falsified transcripts. USC also forfeited the 1978 Pacific 10 track title and Oregon forfeited points in the 1980 Pacific 10 swimming meets.\textsuperscript{122}

According to \textit{Sports Illustrated}, the University of Colorado football team was placed on probation for two years for more than sixty NCAA rules violations between 1973-1978. Colorado was barred from post-season play and NCAA telecasts until December of 1981.\textsuperscript{123}

Arizona State's football program was declared ineligible for bowl games in the 1981 season and from NCAA telecast for two seasons. They were found to be in violation of eligibility, recruiting, and ethical conduct rules.\textsuperscript{124}

California State Polytechnic University at Pomona, a Division II member, was found to have violations in their basketball, football, and cross-country programs during the 1977-79 seasons. Athletes were receiving

\textsuperscript{122}\textit{Sports Illustrated}, Vol. 53, No. 1, August 18, 1980, p. 89.
fraudulent academic credits. The basketball team was barred from NCAA telecasts and post-season competition for two years. The football and cross-country teams were barred for one year.\textsuperscript{125}

\textit{Sports Illustrated} reported that the Big Ten Conference placed the University of Illinois on probation for two years. Illinois was accused of deceiving the Big Ten Conference about the academic eligibility of their football quarterback. The Big Ten Conference placed Illinois on probation by prohibiting the football team from participating in any bowl game or television appearance for one year.\textsuperscript{126}

\textbf{Identification of Prospects}

In 1946, Stagg reported on the development of the NCAA in relationship to intercollegiate athletics in the United States. His study covered the following areas:

1. Admission standards
2. Eligibility Standards
3. Athletic recruitment
4. Financial aid
5. Administration
6. Conference organization

\textsuperscript{125} \textit{Sports Illustrated}, Vol. 54, No. 10, March 2, 1981, p. 79.

Stagg reported the following concerning the recruitment procedures of intercollegiate athletic programs.

Because of modern means of communications and transportation the recruiting and scheduling practices of intercollegiate programs have become national in scope.\textsuperscript{127}

In 1966, Hoy reported on the practices used to control intercollegiate athletics in selected conferences. The purpose of the study was to determine acceptable administrative practices in intercollegiate athletics. The study examined the areas of recruiting, eligibility standards, coaches' contracts, revenue, and budgetary controls. Hoy discovered that the most controversial area of intercollegiate athletics was recruiting. Hoy reports that few objective studies have been made in the area of athletic recruitment and financial aid.\textsuperscript{128}

In 1975, Durso made an investigation of college sport. He found there were pressures to field a representative team at most colleges, regardless of the size of the institution. Durso reported that many coaches turn to talent scouts to find the prospects they need. Alfred "Butch" Lee an All-American player at Marquette University was introduced to the basketball world by Mr. Howard Garfinkle. Mr. Garfinkle is a

\textsuperscript{127} Stagg, "The Development of the NCAA," p. 80.

New York City based talent scout for college basketball coaches. 129

In 1976, Benagh published a book on how college football and basketball teams make it to the top. Benagh made a nationwide exploration in an attempt to determine the way the teams were built and maintained. Benagh discovered that many college basketball coaches are using scouting services to discover basketball prospects. According to Benagh, such scouting reports were illegal until the 1970's. 130

Benagh discussed three scouting services used by college basketball coaches. The Cage Report (See Appendix C) is published by Mr. Dave Bones out of Toledo, Ohio. The Cage Report lists the names of outstanding senior and underclassmen prospects throughout the country. The fee for subscription to The Cage Report is $160 for thirty-four issues annually. 131

Dave Bones also runs a summer basketball sports camp in Louisville, Kentucky. Mr. Bones runs this camp in conjunction with Mr. Rick Bolus, publisher of the High Potential Basketball Recruiting Service (See

129 Durso, The Sports Factory, p. 35.
130 Benagh, Making It to #1, p. 54.
131 Ibid.
Appendix D). The name of their summer sports camp is the "Blue-Chip Basketball Camp (See Appendix E). Mr. Bones and Mr. Bolus try to get top players to enroll in their camp. College coaches who subscribe to their scouting service are encouraged to attend the camp for the purpose of evaluating the player's athletic abilities.

Rothenberg reports on Mr. Howard Garfinkle. Mr. Garfinkle provides information on hundreds of high school players through the High School Basketball Illustrated Report (See Appendix F). The report is purchased by college basketball coaches across the country for a fee of $250 annually. Mr. Garfinkle is also co-director of one of the nation's top summer basketball sport camps. The "Five Star Basketball Camp" (See Appendix G) is attended by many of the top high school players. College coaches who subscribe to Mr. Garfinkle's scouting service are permitted to go to the camp to evaluate the talent. The High School Basketball Illustrated Report covers the Eastern states.132

Mr. Bill Cronauer may be the biggest of the basketball talent scouts. According to Lipper, Mr. Cronauer

makes at least $150,000 from his **B/C Scouting Service**
(See Appendix H) which can be subscribed to annually for a fee of $175. His "B/C All-Star Basketball Camps"
(See Appendix I) are attended by high school players from across the nation. Lipper reports:

> Cronauer's scouting service, which annually appraises thousands of high school prospects, is required reading for college recruiters. And his camp, billed as an 'invitation-only, superstars-only' convocation, allows the best players to be scrutinized under laboratory-like conditions by a Lefty Driesell, a Joe B. Hall, a Bobby Knight.... The upshot is that Cronauer plays a prominent role in the world of college basketball, determining in large measure who the prospects are and where they will be apportioned. To borrow from his artful phrasing, he is a BT (big time) talent scout. Indeed, the biggest.133

Another popular basketball scouting service is the **Metro Index Report** (See Appendix J). This report is written by Mr. Joe Butler out of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Mr. Butler provides a variety of scouting service reports. From Mr. Butler, a college basketball coach can subscribe to a report covering high school basketball prospects throughout the United States, a report covering junior college prospects, a report covering specific states or regions or the country, or combinations of the

---

aforementioned. Mr. Butler also provides a report on non-predictors, those high school players who will not attain a 2.0 grade point average and be eligible for an NCAA scholarship.

Summary

A review of the research indicates that recruiting in college athletics is very prominent at all levels of competition within the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Because of America's love for collegiate sport and our modern systems of communications and transportation, recruiting has increased and become more national in scope. The time and financial costs associated with recruiting have accelerated. Few objective studies have been done which lend themselves to the improvement of the recruiting process at the intercollegiate level. No studies have been discovered which are related to an analysis of the identification methods used by college basketball coaches to identify college basketball prospects.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the procedure and methods employed throughout this study. This chapter is concerned with the methodology associated with a comparison of the identification methods used among selected men's NCAA Division I, II, and III coaches to identify college basketball prospects.

The problem of this study is to examine the methods of identification used by selected men's NCAA Division I, II, and III college and university basketball coaches to identify basketball prospects. The major purposes of this study are to ascertain which identification methods are preferred and used most frequently to accumulate names of potential basketball prospects and to evaluate the athletic ability of players, and to determine the financial cost of the identification methods used by the selected NCAA Division I, II, and III schools in this study. The author hopes the results of this study will help the college coach select identification methods which will make efficient use of time and money.
The major procedures employed in this study included the following:

1. An overview as described in Chapter I of the development of intercollegiate basketball, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the financing of intercollegiate athletics, the recruiting related to financing, and the identification process.

2. A review as described in Chapter II of the related literature in the areas of recruiting in business, recruiting in athletics, procedures for recruiting, the National Letter of Intent program, recruiting violations and penalties, and the identification of prospects.

3. The development of a pilot study.

4. The distribution of a pilot study questionnaire to a selected sample.

5. The analysis of the data received from the pilot study questionnaire.

6. The development of a final questionnaire.

7. The distribution of the final questionnaire.

8. The tabulation of the data received from the questionnaire.

9. The analysis of the data received from the questionnaire.

Pilot Study

The pilot study was conducted in the Spring of 1979. The pilot study questionnaire was sent to fifteen men's NCAA college and university basketball coaches. Five of
the coaches were selected from Division I schools; five, from Division II schools; and five, from Division III schools. The following is a list of those schools which were sent a pilot study questionnaire.

1. Division I schools
   American University
   George Washington University
   The Ohio State University
   Princeton University
   United States Naval Academy

2. Division II schools
   Bentley College
   Central State University
   District of Columbia
   Eastern Illinois University
   University of Maryland Baltimore County

3. Division III schools
   Bethany College
   Hamilton College
   Muskingum College
   Wittenberg University
   Wooster College

   The results of the pilot study were recorded and analyzed in the summer of 1979. The pilot study was used to assist in the development of a valid questionnaire.

Questionnaire

A final questionnaire (See Appendix K) was developed in the winter of 1979-80. The questionnaire was disturbed to the sample in the Spring of 1980 and 1981 by the following methods:
1. The questionnaire was distributed by mail.

2. The questionnaire was distributed to coaches at the 1980 and 1981 NCAA Basketball Coaches' Convention.

3. The questionnaire was distributed to coaches at various summer basketball camps in 1980 and 1981.

Accompanying the questionnaire was a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and definitions of important terms. The questionnaire was designed to gather appropriate information concerning the identification methods used by college basketball coaches to identify college basketball prospects.

The questionnaire listed the following methods of identifying college basketball prospects. Coaches were encouraged to list methods other than those included in the questionnaire.

1. AAU basketball tournaments
2. All-sat basketball games
3. Basketball scouting services
4. Basketball practice sessions
5. Contact initiated by prospect
6. Audio-visual equipment
7. Form letters
8. Newspapers or magazines
9. Pipeline
10. Regular season games
11. Summer basketball camps
12. Summer basketball leagues
13. Tournament games

The questionnaire asked the sample three basic categories of questions. The categories of questions were concerned with the following:

1. The accumulation of names of potential basketball prospects.
2. The evaluation of the athletic ability of basketball players.
3. The financial cost of the identification methods.

Sample

The sample selected for this study were twenty-five NCAA Division I men's basketball schools, twenty-five NCAA Division II men's basketball schools. The questionnaire was distributed to the head men's basketball coach or the assistant men's varsity basketball coach at the schools.

The schools selected for the sample were chosen on the following basis:

1. The school must be a member of a men's NCAA Division I, II, or III basketball program.
2. The head coach or an assistant coach had previous acquaintanceship with the author of this study.
3. The author of the study made personal contact with the head coach or assistant coach at the 1980 or 1981 NCAA Basketball Coaches Convention, at a summer basketball sports camp, or at a high school basketball regular season game or all-star game.

4. The head coach or assistant coach has been at the school for at least three years.

The schools selected for this study do not represent a random sample of the NCAA men's basketball programs. The author of the study did not feel a survey by questionnaire of the entire membership would generate a high rate of return. The information requested by this study is of a highly confidential nature. The financial cost involved in contacting each NCAA member personally was prohibitive. Therefore, the author elected to conduct a descriptive research study of a specific number of schools within each division with whom the author had personal acquaintance. The subjects for this study represent 10 percent of the entire NCAA Division I, II, and III men's basketball programs.

The rate of return of the questionnaire was as follows:

1. 18 Division 18 schools responded for a 74% return rate. The 18 schools represent 7% of the Division I schools.
2. 20 Division II schools responded for an 80% return rate. The 20 schools represent 11% of the Division II schools.

3. 19 Division III schools responded for a 76% return rate. The 20 schools represent 7% of the Division III schools.

The following schools, listed in alphabetical order, were selected to be the subjects for this study:

1. Division I schools
   Cleveland State University
   Cornell University
   DePaul University
   Evansville University
   Georgetown University
   Indiana University
   Lafayette College
   Marshall University
   Miami University, Ohio
   Michigan State University
   Morehead State University
   Murray State University
   Penn State University
   Richmond University
   St. Joseph's College, Pa.
   Toledo University
   University of Cincinnati
   University of Kentucky
   University of Louisville
   University of Michigan
   University of Pennsylvania
   University of Texas
   Virginia Military Institute
   William and Mary College
   Xavier University

2. Division II schools
   Ashland College
   Bellarmine College
   Charleston College
   Florida Southern University
   Florida Technological University
Georgetown College
Indiana Central University
Indiana State University Evansville
Kentucky Wesleyan College
Lewis University
Northern Michigan University
Oakland University
Randolph Macon College
Rollins College
St. Joseph's College, Indiana
St. Michael's College
Southeast Missouri State University
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Transylvania University
University of Bridgeport
University of Missouri, Rolla
Wayne State University
Wisconsin University, Green Bay
Wright State University
Youngstown State University

3. Division III schools

Albion College
Allegheny College
Bryant College
Calvin College
Capital University
Case Western Reserve University
Centre College
Grove City College
Heidelberg College
John Carroll University
Kenyon College
Lycoming College
Lynchburg College
Marrietta College
Methodist College
Mount Union College
North Park College
Ohio Northern University
Ohio Wesleyan University
Otterbein College
Potsdam State University
Roanoke College
University of Rochester
Wabash College
Wheaton College
Collection of Data

Data collected in this study will be grouped according to Division I, Division II, and Division III schools. This method of collecting data will maintain the anonymity of the schools which participated in the study.

As the questionnaires returned, the author collected the data. A follow-up letter was sent to those schools which did not return the questionnaire. The data were recorded within Division I, Division II, and Division III groups as follows:

1. Data were recorded on the number of schools which used the identification methods to accumulate names of college basketball prospects. The percentage of schools using the identification methods for this purpose was also recorded.

2. Data were recorded on the identification methods used by the coaches to accumulate the names of current varsity team members. The frequency and percent of total use for each identification method was recorded. The total frequency for Division I, II, and III schools was also recorded.

3. Data were recorded on the preference by the coaches for identification methods used to accumulate names of potential college basketball prospects. The mean score and the rank/order score for each identification method was recorded.

4. Data were recorded on the number of schools which used the identification methods to evaluate the athletic ability of players. The percentage of schools using the identification methods for this purpose was also recorded.
5. Data were recorded on the identification methods used by the coaches to evaluate the athletic ability of current varsity team members. The frequency and percent of total use for each identification method was recorded. The total frequency for Division I, II, and III schools was also recorded.

6. Data were recorded on the preference by the coaches for identification methods used to evaluate the athletic ability of players. The mean score and the rank/order score for each identification method was recorded.

7. Data were recorded on the annual financial cost for each identification method. The mean annual financial cost and the percent of total cost for each identification method was recorded. The total mean cost for Division I, II, and III was also recorded.

8. Data were recorded on the annual financial costs of identification methods used on campus and identification methods used off-campus. The mean annual financial cost for each identification method was recorded. The total mean annual cost for the on-campus and off-campus identification methods was recorded for Division I, II, and III.

Analysis of Data

Comparisons were made among the selected NCAA Division I, II, and III schools to determine which identification methods were used and preferred at each particular level of classification, and to determine the financial costs of the identification methods. An analysis of the data and comparisons among the selected Divisions
I, II, and III schools were made in the following categories:

The accumulation of names of potential prospects

1. The percentage of schools using the identification methods to accumulate the names of potential basketball prospects.

2. The frequency and percentage of total frequency for the identification methods used to accumulate the names of current varsity team members.

3. The coaches' preferences, expressed in rank/order, for the identification methods used to accumulate names of potential basketball prospects.

The evaluation of the athletic ability of players

1. The percentage of schools using the identification methods to evaluate the athletic ability of players.

2. The frequency and percentage of total frequency for the identification methods used to evaluate the athletic ability of current varsity team members.

3. The coaches preferences, expressed in rank/order, for the identification methods used to evaluate the athletic ability of players.

The financial costs of the identification methods

1. The mean annual financial cost and the percent of total cost for each identification method in Division I, II, and III.
2. The mean annual financial cost and the percent of total costs for the identification methods used off-campus and the identification methods used on campus by the selected Division.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This study was undertaken to provide an educational experience which would strengthen the reader's ability to select identification methods based upon data collected from the selected men's NCAA Division I, II, and III basketball programs.

The process of identifying college basketball players can be divided into two phases. Phase one is the accumulation of names of potential basketball prospects. Phase two is the evaluation of the athletic ability of basketball players. Certain methods of identification may be more appropriate as an instrument to accumulate names of potential prospects. Other methods may be used to evaluate the players' athletic ability. Some of the identification methods may be able to perform both functions. It is the responsibility of the college coach to know the functions of the identification methods.

This study analyzed three basic categories of data:

1. The identification methods used to accumulate names of potential basketball prospects.
2. The identification methods used to evaluate the athletic ability of basketball players.

3. The financial cost involved in the implementation of the identification methods.

The Accumulation of Names of Basketball Prospects

The selected NCAA Division I, II, and III men's basketball coaches were asked to indicate whether or not they used the identification methods to accumulate the names of potential basketball prospects. Table 1 lists the identification methods, the number of schools in Division I, II, and III who responded positively, and the percentage of schools within each division who are using the methods to accumulate names of players.

Data from Table 1 indicates the Division I basketball coaches make frequent use of all of the identification methods to accumulate names of potential prospects except for audio-visual equipment. Only 28 percent of the Division I coaches used audio-visual equipment. One hundred percent of the Division I coaches use basketball scouting services, while over 94 percent use newspapers and magazines, the pipeline method, summer basketball camps, and summer basketball leagues.
### TABLE 1
Division I, II, and III Schools Using the Identification Methods to Accumulate Names of Potential Basketball Prospects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION METHODS</th>
<th>DIVISION I SCHOOLS</th>
<th>DIVISION II SCHOOLS</th>
<th>DIVISION III SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball scouting services</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers and magazines</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball camps</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball leagues</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact initiated by prospect</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form letters</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular season games</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament games</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-star games</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU tournaments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball practice</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Division II, 100 percent of the coaches used basketball scouting services as a method of accumulating names. Ninety percent used pipeline and regular season games methods. AAU tournaments, audio-visual equipment, and all-star games received less than a 50 percent response. Division II coaches made somewhat less use of summer basketball camps and summer basketball leagues than did Division I coaches.

Division III coaches used the pipeline and form letter methods in 94 percent of the selected Division III sample. Newspapers and magazines and contact initiated by prospect received an 89 percent rating. Division III basketball coaches indicated that a smaller percentage of their schools used summer basketball leagues and basketball practices than Division I and II schools, while having a larger percentage of their schools use audio-visual equipment than Division I and II. Sixty-three percent, a surprisingly large number, stated that they do use summer basketball camps as a method of accumulating names.

Data in Table 1 answered the research question number one in the affirmative. In the accumulation of names of potential basketball prospects, the coaches in Division I, II, and III did indicate consistent use of newspapers and magazines, the pipeline, contact
initiated by prospect, and tournament games. However, there were meaningful differences in the following areas:

1. A greater percentage (94 percent) of the Division I schools used summer basketball leagues than did Division II (70 percent) and Division III (37 percent).

2. A greater percentage (67 percent) of the Division I schools used AAU tournaments than did Division II (10 percent) and Division III (32 percent).

3. A larger percentage (90 percent) of the Division II schools used regular season games than did Division I (78 percent) and Division III (79 percent).

4. A smaller percentage (40 percent) of the Division II schools used all-star games than did the Division I (72 percent) and Division III (74 percent).

5. Division III schools used basketball scouting services less frequently (74 percent) than did Division I (100 percent) and Division II (100 percent).

6. Division III schools used summer basketball leagues less frequently (37 percent) than did Division I (94 percent) and Division II (70 percent).

7. Division III schools used basketball practices less frequently (32 percent) than did Division I (67 percent) and Division II (60 percent).

8. A larger percentage (95 percent) of the Division III schools used form letters than did Division I (78 percent) and Division II (80 percent).

9. A larger percentage (42 percent) of the Division III schools used audio-visual equipment than did Division I (28 percent) and Division II (20 percent).
Figure 1 illustrates the relationships among the Division I, II, and III schools for the percentage of schools using the methods to accumulate names of potential basketball prospects.

The Division I, II, and III coaches were asked to list the identification methods which they used to accumulate the names of current varsity team members. Table 2 lists the identification methods, the number of times each identification method was used, and the percentage of total use which each method achieved.

Data from Table 2 indicates that nearly 21 percent of the time the Division I coaches used basketball scouting services to accumulate the names of current varsity team members. The figure corresponds to the high marks achieved by the basketball scouting service method in Table 1. The pipeline and summer basketball camps methods recorded 16 percent and 13 percent marks, respectively, in Table 3. They received similar high percentage scores in Table 1.

Table 1 indicated that summer basketball leagues were used by 16 percent more of the selected Division I sample than regular season games. However, Table 2 indicates that summer basketball leagues were used only 7 percent of the time in accumulating names of current varsity team members. Regular season games was used
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1=Basketball scouting services
2=Newspapers & magazines
3=Pipeline
4=Summer basketball camps
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6=Contact initiated by prospect
7=Form letters
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Figure 1. Percentage of Schools Using the Identification Methods to Accumulate Names of Potential Basketball Prospects
TABLE 2

Division I, II, and III Schools Using Identification Methods to Accumulate the Names of Current Varsity Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION METHODS</th>
<th>DIVISION I</th>
<th>DIVISION II</th>
<th>DIVISION III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency of Use</td>
<td>% of Total Use</td>
<td>Frequency of Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball scouting services</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball camps</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular season game</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form letters</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers and magazines</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball leagues</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-star games</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament games</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact initiated by prospect</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball practice</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU Tournaments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
over 11 percent of the time. Contact initiated by prospect, used by 89 percent of the Division I coaches in Table 1, was used only 3 percent of the time in Table 2.

Table 2 indicates that Division II coaches have received meaningful results from the regular season games, pipeline, and basketball scouting service methods. The high percentages achieved by these methods in Table 2 correspond to the high percentages they achieved in Table 1. Although used by at least 70 percent of the Division II coaches, tournament games, summer basketball leagues, form letters, summer basketball camps, and contact initiated by prospect were not used frequently to accumulate the names of current varsity team members.

In Table 2, Division III coaches demonstrated a strong use rate for the pipeline, form letter, and regular season games methods. The form letter method appears to have greater popularity in Division III than it does in Division I and II. Although receiving low marks from Division I and II, the contact initiated by prospect method achieved a solid 10 percent rating in Table 2 from Division III schools. Summer basketball camps, summer basketball leagues, all-star games, and tournament games contributed at a rate of 3 percent or less to the accumulation of names of current varsity team members in Division III. Audio-visual equipment, although
used by 42 percent of the Division III schools in Table 1, was used in only 1 percent of the cases in Table 3.

Data in Table 2 answered the research question number two in the affirmative. In the accumulation of names of current varsity team members, Divisions I, II, and III demonstrated similar infrequent use in Table 2 of all-star games, tournament games, AAU tournaments, and audio-visual equipment. The newspaper and magazine method received similar ratings of between 6 percent and 7 percent from Divisions I, II, and III. However, meaningful differences existed in the following areas:

1. Nearly 21 percent of the players' names in Division I were accumulated using basketball scouting services as compared to nearly 13 percent for Division II and 7 percent for Division III.

2. 13 percent of the players' names in Division I were accumulated using summer basketball camps as compared to 6 percent for Division II and 3 percent for Division III.

3. 7 percent of the players' names in Division I were accumulated using summer basketball leagues as compared to 1 percent for Division II and 1 percent for Division III.

4. 16 percent of the players' names in Division I were accumulated using the pipeline method as compared to nearly 26 percent for Division II and 26 percent for Division III.
5. Nearly 27 percent of the players' names in Division II were accumulated using regular season games as compared to 11 percent for Division I and 14 percent for Division III.

6. 7 percent of the players' names in Division II were accumulated using basketball practices as compared to nearly 3 percent for Division I and 2 percent for Division III.

7. 25 percent of the players' names in Division III were accumulated using the form letter method as compared to 8 percent for Division I and 5 percent for Division II.

8. 10 percent of the players' names in Division III were accumulated using the contact initiated by prospect method as compared to nearly 3 percent for Division I and nearly 5 percent for Division II.

Figure 2 illustrates the relationships among the Division I, II, and III schools for using the identification methods to accumulate the names of current varsity team members.
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Figure 2. Percentage of Use Rates for Identification Methods Used to Accumulate Names of Current Varsity Team Members
The selected NCAA Division I, II, and III coaches were asked to indicate their preference for the identification methods for the purpose of accumulating names of potential basketball prospects. The coaches were asked to rate the identification methods according to how they would prefer to use them, regardless of any time or monetary constraints associated with the implementation of the methods. The sample ranked the methods from one to thirteen, with one being the highest. Table 3 lists the identification methods, the mean score for each method, and the rank order score for each method in Division I, II, and III.
TABLE 3
Division I, II, and III School's Preferences for Identification Methods Used to Accumulate Names of Potential Basketball Prospects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION METHODS</th>
<th>DIVISION I</th>
<th></th>
<th>DIVISION II</th>
<th></th>
<th>DIVISION III</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rank/Order Score</td>
<td>Rank/Order</td>
<td>Mean Rank/Order Score</td>
<td>Rank/Order</td>
<td>Mean Rank/Order Score</td>
<td>Rank/Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball camps</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball scouting services</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball leagues</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular season game</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-star games</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form letters</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball practices</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU tournaments</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament games</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers and magazines</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact initiated by prospect</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data from Table 3 indicates that the Division I basketball coaches prefer identification methods which would give them an accumulation of names at an early date in the recruiting process. Summer basketball camps, basketball scouting services, summer basketball leagues, and the pipeline are methods which were given the four highest ratings. All of these methods have the capability of generating names of potential prospects before the prospect's senior year of high school begins. AAU tournaments, another method used during the summer months, received a rather low ranking of ninth.

Table 1 indicated that a high percentage of the Division I schools use newspapers and magazines and the contact initiated by prospect methods. However, these methods received a low preference rating from the Division I coaches. Although they use regular season games, tournament games, all-star games, and basketball practices to accumulate names, the Division I coaches did not rate these methods in the top four positions.

Data in Table 3 have some similarities with the data in Table 2. Four of the top five ranked methods in Table 3 rank as the top four methods in Table 2 in terms of the accumulation of current varsity team members. Summer basketball leagues, ranked number three in Table 3, finished in the number seven position in
Table 2 for Division I schools. Summer basketball camps, basketball scouting services, the pipeline, and regular season games appear to be identification methods which are preferred by the Division I coaches, and they are methods which have produced meaningful results in terms of the accumulation of names of current varsity team members.

Division II basketball coaches indicated a preference for methods which could be used before and during the basketball season. Basketball scouting services, the pipeline, regular season games, and summer basketball camps were ranked as the top four. Summer basketball camps and summer leagues were ranked lower in comparison with the Division I coaches' rankings. Regular season games and basketball practices received higher rankings by the Division II coaches. The high preference rating of regular season games is supported by the data from Table 1 which indicated that 90 percent of the Division II schools used the method. Although basketball practices received a high preference rating from the Division II coaches, Table 1 data indicates that only 60 percent of the Division II coaches use the method.

Methods used by less than 50 percent of the Division II coaches in Table 1, received a corresponding low preference rating by the Division II coaches in Table 2.
Although used by 80 percent of the coaches, contact initiated by prospect was given the lowest ranking by the Division II coaches.

Data from Tables 2 and 3 for Division II schools has some distinct similarities. Of the five top ranked identification methods in Table 3, four of the methods rank has the four most productive methods in terms of accumulating names of current varsity team members. Regular season games, the pipeline, basketball scouting services, and basketball practices produced meaningful results in Table 2 and ranked in the top five in Table 3.

Summer basketball camps received a lower preference rating in Division III as compared to Division I and II. However, regular season games, form letters, and tournament games received higher rankings. Although Division III coaches ranked summer basketball leagues number six in Table 3, Table 1 data indicated that only 37 percent of the Division III sample used the method.

Three of the four top rated methods for Division III in Table 3 (regular season games, the pipeline, and form letters) were ranked in Table 2 as the three most productive methods of accumulating names of current varsity team members. Contact initiated by prospect, rated last in Table 3, was the fourth most productive method at accumulating names of current varsity team members in Division III.
Data in Table 3 answer the research question number three in the affirmative. Division I, II, and III coaches generally agreed on the relative importance of basketball scouting services and the pipeline methods. They also agreed by giving low rankings to AAU tournaments, newspapers and magazines, contact initiated by prospect, and ausio-visual equipment. However, meaningful differences existed in the following areas:

1. Summer basketball camps was ranked number one in Division I, while receiving rankings of fourth and seventh in Division II and III, respectively.

2. Summer basketball leagues was ranked higher by the Division I schools (third) than by Division II (sixth) or Division III (sixth).

3. Division I schools ranked all-star games higher (sixth) than Division II (tenth) and Division III (ninth).

4. Division II schools ranked basketball practices higher (fifth) than did Division I (eighth) and Division II (eighth).

5. Division III schools ranked regular season games number one. Division I and II schools ranked regular season games number five and three, respectively.

6. Division III schools ranked form letters higher (fourth) than did the Division I (seventh) and Division II (seventh) schools.

7. Division III schools ranked tournament games higher (fifth) than did Division I (tenth) and Division II (eighth).
Figure 3 illustrates the relationships among the Division I, II, and III coaches for their preference ratings of the identification methods used to accumulate names of potential basketball prospects.
Figure 3. Coaches' Preference Ratings of the Identification Methods Used to Accumulate Names of Potential Basketball Prospects
The Evaluation of the Athletic Ability of Basketball Players

The selected NCAA Division I, II, and III men's basketball coaches were asked to indicate whether or not they used the identification methods to evaluate the athletic ability of basketball players. Table 4 lists the identification methods, the number of schools in Division I, II, and III who responded positively, and the percentage of schools within each division who are using the methods to evaluate the athletic ability of basketball players.
TABLE 4
Division I, II, and III Schools Using the Identification Methods to Evaluate the Athletic Ability of Basketball Players

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION METHODS</th>
<th>DIVISION I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>DIVISION II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>DIVISION III</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Schools</td>
<td>% of Schools</td>
<td>No. of Schools</td>
<td>% of Schools</td>
<td>No. of Schools</td>
<td>% of Schools</td>
<td>No. of Schools</td>
<td>% of Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular season game</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament game</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball practice</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball camps</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-star games</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball leagues</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU tournaments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball scouting services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact initiated by prospect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers and magazines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form letters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data in Table 1 indicates that a greater percentage of Division I coaches use identification methods which give them an in-person view of the players. Regular season games and tournament games are used by 100 percent of the Division I coaches. The pipeline is the only method which does not offer an in-person evaluation of athletic ability that received over a 67 percent rating.

Division II coaches also prefer identification methods which provide an in-person evaluation of athletic ability. Regular season games and tournament games are used by 100 percent of the Division II coaches. The only methods used by less than 50 percent of the Division II coaches were newspapers and magazines, the pipeline, AAU tournaments, contact initiated by prospect, and form letters.

One hundred percent of the Division III coaches use regular season games to evaluate the athletic ability of players. Eighty-nine percent of the Division III coaches use tournament games, all-star games, and audio-visual equipment. Methods used by 37 percent or less of the Division III sample were basketball practices, summer basketball leagues, basketball scouting services, AAU tournaments, newspapers and magazines, contact initiated by prospect, and form letters.
Data in Table 4 answer the research question number four in the affirmative. In the evaluation of the athletic ability of players, Division I, II, and III coaches were nearly unanimous in their use of regular season games and tournament games as methods to evaluate athletic ability. They also reported similar infrequent use of contact initiated by prospect, newspapers and magazines, and form letters. However, meaningful differences existed in the following areas:

1. A greater percentage (94 percent) of the Division I schools use summer basketball camps than do Division II (70 percent) and Division III (53 percent).

2. A greater percentage (89 percent) of the Division I schools use summer basketball leagues than do Division II (60 percent) and Division III (37 percent).

3. A greater percentage (67 percent) of the Division I schools use AAU tournaments than do Division II (20 percent) and Division III (21 percent).

4. A larger percentage (50 percent) of the Division II schools use basketball scouting services than do Division I (39 percent) and Division III (32 percent).

5. A smaller percentage of the Division II schools (30 percent) use the pipeline than do Division I (78 percent) and Division III (63 percent).

6. A smaller percentage of the Division II schools (70 percent) use all-star games than do Division I (89 percent) and Division III (89 percent).
7. A smaller percentage of the Division III schools (37 percent) use basketball practices than do Division I (94 percent) and Division II (90 percent).

8. A larger percentage of the Division III schools (89 percent) use audio-visual equipment than do Division I (67 percent) and Division II (50 percent).

Figure 4 illustrates the relationship among the Division I, II, and III schools for the percentage of schools using the methods to evaluate the athletic ability of basketball players.
Figure 4. Percentage of Schools Using the Identification Methods to Evaluate the Athletic Ability of Players
The selected Division I, II, and III coaches were asked to list the identification methods which they used to evaluate the athletic ability of current varsity team members. Table 5 lists the identification methods, the number of times each method was used, and the percentage of total use which each method achieved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION METHODS</th>
<th>DIVISION I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>DIVISION II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>DIVISION III</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency of Use</td>
<td>% of Total Use</td>
<td>Frequency of Use</td>
<td>% of Total Use</td>
<td>Frequency of Use</td>
<td>% of Total Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular season games</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament games</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball practice</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-star games</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball camps</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball leagues</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball scouting services</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU tournaments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers and magazines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact initiated by prospect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form letters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 data indicates that regular season games have been used extensively by Division I coaches to evaluate the athletic ability of current varsity team members. Nearly 35 percent of current varsity team members were evaluated by the Division I coaches during their regular season games. Tournament games, basketball practices, and all-star games were also used frequently. Summer basketball camps and summer basketball leagues, despite being used by at least 89 percent of the Division I schools (See Table 4), achieved only 8 percent and 6 percent ratings, respectively, in Table 5.

Division II coaches used regular season games 50 percent of the time in the evaluation of their current varsity team members. Basketball practices, the pipeline, and tournament game methods were also used frequently. Division II coaches made less use of all-star games, summer basketball camps, summer basketball leagues, and basketball scouting services than did the Division I coaches.

Division III coaches used regular season games 36 percent of the time in their evaluation of current varsity team members. Division III coaches used the pipeline method for evaluation more frequently than Division I or II coaches. Tournament games, basketball practices, audio-visual equipment, and all-star games
made the next most significant contributions to the evaluation of current Division III varsity team members.

Data in Table 5 answer research question number five in the affirmative. In the accumulation of names of current varsity team members, there was general agreement by Division I, II, and III coaches on the importance of regular season and tournament games, and the infrequent use of basketball scouting services, AAU tournaments, newspapers and magazines, contact initiated by prospect, and form letters, there are meaningful differences in the following areas:

1. 12 percent of the players in Division I were evaluated by the use of all-star games as compared to nearly 4 percent for Division II and 5 percent for Division III.

2. 13 percent of the players in Division I and 16 percent of the players in Division II were evaluated by the use of basketball practices as compared to 8 percent for Division III.

3. 50 percent of the players in Division II were evaluated by the use of regular season games as compared to 35 percent for Division I and 36 percent for Division III.

4. 8 percent of the players in Division I were evaluated by the use of summer basketball camps as compared to 2 percent for Division II and 3 percent for Division III.
5. 6 percent of the players in Division I were evaluated by the use of summer basketball leagues as compared to 3 percent for Division II and 1 percent for Division III.

6. 19 percent of the players in Division III were evaluated by the use of the pipeline method as compared to 3 percent for Division I and nearly 12 percent for Division II.

7. Nearly 7 percent of the players in Division III were evaluated by the use of audio-visual equipment as compared to zero percent for Division I and 2 percent for Division II.

Figure 5 illustrates the relationships among the Division I, II, and III schools for using the identification methods to evaluate the athletic ability of current varsity team members.
Figure 5. Percentage of Use Rates for Identification Methods Used to Evaluate the Athletic Ability of Current Varsity Team Members

Identification Methods

1=Regular season games
2=Tournament games
3=Basketball practices
4=All-star games
5=Summer basketball camps
6=Summer basketball leagues
7=Basketball scouting services
8=Pipeline
9=AAU tournaments
10=Newspapers & Magazines
11=Contact initiated by prospect
12=Audio-visual equipment
13=Form letters
The selected Division I, II, and III coaches were asked to indicate their preference for the identification methods for the purpose of evaluating the athletic ability of basketball players. The coaches were asked to rate the identification methods according to how they would prefer to use them, regardless of any time or monetary constraints associated with the implementation of the methods. The coaches ranked the methods from one to thirteen, with one being the highest. Table 6 lists the coaches' rankings of the identification methods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION METHODS</th>
<th>DIVISION I</th>
<th></th>
<th>DIVISION II</th>
<th></th>
<th>DIVISION III</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rank/</td>
<td>Rank/</td>
<td>Mean Rank/</td>
<td>Rank/</td>
<td>Mean Rank/</td>
<td>Rank/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Order Score</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Order Score</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Order Score</td>
<td>Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular season games</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball camps</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball leagues</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball practice</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament games</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-star games</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU tournament</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball scouting services</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers and magazines</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact initiated by prospect</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form letters</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data from Table 6 indicates that Division I basketball coaches have a preference for identification methods which give them an in-person evaluation of the player. Regular season games was ranked number one ahead of summer basketball camps and summer basketball leagues. Evaluating players in real game situations appears to have more popularity than any type of summer league play or post-season play. Basketball practices received a strong rating of fourth which placed the method ahead of such post-season play as tournament games and all-star games.

Division II coaches ranked the methods in a similar manner as did Division I coaches, with regular season games ranked number one. Division II coaches did, however, give basketball practices and tournament games higher rankings. Pipeline and basketball scouting services also received strong rankings of sixth and seventh, respectively. In general, Division II coaches gave good preference ratings to those methods which gave them the in-person evaluation approach.

Division III coaches agreed with Division I and II coaches that regular season games is the most preferred method of evaluating the athletic ability of basketball players. Division III coaches also have a strong preference for tournament games, basketball practices, all-star games, and summer basketball camps and summer
basketball leagues. These methods are preferred by the Division III coaches despite the fact that Table 4 indicated only 37 percent of the Division III schools use basketball practices and summer basketball leagues, and only 53 percent of the schools use summer basketball camps to evaluate players. Audio-visual equipment received a solid preference rating of seventh by the Division III coaches.

Data in Table 6 answer the research question number six in the negative. Although there were some differences in the rankings, there was agreement in the following areas:

1. Divisions I, II, and III ranked regular season games number one.

2. Divisions I, II, and III ranked newspapers and magazines, contact initiated by prospect, and form letters in the last three positions.

3. Divisions I, II, and III gave similar favorable rankings (anywhere from two to eight) to summer basketball camps, summer basketball leagues, basketball practices, tournament games, and all-star games.

4. Division I, II, and III schools did not rank AAU tournaments, basketball scout-in services, pipeline, or audio-visual equipment in the top five, nor in the bottom three positions.

Figure 6 illustrates the relationships among the Division I, II, and III coaches for their preference ratings of the identification methods used to evaluate the athletic ability of basketball players.
Figure 6. Coaches' Preference Ratings of the Identification Methods Used to Evaluate the Athletic Ability of Players
The Financial Cost of the Identification Methods

The selected NCAA Division I, II, and III basketball schools were asked to list the average number of times they use each identification method annually and to list the average financial cost involved in the implementation of each method. The mean cost per application was multiplied by the mean number of applications annually to determine the mean annual financial cost for each identification method. Table 7 lists the identification methods, the mean annual cost for each method, the percentage of total cost for each method within each division, and the total mean annual cost for each division.
TABLE 7
Annual Mean Financial Costs for Identification Methods Used by Division I, II, and III Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION METHODS</th>
<th>DIVISION I Mean Annual Financial Cost</th>
<th>% of Total Financial Cost</th>
<th>DIVISION II Mean Annual Financial Cost</th>
<th>% of Total Financial Cost</th>
<th>DIVISION III Mean Annual Financial Cost</th>
<th>% of Total Financial Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular season game</td>
<td>8,112</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2,378</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td>4,016</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball practice</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament games</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball camps</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-star games</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball leagues</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball scouting services</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU tournaments</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form letters</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers and magazines</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFICATION METHODS</td>
<td>DIVISION I</td>
<td></td>
<td>DIVISION II</td>
<td></td>
<td>DIVISION III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Annual Financial Cost</td>
<td>% of Total Financial Cost</td>
<td>Mean Annual Financial Cost</td>
<td>% of Total Financial Cost</td>
<td>Mean Annual Financial Cost</td>
<td>% of Total Financial Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact initiated by prospect</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL ( \bar{x} ) COST</strong></td>
<td>21,740</td>
<td>6,836</td>
<td>4,811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RANGE</strong></td>
<td>26,720 - 14,375</td>
<td>9,760 - 4,790</td>
<td>5,940 - 3,770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( R = 12,345 )</td>
<td>( R = 4,970 )</td>
<td>( R = 2,170 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data from Table 7 indicates that 37 percent of the financial costs associated with the implementation of the identification methods by Division I schools was associated with the use of regular season games. The mean annual cost of $8,112 for regular season games was at least double the cost associated with any other method.

The long distance phone calls associated with the pipeline method accounted for nearly 19 percent of the total expenses in Division I. Attendance at basketball practices was another costly method with a mean annual expense of $2,597. Tournament games, summer basketball camps, and all-star games all had a mean cost of over $1,000. The remaining identification methods had mean costs of less than $1,000.

Data from Table 7 indicates that Division II schools allocated nearly 35 percent of their recruiting money associated with the implementation of the identification process to attendance at regular season games. The mean annual cost of $2,378 accounted for at least 20 percent more of the total mean cost than any other method except the pipeline, which accounted for nearly 25 percent of the total mean cost.

Division II schools also spend a good portion of their funds on attendance at basketball practices (nearly 10 percent). All of the other methods resulted in annual
expenditures of $306 or less. The total mean annual expense of $6,836 was only 31 percent of the total spent by Division I schools.

Data from Table 7 indicates that Division III schools spent nearly 65 percent of their monies on the use of the pipeline and regular season games methods. The $2,085 spent on the pipeline was twice the amount spent on attendance at regular season games. Division III schools also spent 12 percent of their money on attendance at tournament games. All of the other identification methods used by the Division III schools accounted for 6 percent or less of their total expenditures. The total mean cost of $4,811 for Division III schools was 70 percent of the Division II total and only 22 percent of the Division I total.

Data in Table 7 answer research question number seven in the affirmative. Although similar percentages of the total mean costs among Divisions I, II, and III were spent on all-star games, basketball scouting services, AAU tournaments, newspapers and magazines, audio-visual equipment, and contact initiated by prospect, differences existed in the following areas:

1. Summer basketball leagues accounted for 4 percent of the total expenditures in Division I as compared to 2 percent for Divisions II and III.
2. Summer basketball camps accounted for 7 percent of total expenditures in Division I as compared to 3 percent for Division II and 2 percent for Division III.

3. Tournament games accounted for 8 percent of the total expenditures in Division I as compared to 14 percent for Division II and 12 percent for Division III.

4. Regular season games accounted for 21 percent of the total expenditures in Division III as compared to 37 percent for Division I and 35 percent for Division II.

5. The pipeline method accounted for 43 percent of the total expenditures in Division III as compared to 18.5 percent for Division I and nearly 25 percent for Division II.

6. Basketball practices accounted for 2 percent of the total expenditures in Division III as compared to 12 percent for Division I and 10 percent for Division II.

7. Form letters accounted for 4 percent of the total expenditures in Division III as compared to 1 percent for Division I and 1 percent for Division II.

8. The total mean cost for the identification methods in Division I of $21,740 is over 3 times greater than the $6,836 spent by Division II and 4.5 times greater than the $4,811 spent by Division III.

9. The total annual mean cost for the identification methods in Division II of $6,836 is 1.4 times greater than the $4,811 spent by Division III.
Figure 7 illustrates the relationships among the selected Division I, II, and III schools for the financial costs associated with the implementation of the identification methods.
Figure 7. Percentage of Total Expenditures for Each Identification Method in the Division I, II, and III Schools
Table 8 is a comparison of the financial costs associated with identification methods used on campus and identification methods used off-campus. The identification methods are listed under the appropriate category. The mean annual financial cost for the identification methods and the total mean annual cost for Divisions I, II, and III are listed under the categories of on-campus and off-campus.
**TABLE 8**

Annual Mean Financial Costs for Identification Methods Used On Campus and Off Campus by Division I, II, and III Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION METHODS</th>
<th>DIVISION I</th>
<th>DIVISION II</th>
<th>DIVISION III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFF-CAMPUS METHODS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular season games</td>
<td>8,112</td>
<td>2,378</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball practices</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament games</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-star games</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer basketball</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU tournaments</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL X COST</strong></td>
<td>16,395</td>
<td>4,731</td>
<td>2,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ON-CAMPUS METHODS**  |            |             |              |
| Pipeline               | 4,016      | 1,696       | 2,085        |
| Basketball scouting    | 782        | 250         | 96           |
| services               |            |             |              |
| Form letters           | 277        | 51          | 206          |
| Newspapers and         | 178        | 72          | 59           |
| magazines              |            |             |              |
| Audio-visual           | 92         | 36          | 100          |
| equipment              |            |             |              |
| Contact initiated by   | --         | --          | --           |
| prospect               |            |             |              |
| **ANNUAL X COST**      | 5,345      | 2,105       | 2,546        |
Data from Table 8 indicate that in Division I, the implementation of the off-campus identification methods costs over three times the amount to implement on-campus identification methods. The $16,395 associated with off-campus identification methods accounts for approximately 75 percent of the expenditures in Division I. The most expensive off-campus identification method in Division I was regular season games. The most expensive on-campus identification method in Division I was the pipeline method.

In Division II, the implementation of identification methods used off-campus cost over twice the amount it required to implement on-campus methods. The $4,731 spent on off-campus identification methods by the Division II schools accounted for approximately 69 percent of the expenditures. The most expensive off-campus identification method in Division II was regular season games. The most expensive on-campus identification method was the pipeline.

Data in Table 8 indicate that Division III schools spent less money on the off-campus identification methods than on the on-campus methods. Expenditures for off-campus identification methods in Division III accounted for 47 percent of the costs. The most expensive off-campus identification method was regular season games. Expenses
for on-campus methods in Division III accounted for 53 percent of the financial costs. The most expensive on-campus identification method was the pipeline. The pipeline method accounted for 43 percent of total costs in Division III.

Data in Table 8 answer the research question number eight in the affirmative. Although there was little difference in the total expenditures for the on-campus and off-campus identification methods in Division III, there were meaningful differences in the following areas:

1. In Division I, the $16,395 spent annually on the off-campus identification methods was three times greater than the $5,345 spent for the on-campus identification methods.

2. In Division II, the $4,731 spent annually on the off-campus identification methods was over two times greater than the $2,105 spent for the on-campus identification methods.

3. The cost for off-campus identification methods in Division I ($16,395) was 3.47 times greater than the $4,731 spent by Division II and 7.24 times greater than the $2,265 spent by Division III.

4. The cost for off-campus identification methods in Division II ($4,731) was 2.07 times greater than the $2,265 spent by Division III.

5. The cost for on-campus identification methods in Division I ($5,345) was 2.54 times greater than the $2,105 spent by Division II and 2.10 times greater than the $2,546 spent by Division III.
Figure 8 illustrates the relationships among the selected Division I, II, and III schools for the financial costs associated with the implementation of the on-campus and off-campus identification methods.
Figure 8. Percentage of Financial Costs Associated with the Use of On-campus and Off-campus Identification Methods.
Summary

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze data gathered by the questionnaire concerning the identification methods used by the selected Division I, II, and III schools. The presentation of tables was followed by a textual discussion of the data. Figures were used to illustrate the relationships among the data.

The analysis of data indicates there are some meaningful differences among the selected Division I, II, and III schools. These differences exist in the following areas:

1. The identification methods used to accumulate names of potential basketball prospects.

2. The identification methods used to accumulate names of current varsity team members.

3. The preference rankings of the identification methods used to accumulate names of potential basketball prospects.

4. The identification methods used to evaluate the athletic ability of players.

5. The identification methods used to evaluate the athletic ability of current varsity team members.

6. The financial cost associated with the implementation of the identification methods.
7. The financial cost associated with the implementation of identification methods used on campus and identification methods used off campus.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to examine the identification methods used by the selected NCAA Division I, II, and III schools to identify college basketball prospects. An attempt was made to determine if there were any meaningful differences among the Division I, II, and III schools in the following categories:

1. The identification methods the schools use, and the methods they would prefer to use, to accumulate names of potential basketball prospects.

2. The identification methods the schools use, and the methods they would prefer to use, to evaluate the athletic ability of players.

3. The financial costs associated with the implementation of the identification methods.

In order to place the study in perspective, Chapter I included a brief history of college basketball, the NCAA as a controlling agent of intercollegiate sports, financing practices, recruiting related to finances, and
a description of the identification process. Chapter I also included the statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, limitations, assumptions, and definition of terms.

Chapter II reported on research related to the study. The survey of related research included a brief look into recruiting in business as well as recruiting in athletics. Literature concerned with recruiting in athletics covered the historical development of recruiting, procedures for recruiting, the National Letter of Intent, recruiting violations and penalties, and the identification of prospects.

Chapter III explained the methods and procedures employed in the study. A description of the pilot study, the questionnaire, the sample, and the means of collecting and analyzing the data were presented.

The subjects for the study were men's NCAA Division I, II, and III basketball coaches. Twenty-five schools in each division agreed to participate in the study. Eighteen Division I schools, twenty Division II schools, and nineteen Division III schools returned a completed questionnaire. The questionnaire gathered data concerning the following:

1. The identification methods which are used by the schools.
2. The identification methods which were used to identify current varsity team members.

3. A preference rating of the identification methods by the coaches.

4. The financial costs associated with the implementation of the identification methods.

Chapter IV reported the findings of the study in narrative form. Tables were used which presented consolidated data, and figures were employed which displayed the relationships among the data. The analysis of data in Chapter IV failed to confirm seven of the eight research questions which were presented in Chapter I. The contention of all eight research questions was that there would be no meaningful differences among the Division I, II, and III schools in any of the following:

1. The percentage of the schools using the identification methods to accumulate names of potential basketball prospects.

2. The percentage of use rates for the identification methods used to accumulate the names of current varsity team members.

3. The preference rankings for the identification methods used to accumulate the names of potential basketball prospects.

4. The percentage of the schools using the identification methods to evaluate the athletic ability of players.
5. The percentage of use rates for the identification methods used to evaluate the athletic ability of current varsity team members.

6. The preference rankings for the identification methods used to evaluate the athletic ability of players.

7. The financial costs associated with the implementation of the identification methods.

8. The financial costs associated with the implementation of identification methods used on campus and identification methods used off campus.

Meaningful differences existed among the Division I, II, and III schools in all of the research questions except number six.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are made concerning the identification methods used by the selected men's NCAA Division I, II, and III basketball programs in this study.

The Accumulation of Names of Potential Basketball Prospects

The following conclusions are made concerning the identification methods used by the Division I, II, and III schools in this study to accumulate the names of potential basketball prospects.
1. **AAU Tournaments**

   This off-campus identification method was used by a larger percentage of the Division I schools. Because of larger recruiting budgets, Division I schools may find it easier to accommodate the costs involved in implementing the method. Based on data in Table 2, the results of this method are minimal.

2. **Basketball Scouting Services**

   This on-campus identification method was used by a greater percentage of the Division I and II schools. Division I schools may have obtained greater results (See Table 2) because they are financially able to subscribe to a greater number of scouting services and see play a larger percentage of the players listed in the reports. This method has produced meaningful results (See Table 2), especially at the Division I and II levels. Because many of the evaluations of players in the reports are based on written evaluations from high school and
junior college coaches, it is more appropriate to use this method to accumulate names of players.

3. **Contact Initiated by Prospect**

This on-campus identification method is used by a large percentage of the Division I, II, and III schools. It is a method best suited for accumulating names of potential prospects. The method appears to be least effective for use at the Division I level (See Table 2).

4. **Form Letters**

This on-campus identification method is used primarily for the accumulation of names of potential basketball prospects. A large percentage of the Division III schools used the method. Division III schools may find this method as an inexpensive means of generating a lot of names of potential basketball prospects. This method has produced results at all three divisions, but more meaningfully at the Division III level (See Table 2).
5. **Newspapers and Magazines**
   This on-campus identification method was used by a large percentage of the Division I, II, and III schools. Based on data in Table 2, the method has produced results in all three divisions.

6. **Pipeline**
   This on-campus identification method was used by a large percentage of the Division I, II, and III schools. Based on data in Table 2, the method has produced very good results at the Division I, II, and III schools.

7. **Regular Season Games**
   This on-campus identification method was a highly used and preferred method by the Division I, II, and III schools. According to data in Table 2, the method has produced meaningful results in all three divisions.

8. **Summer Basketball Camps**
   This off-campus identification method has produced greater results for the
Division I schools, according to data in Table 2. Because of larger recruiting budgets, Division I schools may find it easier to accommodate the expense involved in implementing this method.

9. **Summer Basketball Leagues**

This off-campus identification method has produced greater results (See Table 2) for the Division I schools. According to data in Table 2, the method has produced very small results for the Division II and III schools. Larger recruiting budgets may enable Division I schools to implement this method more frequently.

---

The Evaluation of the Athletic Ability of Players

The following conclusions are made concerning the identification methods used by the Division I, II, and III schools in this study to evaluate the athletic ability of players.
1. **All-Star Games**
   This off-campus identification method was used by a large percentage of the Division I, II, and III schools. Based on the data in Table 5, this method has produced greater results at the Division I level. The popularity of the method may stem from the fact the method gives coaches an opportunity to evaluate current recruits and identify new prospects simultaneously.

2. **Audio-Visual Equipment**
   This on-campus identification method was used more by Division III coaches. This method was not popular among the Division I and II schools. The method has produced some results at the Division III schools (See Table 5).

3. **Basketball Practices**
   This off-campus identification method was used frequently by the Division I and II schools. The method may have been used less by Division III schools because some of the Division III schools
schools in this study (the Ohio Athletic Conference members) are not permitted to attend high school practices. Table 6 indicates the Division III coaches did give the method a very good preference rating. Based on data in Table 5, this method has produced some meaningful results, especially at the Division I and II levels.

4. **Pipeline**

Based on data in Table 5, this on-campus identification method has produced some meaningful results at the Division II and III schools. With smaller recruiting budgets, Division II and III schools may rely more on the use of on-campus identification methods to evaluate players.

5. **Regular Season Games**

This off-campus identification method is a highly used and preferred method in all three divisions. According to data in Table 5, the method has produced meaningful results in
Divisions I, II, and III. This method appears to be the most frequently used and preferred method of evaluating athletic ability.

6. **Summer Basketball Camps**

This off-campus identification method is used by a greater percentage of the Division I schools, although over 50 percent of the Division II and III schools reported using the method (See Table 4). The method has produced greater results (See Table 5) for the Division I schools. Larger recruiting budgets may enable Division I schools to attend more camps and, thus, identify more players.

7. **Summer Basketball Leagues**

This off-campus identification method is used by a large percentage of the Division I schools and by over 50 percent of the Division II schools. This method has produced some results for the Division I and II schools (See Table 5).
8. **Tournament Games**

This off-campus identification method was used by 100 percent of the Division I and II schools and by 89 percent of the Division III schools. Data in Table 5 indicates that meaningful results were attained by this method in all three divisions.

**The Financial Costs of the Identification Methods**

The following conclusions are made concerning the financial costs associated with the implementation of the identification methods.

1. Because of larger recruiting budgets, larger coaching staffs, and a greater amount of working time allocated for recruiting, the Division I schools in this study used the methods more frequently and, thus, generated much greater costs than the Division II and III schools (See Table 7). Division I schools spent 75 percent of their monies on the use of off-campus identification methods.
2. Although spending over three times less money than the Division I schools, the Division II schools did spend 69 percent of their monies on the use of off-campus identification methods. Despite having less recruiting money than Division I coaches, it is concluded that Division II coaches do have enough resources to enable them to recruit off-campus.

3. In Table 7, Division III schools reported spending less money annually than Division I and Division II schools. In Table 8, Division III schools reported spending 53 percent of their monies on the use of on-campus identification methods. It is concluded that the recruiting budgets and the working schedules of the Division III coaches provides them with less of an opportunity to recruit off campus. Consequently, they spend a larger percentage of their monies on the use of on-campus identification methods.
Recommendations

As a result of the conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are made to provide for additional improvement in the process of identifying college basketball prospects:

1. Because of the pressure to win at the Division I level, Division I schools should attempt to identify prospects as early as possible. Division I schools should utilize the pipeline, scouting service, summer camp, and summer league methods to accumulate names of prospects prior to the beginning of the prospects' senior year. Summer camps, summer leagues, regular season games, tournament games, and all-star games should be used to evaluate athletic ability. Audio-visual equipment should also be used to evaluate players in an attempt to reduce off-campus travel.

2. Because of smaller recruiting budgets than Division I schools, Division II schools should use off-campus identification methods with moderation. Summer
camps and summer leagues should be utilized within the confines of the budgets. Division II schools should make use of on-campus methods such as the pipeline, scouting service, newspapers and magazines, and contact initiated by prospect to accumulate names of players. Regular season games, tournament games, basketball practices, and summer camps should be used with moderation to evaluate athletic ability. Audio-visual equipment should be used as often as possible to evaluate players.

3. Because of small recruiting budgets, Division III schools should make extensive use of on-campus identification methods. Form letters, the pipeline, newspapers and magazines, and basketball scouting services should be used to accumulate names of players. Regular season games, tournament games, and all-star games should be used with moderation to evaluate players. Audio-visual equipment should be used extensively. Summer camps
and summer leagues may be used to evaluate players on a local basis.

4. College coaches should make effective use of audio-visual equipment in the evaluation of players. The audio-visual method is a less expensive means of making an initial evaluation of a player. Division I and II schools should make greater use of the method.

5. College coaches should not rely on basketball scouting services as a technique for evaluating players, although the method is excellent for accumulating names. Coaches should utilize methods which provide for an in-person evaluation of the prospect.

6. Conferences or groups of schools should consider subscribing to scouting services as a group. A group subscription may reduce the financial cost to each individual school.

7. Recommendations for further research in the area of identifying college basketball prospects are as follows:
a. A similar study may be completed which would have as its subjects the top college coaches (based on won-lost record) in Division I, II, and III. The findings on what these coaches are doing may be most appropriate for identifying players who are participating in winning programs.

b. A cost/benefit analysis study of the Division I, II, and III schools may determine if there is any correlation between the amount of money spent on identifying prospects and the attained results measured by won-lost record.
Bylaw 1-1(a)

Bylaws and Interpretations of
The National Collegiate Athletic Association

[Note: Below Articles 8, 9, 11 and 12 are “common” bylaws and apply in their entirety to the three Divisions of the Association. These other bylaws are amended in a division acting separately. In those articles, portions that are applicable to one or two divisions but not to all three are designated appropriately in the margin. Where there is no marginal designation, the provision pertains to all three divisions.]

ARTICLE ONE

RECRUITING

Section 1. Offers and Inducements. (a) No member of an institution’s athletic staff or other representative of athletic interests shall solicit the enrollment of any prospective student-athlete except as permitted by this Association, the institution, and the conference of which it may be a member. [Case Nos. 174, 178, 235, 289]

D.I. 100. A prospective student becomes a prospective student-athlete if a member of the athletic staff or other representative of athletic interests (i) solicits transportation to the prospective student to visit its campus, or (ii) arranges for the prospective student to visit its campus, except the institution may make an eligible to the prospect a complimentary admission to an athletic contest, (iii) initiates or arranges a telephone contact with the prospective student or member of the student’s family (or guardian) for the purpose of recruitment, (iv) visits a prospective student or member of the student’s family for the purpose of recruitment, or (v) arranges or permits members of the family (or guardian) of a prospective student on its campus.

D.I. 101. Matriculation is considered to have been solicited if a member of the athletic staff or other representative of athletic interests (i) solicits transportation to the prospective student to visit its campus, or (ii) initiates or arranges a telephone contact with the prospective student or member of the student’s family (or guardian) for the purpose of recruitment, or (iii) visits a prospective student or member of the student’s family for the purpose of recruitment, or (iv) arranges or permits members of the family (or guardian) of a prospective student on its campus.

D.I. 102. An institution’s staff member requests an alumna or other friend of the institution to recruit a particular prospect that has knowledge that the alumna or friend is recruiting the prospect, then and whenever the alumna or friend becomes a representative of athletic interests of that institution since a person is deemed to become a representative, it is presumed that person retains that identity. [Case No. 224]

Bylaw 1-1(b)

Section 2. Contacts. (a) Divisions I and II—Contact in person with a prospective student-athlete or any representative of athletic interests shall not be permitted by any member institution unless the contact is subject to the following limitations: [Adopted: 8/15/75, Revised: 8/17/76] [Case Nos. 100, 106]

D.I. 103. No more than three such contacts per prospective student-athlete prior to and on the occasion on which the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent, which shall include contacts with the prospect’s relatives or legal guardian, shall be permitted by any single institution. Subsequent to the occasion of the National Letter of Intent signing, there shall be no limit on such contacts with the prospect, the prospect’s relatives or legal guardian by the institution with which the prospect has signed. Further, subsequent to the National Letter of Intent signing date, there shall be no limit on such contacts by a national service academy with which the prospect has been admitted. [Adopted: 8/15/75, Revised: 8/17/76, 8/15/76, 8/18/81] [Case Nos. 107 through 109]

The 75th NCAA Convention amended the foregoing paragraph (1) to read as follows, effective August 1, 1981:

(1) Three such contacts (at sites other than the prospect’s educational institution) per prospective student-athlete prior to and on the occasion on which the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent, which shall include contacts with the prospect’s relatives or legal guardian, shall be permitted by each member institution. [Adopted: 8/15/75, Revised: 8/17/76, 8/15/76, 8/18/81] [Case Nos. 107 through 109]

*The provisions of Bylaw 1-2(a) are applicable to persons of Division I, Division II, and Division III.
Div. 1 and 11

(i) Three additional in-person, off-campus contacts per prospect shall be permitted by each member institution on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the written approval of that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative. (Adopted: 8/11/81)

(ii) Subsequent to the occasion of the National Letter of Intent signing, there shall be no limit on such contacts with the prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardian by the institution with which the prospect has signed; further, subsequent to the National Letter of Intent signing date, there shall be no limit on such contacts by a national service academy to which the prospect has applied for admission. (Adopted: 8/11/81, Revised: 1/6/82)

(iii) No member institution may participate in an institutional or a conference athletic letter-of-intent program which involves a signing date in the sport of football or basketball that precedes the initial signing date for that sport in the National Letter of Intent program. (Adopted: 8/11/81)

(c) Any face-to-face encounter between a prospective student-athlete, the prospect's parents or legal guardian and a member institution's staff member or athletic representative during any dialogue occurs in excess of an exchange of a greeting shall be a contact. Further, any face-to-face encounter which is by arrangement on which takes place on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution or at the site of organized competition and practice involving the prospect on the team (i.e., high school, preparatory school, junior college or all star team) the prospect represents shall be considered a contact regardless of the conversation which occurs. (Adopted: 8/11/81)

(1) No such contact shall be made with a prospective student-athlete, the prospect's parents or legal guardian, and a member institution's staff member or athletic representative during any dialogue occurs in excess of an exchange of a greeting shall be a contact. Further, any face-to-face encounter which is by arrangement on which takes place on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution or at the site of organized competition and practice involving the prospect on the team (i.e., high school, preparatory school, junior college or all star team) the prospect represents shall be considered a contact regardless of the conversation which occurs. (Adopted: 8/11/81)

(2) Any face-to-face encounter between a prospective student-athlete, the prospect's parents or legal guardian and a member institution's staff member or athletic representative during any dialogue occurs in excess of an exchange of a greeting shall be a contact. Further, any face-to-face encounter which is by arrangement on which takes place on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution or at the site of organized competition and practice involving the prospect on the team (i.e., high school, preparatory school, junior college or all star team) the prospect represents shall be considered a contact regardless of the conversation which occurs. (Adopted: 8/11/81)

(3) No such contact shall be made with a prospective student-athlete, the prospect's parents or legal guardian, and a member institution's staff member or athletic representative during any dialogue occurs in excess of an exchange of a greeting shall be a contact. Further, any face-to-face encounter which is by arrangement on which takes place on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution or at the site of organized competition and practice involving the prospect on the team (i.e., high school, preparatory school, junior college or all star team) the prospect represents shall be considered a contact regardless of the conversation which occurs. (Adopted: 8/11/81)

(4) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of football only during the period between December 1 (or the date of the completion of the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter) and March 1. The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions with established admissions procedures utilizing acceptance dates subsequent to the March 1 deadline. (Adopted: 8/11/81)

(5) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball only during the period between August 1 and October 1 and the period between March 1 (or the date of the completion of the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest, if it occurs thereafter) and May 15. (Adopted: 8/11/81)

(b) Division III—No athletic staff member or other representative of the institution's athletic interests shall contact a prospective student-athlete in person off campus for recruiting purposes per Div. I-1100 during the academic year until the prospect completes the junior year in high school. (Adopted: 8/11/81, Revised: 8/11/82)

(c) Any staff member or other representative of a member institution's athletic interests desiring to contact a prospective student-athlete at the prospect's high school, college preparatory school or junior college first shall contact that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's authorized representative. The purpose of the call and request permission to contact the student-athlete. Contact may be made at these places only when such permission is granted.

(1) No contacts with a prospective student-athlete shall be made at the site of a school's athletic competition when the prospect is a participant therein ("Contact" with a prospect "at the site of a school's athletic competition" is defined as an event in which the prospect is providing athletic competition in which he is participating or a cooperative event in which the prospect is participating or a cooperative event in which the prospect is participating. (Adopted: 8/11/81)

(2) Any contact made with such prospect before the competition during the day of the competition. (Adopted: 8/11/81)

(3) No contact shall be made with such prospect before the competition during the day of the competition. (Adopted: 8/11/81)

(4) After the competition has been completed, the "site" shall be interpreted as the facility in which the competition was conducted and any dressing room or meeting facility utilized in conjunction with the competition. Accordingly, contact shall not be made after the competition at the site until the prospective student-athlete is released by the appropriate institutional authority and departs the dressing and meeting facility. (Adopted: 8/11/81)

(5) If a prospective student-athlete is involved in competition which requires participation more than one day (e.g., basketball game) between the date of the last competition and the date of the signing is not permissible. (Adopted: 8/11/81)
The 75th NCAA Convention approved the following new
Division I and II* Bylaw Sections:

Section 3. Effective August 1, 1981

Section 3. Evaluation Periods. The involvement of institutional staff members or representatives of athletic interests in off-campus scouting activities shall be restricted to the permissible periods for in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts as follows: (Adopted: 8/1/81)

(a) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of basketball during the period between June 15 and August 1 and the period between December 1 and March 1 (or the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest), as well as the month of May. (Adopted: 8/1/81)

(b) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the period between August 1 and December 1 (or the prospective student-athlete's final high school or junior college contest), as well as the month of May. (Adopted: 8/1/81)

(c) Participation by institutional staff members or representatives of athletic interests in off-campus scouting activities related to the sports of basketball and football during the evaluation periods described in paragraphs (a) and (b) shall not involve any personal contact on the part of the institution's coaches or representatives with the prospects being evaluated. (Adopted: 8/1/81)

Section 4. Use of Funds. (a) All funds for the recruiting of prospective student-athletes shall be deposited with the member institution, which shall be exclusively and entirely responsible for the manner in which it expends the funds. (Adopted: 8/1/81)

(b) No member institution shall permit any outside organization, agency or group to recruit by utilizing the services of an individual who is not an employee or representative of the member institution. (Adopted: 8/1/81)

(c) No member institution shall permit any outside organization, agency or group to recruit by utilizing the services of an individual who is not an employee or representative of the member institution. (Adopted: 8/1/81)

Section 5. Publicity. (a) Publicity released by an institution about the commitment of a prospective student-athlete to attend the institution shall be limited to announcing the prospective student-athlete's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission as a student and/or written tender of financial assistance to be provided on the prospect's enrollment and shall be limited to communications in those media forms normally used by the institution. (Adopted: 8/1/81)

(b) The release of such communications shall be limited to the media outlets normally used by the institution and to the media outlets normally used by the educational institutions currently and formerly attended by the prospective student-athlete. (Adopted: 8/1/81)

(c) A member institution shall not publicize or arrange publicity of the visit of a prospective student-athlete to the institution's campus or the student athlete's intention to accept its tender of financial assistance. (Adopted: 8/1/81)

Section 6. Use of Funds. (a) All funds for the recruiting of prospective student-athletes shall be deposited with the member institution, which shall be exclusively and entirely responsible for the manner in which it expends the funds. (Adopted: 8/1/81)

(b) No member institution shall permit any outside organization, agency or group to recruit by utilizing the services of an individual who is not an employee or representative of the member institution. (Adopted: 8/1/81)

(c) No member institution shall permit any outside organization, agency or group to recruit by utilizing the services of an individual who is not an employee or representative of the member institution. (Adopted: 8/1/81)
school athletic association or, interstate, to the National Federation of State High School Associations, or by the NCAA all-star high school games committee in accordance with Constitution 3-3-4.(a).

Revised: 1/17/78

Section 8. Transportation, Visitation and Entertainment.
(a) A member institution may finance one and only one visit to its campus for a given prospective student-athlete. Such visit shall not exceed 18 hours. Only actual round trip transportation costs by direct route between the student’s home and the institution's campus may be paid. If commercial air transportation is used, the fare may not exceed tourist (or comparable class) (Revised 1/17/78) [Case Nos. 216 through 224, 225, 226].

(b) Division I — There shall be a limit on the total number of paid visits an institution may provide to prospective student-athletes in the following sports during an academic year: Football—95, Basketball—18. The institution must maintain a written record of the paid visits of prospective student-athletes pursuant to this paragraph. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to this regulation for institutions which have suffered extraordinary personnel losses from one or more of their intercollegiate athletic teams due to accident or illness of a disastrous nature (Adopted: 8/15/75, Revised: 1/17/76, 11/10/79) [Case Nos. 221-227].

(c) Any person, at the person’s own expense, may transport or pay the transportation costs for a prospective student-athlete to visit the campus of a member institution once in a lifetime provided each person, at the person’s own expense, accompanies the prospective student-athlete on the visit. Only actual round trip transportation costs by direct route between the student’s home and the institution’s campus may be paid. If commercial air transportation is used, the fare may not exceed tourist (or comparable class) (Revised 1/17/78) [Case Nos. 199, 221].

(d) No member institution shall permit more than one expense-paid visit to its campus under the authorization of Bylaw 1-8(a) and (1). A prospective student-athlete may not be provided an expense-paid visit earlier than the opening day of classes of the prospective student’s junior year in high school (Revised: 8/17/72).

(e) If an institution is to pay the transportation costs of a prospective student-athlete to visit the campus, the cost actually incurred must be made to the campus and not, for example, an airport where the institution may be appearing in an athletic contest at the particular time. However, if an institution is required to pay all or part of its own expenses, it may provide transportation costs for up to two home games and for one away game (e.g., in the event of a natural disaster). The institution may provide a bus ride or a car service to the venue.

(f) It is permissible for an institution to pay the actual cost

The provisions of Bylaw 1-8(a) pertain to Division I men’s only.

O.I. 104. The limitations on total visits set forth in Bylaw 1-8 apply separately to the period in which the prospective student-athlete is in high school and to the period beginning with the prospect’s enrollment in a college preparatory school or junior college.

(ii) A prospective student-athlete may visit a member institution’s campus at the prospect’s own expense as often as the prospect wishes. During such visits, the institution may not pay any expense or provide any entertainment except a meal in the institution’s on-campus student dining facilities and a maximum of three complimentary admissions to campus athletic events. This exclusion does not admit the prospective student-athlete and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit. Payment of any expenses or providing any entertainment, except as noted, shall constitute an expense-paid trip [Case Nos. 180, 224, 225, 226].

(iii) An institution or its representatives shall not furnish a prospective student-athlete, directly or indirectly, with transportation to the campus for enrollment [Case Nos. 221].

(iv) An institution or its representatives shall not provide a prospective student-athlete free transportation to or from a summer job unless it is the employer’s established policy to transport all employees from that locale to the place.

(v) No member institution shall permit its athletic department staff members or other representatives of its athletic interests to pay or arrange for the payment of the transportation costs incurred by

The provisions of Bylaw 1-8(a) pertain to members of Division I and Division II only.
complimentary admissions to a campus athlete event if the ticket is utilized to accompany a prospective student athlete to that event during the prospects official visit to the campus. [Adopted 8/17/70]

(3) No member institution may arrange for or permit excessive entertainment of any prospective student-athlete on the campus or elsewhere. [Case Nos. 226 through 229]

(4) The institution or representatives of its athletic interests shall not provide cash to the prospect for entertainment purposes and shall not provide any automobile for the use of the prospect or student host. [Revised 8/17/72, 8/17/73]

(b) If an institution schedules any regular season home games in any given sport at a site located in a community other than its own and in the same state, the host institution may provide a minimum of three complimentary admissions to one such game only for the exclusive use of admitting a prospective student athlete and those persons accompanying the prospect. Tournament and postseason games are excluded. Further, the institution shall not arrange for or permit any other entertainment or payment of any expenses, including transportation.

(1) A member institution’s athletic department staff member or other representative of its athletic interests may visit a prospective student athlete or the prospect’s relatives at any location for recruiting purposes. However, in no case shall the official visit nor any representative of the institution exceed any limits other than necessary for the use of the institution’s own personal expenses. [Adopted 8/17/70, Revised 8/17/72, 8/17/73]

(2) A member institution may entertain high school, college preparatory school or junior college coaches only on its campus. Such entertainment shall be limited to providing a maximum of two complimentary tickets to home athletic contests and shall not include food and refreshments, room expenses or the cost of transportation to and from the institution. [Adopted 8/17/72, Revised 8/17/74, 8/17/75]

(3) It shall not be permissible for an institution to reimburse a high school, college preparatory school or junior college coach for expenses incurred in transporting a prospect to visit its campus.

(4) A high school coach may transport members of the coach’s athletic squad to an off-campus site to watch NCAA member institutions compete, provided that no member institution reimburses the coach for the transportation costs or provides complimentary tickets for the coach or any of the team members.

Section 3. Recruitment Expense. No institution or a representative of its athletic interests shall, provide or arrange for financial assistance, directly or indirectly, for a prospective student athlete to pay any student or in part the costs of the prospect’s educational or other expenses for any period prior to the prospect’s enrollment to or in a postgraduate education. [Case Nos. 120, 121, 197 through 225]

(4) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to Bylaw 1.9 (a), provided such exceptions are limited to procedures involving preparation for entrance into a graduate or postgraduate program at a college, university, or professional school.

(5) No institution may permit a student-athlete who is a prospective or committed student athlete to accept any compensation for performance or participation in any sport or activity, including participation in a trial team or any other training or practice team, at any time.

(6) No institution may permit a student-athlete who is a prospective or committed student athlete to accept any compensation for performance or participation in any sport or activity, including participation in a trial team or any other training or practice team, at any time.

(7) No institution may permit a student-athlete who is a prospective or committed student athlete to accept any compensation for performance or participation in any sport or activity, including participation in a trial team or any other training or practice team, at any time.
Page 54  Bylaw 1-9(b)(1)

(1) The NCAA Council has approved the U.S. Military Academy's request for permission as operated at West Point. This approval is subject to the following conditions:

(i) The school will accept prospective students regardless of athletic ability.

(ii) The U.S. Military Academy will not allow any funds under its control and jurisdiction for the educational costs of prospective student-athletes at West Point School.

(iii) The Delfield Foundation, a nonprofit outside organization, may collect funds from alumni and other friends of the academy to pay the educational costs of student-athletes attending West Point School.

(iv) The West Point course for prospective student-athletes will be limited to a period of six weeks in the late spring or early summer of the candidate's senior year at high school.

(v) No prospective student-athlete will be enrolled at West Point School without the approval of the principal of the candidate's high school.

(vi) No candidate who attends West Point School under the sponsorship of the Delfield Foundation will be obligated to attend the military academy.

Bylaw 1-10

Section 1. Administration. The functions of the Administration Committee and the Postseason Footbal Committee shall include the designation of the following extra events as satisfying pertinent qualifications and other applicable regulations and policies of the Association as set forth in this article and as from time to time determined by the annual Convention of the NCAA Council: postseason football contests (Postseason Football Committee), college all-star football and basketball contests, track and field meets and gymnastics meets (Extra Events Committee) [Revised: 1968].

Section 2. Postseason Football Contests. No member institution shall compete in any football game that is not scheduled as to the advent of a participating collegiate team before the beginning of the regular football season of the college for any academic year, unless the game contest is a part of the NCAA championships for Division I-AA, Division II and Division III members, international competition approved by the NCAA Council (by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting) as the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, football championships or complexes with the following requirements or meets the following conditions [Revised: 1968].

(a) Any noncollegiate or nonconference sponsoring organization of such game shall include in the active membership of its administration committee at least two representatives from member institutions of this Association, one a faculty member and one an athletic coach. Any such organization shall be approved by the Postseason Football Committee of the Association. Both institutional representatives shall be required to meet with the Postseason Football Committee a written report on the conduct and administration of the event following its conclusion.

(b) The competing institutions shall be active members of this Association, and Division I members must be conducting their intercollegiate athletics program in conformance with Bylaw 8-4(b).

(c) No member institution shall participate in more than one such game during any academic year [Revised: 1968].

(d) Except for closed games i.e., those games in which participation of both teams is determined by conferences rather than selection to the sponsoring agency, football all-star games shall be selected from among those which do not assign official or for the participating teams from the regular season [Revised: 1968].

(e) The official playing rules of the Association shall govern the conduct of the game.

(f) The eligibility rules governing individual participation shall be as demanding as those governing participation in NCAA-sponsored meets and tournaments, except that a student-athlete granted an additional year of competition by the student athlete's conference or association for reasons of hardship is eligible for participation.

(g) Any student-athlete not selected or qualified for a postseason game shall be required to complete and
APPENDIX B

THE NATIONAL LETTER OF INTENT
History of the National Letter of Intent

Dr. I. William Davis, retired Professor of Government and Chairman of the Athletic Council and Faculty Representative for Athletics at Texas Tech University, conceived and promoted the idea of the Inter-Conference Letter of Intent now known as the National Letter of Intent. He received valuable assistance from Howard Grubbs, former Commissioner of the Southwest Conference.

One of the most serious problems in intercollegiate athletics has been the intense competition among institutions in recruiting prospective student athletes. The so-called "blue-chip" athlete has been courted by athletic interests of colleges and universities all over the country, and frequently, in the all-out effort to interest a prospect in attending a particular institution, recruiting regulations of the NCAA and athletic conferences have been violated.

At one time, it was fairly customary for students to attend colleges in their home area. It was relatively easy for a coach or representative of an institution to contact the athlete and interest him in the nearby institution. Or, a home town alumni of the college might draw a prospective athlete to the campus to visit the coach and look over the campus.

Playing World War II and beginning in the late 1940's, intercollegiate athletics has become more international and national in its character, and that trend has been reflected in the recruiting of athletes. Coaches roam far afield in search of talent, and prospective student-athletes may fly in to visit institutions many hundreds of miles from their homes. The increased recruiting intensity was aided by television exposure and revenue as well as the jet airplane.

In the competition for athletes, many recruiters pursued a prospect from the end of his playing season to the beginning of the next fall semester. Often the competition was fierce during the summer, and even after a student arrived at a campus, there might be attempts to lure him away at the last minute. Even though an athlete might indicate his intention to enroll at a particular institution, there were continuous attempts to influence him to change his mind. Even college dormitory rooms aren't sacred for the aggressive recruiter of athletic talent. More than one young man left a closet filled with clothes to sneak out of a dorm room and into waiting automobiles in the direction of another campus. Some means was needed to answer this widespread raiding of talent, to bring some order to the chaos called recruiting.

In order to alleviate this type of nefarious recruiting, some athletic conferences arrived at an agreement among their member institutions to place a time limit on recruiting. They formulated a plan generally known as the "Letter of Intent," or a Pre-Enrollment Application. The theme of the plan was that each institution would house the written intent of the student as to his preference. On a given date, students could sign the letter of intent, and after that signing, no university is the conference would make any effort to enroll the student, nor could it participate in any other institution in the conference after expressing his intent.

The plan worked extremely well in the conferences which adopted it. However, there were complicating factors. First, some conferences have no letter of intent. Second, some institutions do not belong to a conference. Finally, conferences often were not recognized by institutions outside the particular conference.

Recognizing the value of the pre-enrollment plan, a proposal was made to the NCAA to create a national, compulsory letter of intent.

Most of the conferences which had experienced the value of the letter of intent supported it at the 1961 NCAA convention. A great deal of opposition to the program existed, however, and in two succeeding conventions, the proposal was defeated.

After the second defeat on the convention floor, the idea was conceived to offer a voluntary inter-conference letter of intent to those conferences which were interested. A meeting was held of the commissioners and faculty representatives from each of the major conferences to discuss the possibilities of a voluntary, cooperative program. The idea was enthusiastically received and a Steering Committee was formed to draw up the details.

The Steering Committee offered a simple plan which could operate through the conference offices and would also allow independent institutions to participate in the program. In brief, the plan is as follows:

On a given date in May (May 20, 1964), the prospective student-athlete is permitted to sign a form called "Inter-Conference Letter of Intent." He certifies at that time that he intends to enroll in a certain institution in the fall. The form is also signed by a parent or guardian of the student, and by the Athletic Director of the institution. The Athletic Director indicates the type and extent of financial aid that the institution will furnish in a separate letter. Currently, the first signing date in football is the third Wednesday in February and in all other sports the second Wednesday in April.

The student is informed that other cooperating conferences and institutions will respect his decision and not attempt to recruit him further. He also is made aware that if he elects to enroll at some other institution, his athletic eligibility will be limited.

All of the agreements are subject to the student's qualifying for admission to the institution of his choice and the NCAA requirement for financial aid.

In case he does not meet these requirements, the letter of Intent is not binding.

The National Letter of Intent Program is administered by the Collegiate Commissioners Association through the commissioners of the various conferences. Independent institutions which participate in the plan work through the most appropriate conference commissioner-usually the one closest to the institution. Each conference commissioner informs all other commissioners of the signatures.

The Program started in 1964 with 7 conferences and 8 independent institutions (total of 33) and has grown to 1964 with 23 conferences and 231 institutions (total of 231). Annually there are approximately 9,200 individual signings with the Big Ten Conference alone running a computerized check for double signings. The program has been accepted by most of the major All-American conferences and independent institutions.

Dr. I. William Davis was Chairman of the National Letter of Intent Steering Committee from 1964-73 with Fred Jacobs, Commissioner of the Mid-American Conference, serving as chairman since 1973 with committee members John Dobby, Assistant Commissioner of the Big Ten Conference, and C. L. Price, Commissioner of the Missouri Valley Conference.

The primary purpose of the program is to reduce recruiting time and expense for the institution and to reduce extended recruiting pressure on the prospective student-athlete. The program is simple and workable because it is a voluntary program and the participating conferences want to make it work. Many of the problems of competitive recruiting have been eliminated or minimized.
1981 NATIONAL LETTER OF INTENT

(Administered by the Collegiate Commissioners Association)

☐ Football: Do not sign prior to 8:00 a.m. February 18, 1981
and no later than May 15, 1981

☐ Basketball: Do not sign prior to 8:00 a.m. April 8, 1981
and no later than May 15, 1981

☐ All other sports:
(Place "X" in proper box above)

Do not sign prior to 8:00 a.m. April 8, 1981
and no later than August 1, 1981

Name of student ____________________________

Address ____________________________
Street Number ____________ City, State, Zip Code ____________

This is to certify my decision to enroll at ____________________________

IMPORTANT • READ CAREFULLY

It is important to read carefully this entire document, including the reverse side, before signing this Letter in triplicate. One copy is to be retained by you and two copies are to be returned to the institution, one of which will be sent to the appropriate conference commissioner.

1. By signing this Letter, I understand that if I enroll in another institution participating in the National Letter of Intent Program, I may not represent that institution in intercollegiate athletic competition until I have been in residence at that institution for two calendar years and in no case will I be eligible for more than two seasons of intercollegiate competition in any sport. However, these restrictions will not apply to me:

(a) If I have not, by the opening day of its classes in the fall of 1981, met the requirements for admission to the institution named above, its academic requirements for financial aid to athletes, and the NCAA 2000 GPA requirement; or

(b) If I attend the institution named above for at least one academic year; or

(c) If I graduate from junior college after having signed a National Letter of Intent while in high school or during my first year in junior college; or

(d) If I have not attended any institution (or attended an institution, including a junior college, which does not participate in the National Letter of Intent Program) for the next academic year after signing this Letter, provided my request for the originally specified financial aid for the following fall term is not approved by the institution with which I signed. In order to receive this waiver, I must file with the appropriate conference commissioner a statement from the Director of Athletics at the institution with which I signed certifying that such financial aid will not be available to me for the requested fall term; or

(e) If I serve on active duty with the armed forces of the United States or on an official church mission for at least eighteen (18) months; or

(f) If my sport is discontinued by the institution with which I signed this Letter.

2. I understand that THIS IS NOT AN AWARD OF FINANCIAL AID. If my enrollment decision is made with the understanding that I will receive financial aid, I should have in my possession before signing this Letter a written statement from the institution which lists the terms and conditions, including the amount and duration, of such financial aid.

I certify that I have read all terms and conditions on pages 1 and 2, fully understand, accept and agree to be bound by them. (Sign each copy individually, do not use carbons)

SIGNED ____________________________

Student ____________________________

Date ____________________________

Time ____________________________

SIGNED ____________________________

Parent or Legal Guardian ____________________________

Date ____________________________

Time ____________________________

Submission of this Letter has been authorized by:

SIGNED ____________________________

Director of Athletics ____________________________

Date issued to Student ____________________________

Sport ____________________________
3. I MAY SIGN ONLY ONE VALID NATIONAL LETTER OF INTENT. However, if this Letter is rendered null and void under Item 1 (a) on page 1, I remain free to enroll in any institution of my choice where I am admissible and shall be permitted to sign another Letter in a subsequent signing year.

4. I understand that I have signed this Letter with the Institution and not for a particular sport.

5. I understand that all participating conferences and institutions listed below are obligated to respect my decision and shall cease to recruit me once I have signed this Letter.

6. If my parent or legal guardian fails to cosign this Letter, it will be invalid. In that event, this Letter may be reissued.

7. My signature on this Letter nullifies any agreements, oral or otherwise, which would release me from the conditions stated on this Letter.

8. This Letter must be signed and dated by the Director of Athletics or his authorized representative before submission to me and my parent or legal guardian for our signatures.

9. I must sign this letter within 14 days after it has been issued to me or it will be invalid. In that event, this Letter may be reissued.

10. This Letter must be filed with the appropriate conference by the institution with which I sign within 21 days after the final date of signing or it will be invalid. In that event, this Letter may be reissued.

11. If I have knowledge that I or my parent/legal guardian have falsified any part of this Letter, I understand that I shall forfeit the first two years of my eligibility at the participating institution in which I enroll as outlined in item 1.

12. A release procedure shall be provided in the event the student-athlete and the institution mutually agree to release each other from any obligations of the Letter. A student-athlete receiving a formal release shall not be eligible for practice and competition at the second institution during the first academic year of residence and shall have no more than three seasons of eligibility remaining. The form must be signed by the student-athlete, his parent or legal guardian, and the Director of Athletics at the institution with which he signed. A copy of the release must be filed with the conference which processes the Letters of the signing institution.

13. This Letter applies only to fall entrants who will be entering a four year institution for the first time as a full time student.

The following Conferences and Institutions have subscribed to and are cooperating in the National Letter of Intent Plan administered by the Collegiate Commissioners Association:

**CONFERENCES:**
- Atlantic Coast
- Big Eight
- Big Ten
- California Collegiate
- Central Intercollegiate
- Metropolitan
- Mid-American
- Mid-Continental
- Mid-Eastern
- Midwestern City
- Missouri Valley
- North Central
- Ohio Valley
- Pacific Coast
- Pacific-10
- South Atlantic
- Southeastern
- Southern
- Southern Intercollegiate
- Southeast
- Southwestern
- Sun Belt
- Trans America
- West Coast
- Western

**INSTITUTIONS:**
- Alabama State
- Arkansas-Pine Bluff
- Baptist
- Bellarmine
- Boston College
- Campbell
- Canisius
- Central Florida
- Central State (Ohio)
- Charleston
- Cleveland State
- Connecticut
- Dayton
- DePaul
- Detroit
- Duquesne
- East Carolina
- Ferris State
- Florida Southern
- Fordham
- George Mason
- George Washington
- Georgetown
- Grand Valley
- Hofstra
- Illinois-Chicago Circle
- Iona
- James Madison
- Kentucky Wesleyan
- Lake Superior
- Maine (Orono)
- Marquette
- Miami (Florida)
- Michigan Tech
- Minnesota-Duluth
- Nevada-Las Vegas
- New Hampshire
- New Orleans
- Niagara
- North Carolina-Wilmington
- North Texas State
- Northern Kentucky
- Notre Dame
- Oakland
- Old Dominion
- Pan American
- Penn State
- Pittsburgh
- Portland State
- Providence
- Randolph-Macon
- Rhode Island
- Richmond
- Robert Morris
- Rutgers
- St. Bonaventure
- St. Francis (Pa)
- South Carolina
- Southeastern Louisiana
- Southern Mississippi
- Southwest Missouri
- Stetson
- Syracuse
- Tampa
- Tennessee State
- Transylvania
- Troy State
- Vermont
- Wayne State
- West Virginia
- William and Mary
- Wisconsin-Green Bay
- Wright State
1. Each conference and participating institution agrees to abide by the regulations and procedures outlined in the National Letter of Intent Program.

2. An institution must be an NCAA member to participate in the Program, and the Letter applies only to those institutions.

3. The Steering Committee has been authorized to issue interpretations, settle disputes, and consider petitions for release from the provisions of the Letter where there are extenuating circumstances. Its decision may be appealed to the CCA, which is the final adjudication body.

4. No additions or deletions may be made to the Letter or the release form.

5. A coach is not authorized to void, cancel or give a release to the Letter.

6. A release from the Letter shall apply to all participating institutions and cannot be conditional or selective by institution.

7. When two members of the same conference are in disagreement involving the validity of a Letter, the conference commissioner shall be empowered to resolve the issue.

8. The prospect should be notified anytime his signed National Letter of Intent has been declared invalid or null and void.

9. In matters involving the validity of the Letter or administrative procedures between two or more institutions not members of the same conference, the appropriate conference commissioners shall take steps to ascertain the facts and apply National Letter of Intent rules. If the case cannot be settled in this manner, it shall be submitted to the Steering Committee. The prospective student-athlete may submit any information he desires.

10. The institution shall immediately notify a prospect if he fails to meet, for the fall of 1981, its admission requirements, or its academic requirements for financial aid to athletes, or the NCAA 2.000 GPA requirement. The institution also shall immediately notify the appropriate conference commissioner of the prospective student-athlete's failure to meet any of these requirements, and the date on which the notification of such failure was sent to the prospect. The conference commissioner shall promptly notify all other participating conference commissioners.

11. The parent or legal guardian is required to sign the Letter regardless of the age of the prospective student-athlete.
12. If the prospect does not have a living parent or a legal guardian, the Letter should be signed by the person who is acting in the capacity of a guardian. An explanation of the circumstances should accompany the Letter.

13. If the NCAA or Conference declares a student ineligible for competition at the institution at which he signed a National Letter of Intent, he shall be released from that Letter, but may not sign a second letter.

14. It is presumed that a student is eligible for admission and financial aid at the institution for which he signed a National Letter of Intent until information is submitted to the contrary. This means that it is mandatory for the student to provide a transcript of his previous academic record and an application for admission to the institution where he signed a National Letter of Intent when requested.

15. The National Letter of Intent rules and regulations shall apply to all sports recognized by the member institution as varsity intercollegiate sports in which the NCAA sponsors championships or publishes the official playing rules.

16. The National Letter is considered to be officially signed on the final date of signature by the prospective student and his parent or legal guardian. A National Letter is validated when name is listed on signing list that is circulated to all conferences. If an incomplete Letter is submitted to a conference office by an institution, the Letter may be returned and reissued.

17. It is a breach of ethics for an institution to sign a prospective student-athlete to an invalid second Letter for the purpose of making the prospect feel obligated to that institution.

18. If a prospect signing a Letter is eligible for admission but the institution defers his admission to a subsequent term, the Letter shall be rendered null and void. However, if the prospect defers his admission, the Letter remains valid.

19. Any prospect who signs a Letter prior to April 8, 1981, and who becomes a countable player under NCAA Bylaw 5, shall be counted in the maximum awards in the sport of football in his first year at the institution with which he signed.

20. The conditions of the National Letter of Intent Program shall not apply retroactively to an institution joining the Program.

21. A prospect who signs a professional sports contract remains bound by Letter rules when financial aid cannot be made available to him by the institution with which he signed.

22. Upon receipt of the completed Letter, the commissioner of each conference shall promptly notify the commissioners of all other participating conferences of the signing.
TO: Directors of Athletics of Mid-American Conference Institutions, Central State (Ohio), Charleston, Cleveland State, Dayton, Ferris State, Grand Valley, Lake Superior, Northern Kentucky, Oakland, Penn State, Wayne State and Wright State

SUBJECT: National Letter of Intent Processing Procedures

Under separate cover, copies of the 1981 National Letter of Intent have been mailed to you.

The 1981 Letter includes several basic choices:

1. Change in Release Agreement - If a student seeks a mutual release from the institution he signed with prior to enrollment or the completion of one academic year, he shall not be eligible for practice and competition at the second institution during the first academic year of residence and shall have no more than three remaining seasons of competition (1+ penalty). See the enclosed memorandum for a more detailed explanation.

2. Signing dates for the 1981 National Letter of Intent are:
   - Football: February 18 to May 15, 1981
   - Basketball: April 8 to May 15, 1981
   - All Other Sports: April 8 to August 1, 1981

As a point of emphasis, the commissioner and prospect should be notified promptly when a prospect fails to meet the requirements for admission or financial aid at the signing institution (Item 1 - (a) of the Letter) and his Letter is null and void. Although not eligible to sign another Letter in the same signing year, the prospect is free to attend any other institution at which he is admissible without penalty.

Each director of athletics should check the following information on each National Letter of Intent before mailing into the MAC office:

1. Each Letter should be signed by both the athlete and his parents or legal guardian.
2. The date and time should be indicated for each signee.
3. The city and state indicated by the athlete.
4. The Letter should be signed and dated by the director of athletics prior to submission to prospect and parents.

The program can operate more effectively and efficiently if the above procedures are followed. Should you have any questions, don't hesitate to contact me.

Cordially,

Fred Jacoby
Commissioner

FJ/Blj

Encl.
NATIONAL LETTER OF INTENT

Release Agreement

_________________________ signed a National Letter of Intent

(Title of Student)

certifying his decision to enroll at ________________________________.

It has been mutually agreed by the student-athlete, his parents or legal

_________________________ guardian, and the director of athletics of the above named institution that

Student-Athlete

this student receiving this properly executed Release Agreement shall not be

Director of Athletics

eligible for practice and competition at the second institution during the

Parent or Legal Guardian

first academic year of residence and shall have no more than three remaining

Number & Street

seasons of eligibility.

Institution

The student-athlete, his parent or legal guardian, and the director of

City & State

athletics release each other from any commitment or liability to each other

Date

as the result of the National Letter of Intent.

Date

All parties state that they have read this Release, fully understand its

(This form must be completed in triplicate. One copy should be returned by

meaning and effect, know it as an unconditional release in full as to each

the student-athlete, one copy by the institution, and one copy to the

other, and that they have voluntarily signed it.

conference which processed the original letter.)

This Release shall be effective immediately.

_________________________ __________________________

Student-Athlete Director of Athletics

_________________________

Parent or Legal Guardian

_________________________

Number & Street Institution

_________________________

City & State

_________________________

Date Date
APPENDIX C

CAGE REPORT
There are 3 vital reasons that have surfaced recently that prove more than ever that CAGE SCOPE, the original recruiting service and the one that others are judged by, is a can't miss investment. 1.) Increased athletic department budgetary restrictions make CS more valuable than ever since travel money is tighter and trips have to truly worth the money. 2.) The limit on coaching staffs makes it possible to get more accomplished with less people. 3.) NCAA restrictions on contacts magnifies the on the button accuracy of the CS evaluations. THE MODERATELY PRICED CAGE SCOPE RETURNS ITS INVESTMENT MANY TIMES.

Earlier letters have articulated the CS philosophy and format. We are knee deep into the 1981/82 season. All back issues will be immediately mailed upon receipt of your subscription. If your budget is limited, try the admissions office as a source of funds

The basic CS indepth critiques of our some 2,000 players from all 50 states are the heart of our service. There are 34 issues with the last release in mid-March well within the recruiting time frame. You will receive 30 regular issues, plus the mid-season composite, final composite and 2 underclassmen issues (valuable head start for the next season). In addition, you get the Top 100 senior and junior ratings which are nationally publicized and recognized. THE CAGE SCOPE REGIONS COMES FROM OUR ATTENTION TO DETAIL.

The annual Cage Scope/High Potential "Blue Chip" Basketball Camp in Louisville will be held two weeks this summer. It's a great chance to see a wealth of prospects in a great setting. As a CS subscriber you'll receive our VIP welcome. However for me, the camp is an adjunct to my service. I want you to come to the camp because of CS not vice-versa. If you are not a subscriber, rest assured that you can come anyway (of course, I'll treat you like dirt). Seriously, I just want to make you aware of Blue Chip as an extra for your subscription to CAGE SCOPE.

It is not too late to subscribe for 81/82. As stated earlier, all back issues are still available. This will be my last letter to you the season so hope you'll consider CS strongly. Just fill out the order form below and then you're all set!

DON'T YOU JOIN ME IN MY SILVER ANNIVERSARY SEASON OF CAGE SCOPE?

Best regards,

Dave Bones, Editor/Publisher

---

**CAGE SCOPE ORDER FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1981/82 CAGE SCOPE ORDER FORM</th>
<th>1981/82</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Bones Publications</td>
<td>Send CS to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4321 Whiteford Road</td>
<td>Invoice to (if different):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo, OH 43623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(419) 862-5935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 81/82, 34 issues—$160.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cash or check</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Please bill (Oct.)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ATKINSON, MARK
- **Position**: F
- **School**: BROWNSBURG H. S.
- **Address**: BROWNSBURG, IN 46112
- **Phone**: (317) 482-3986

#### Description:
- Late bloomer's a rewarding passer being fully unselfish...A good shooter, he is a bit timid but has to score more this yr. Just nature physically...TOP SC WINGER...GR:250/340,C.

### BALL, NELSON
- **Position**: G
- **School**: SIOUX HILL H. S.
- **Address**: AURORA, CO 80011
- **Phone**: (303) 693-1700

#### Description:
- Quality shooter to 22' has to become a better driver...Gets way up...Quickness needs a dash of savvy...Floor game confidence varies...ENJOYS SCENE...GR: 1/4,CP-B.

### BURFIELD, TOD
- **Position**: F
- **School**: JOHN F. KENNEDY H. S.
- **Address**: CLEVELAND, OH 44123
- **Phone**: (216) 734-4759

#### Description:
- Plays tall but shot restrictions make be iffy...A good shooter, he is a bit tin...DOUG...Must mature physically...TOP SC WINGER...GR:250/340,C.

### BIAS, LEV
- **Position**: C/F
- **School**: NORTHEASTERN H. S.
- **Address**: AURORA, CO 80011
- **Phone**: (303) 693-1700

#### Description:
- Potential has been obvious to seasoned observers and is coming into the spotlight for a sr yr that will propel him near the area elite...Is a consistent inside operator having both moves...Power game is there at times...Plays decently facing so fwd is feasible...Gets up down court well...RISING STAR...GR: CP.

### BURKELL, DOUG
- **Position**: F
- **School**: POWELL COUNTY I. I. S.
- **Address**: DEER LODGE, MT 59722
- **Phone**: (406) 846-3167

#### Description:
- Plays hard if not always under full control...AJusts best conside...FORGET...5'10...FIRST STEP...GR: CP.

### COLLINS, J. D.
- **Position**: G
- **School**: JONES HONORS H. S.
- **Address**: CHARLESTON, WV 25302
- **Phone**: (304) 461-2093

#### Description:
- Will bounce back from his ankle injury of last yr...Decent in all phases with scoring best feature...Long bombs need consistency...AVG. quicks...CLAMPSY ABOVE DIV.II...GR:57/133,Gen.,C.

### DAVIES, ALBERT
- **Position**: G
- **School**: POOL H. S.
- **Address**: L. O. I. A., FL 32670
- **Phone**: (904) 565-1500

#### Description:
- Can pass on the break but set off...finds him wanting...Def, decent & he's quick...Hits it to 22'...Driving game is limited...3C TRANSITION LOVE NEEDS DISCIPLINE...GR:364/567,C.
Krus, Billy — G/F — Sr. — 6'4" — 205

Light end build yet jumps out of the gym with his dunks legendarily. Very strong on the 1ds but def. concentration lags... Scores mostly inside... Just improve his jump shot & move much better without the sphere...LM in THE RIGHT PROGRAM --- TOUGH TO GAUGE... GR: CP, B+.

Laffey, Dean — G — Jr. — 6'2" — 170

Good talent whose undisciplined ways causes difficulties... Quick & a leaper, he handles not a lot but can pass... Scores in a 17' radius... GREAT HANDS FOR THIS LM KID... GR: 1/3, CP, C.

Lehman, Steve — F/C — Jr. — 6'4" — 160

Has to either grow considerably or push his jumper from 15-20' to be LM material... Smart, sound & def. steady... Fine 1st step keys drives ... PROJECTS TO UPPER DIV. I... GR: 1/3, CP, B+.

Love, Phil — G — Sr. — 5'10" — 160

Runs show decently but unspectacularly... Not a bad 15-19' shooter with confidence perhaps shallow... Attitude good yet not aggressive enough... OK at DIV.I... GR: 13/25, CP, C.

Lupsford, Keith — F/G — Sr. — 6'2" — 162

Long, lean future g has to become stronger... Bq is pretty solid... Gaining a better fix on his mid-distance jumper... Can jump... FM ... FIsh finish carries into this yr... GR: 22/35, C.

Mc Corb, Jeff — F — Jr. — 6'4" — 185

Getting feet wet on the varsity with on/off games... Like his shooting credentials with confidence gain a must... Eager on the bds... Mistakes based on honest effort... GR: 14/7, 96.

Mead, Scott — C — Jr. — 6'8" — 205

Looks like he'll grow to 6'10"... Has considerable promise (? hands worry) but has to prove how much he wants it... Can score inside... LH only if he works... GR: 85/175, CP.

Hersch, Sr. — G — Sr. — 6'3" — 190

Has good pivot moves putting it down well... Touch is fine to 15' but f/w success hard to predict... Sure handed r/b... LM POWER GUY FOR ONE USING A TANDEM THERE... GR: 150/250, C-P.

Tongan, Daniel — F — Sr. — 6'5" — 190

Just 3rd yr of ball for this finesse f who also will r/b for you... Nifty ly... Def. solid... Just raise bh & savvy aspects... IMPROVES WELL INTO COLLEGE... LM... GR: CP, C (2, 3).

Savacini, Pat — F — Sr. — 6'4" — 182

Kind of player who scores so quietly that the box score is a revelation... Has nice moves, uses a pick well & is respectable to 17'... Not more than a passable r/b & def. is suspect... Not big enough for a g & quickness ? overall... LM BLEND CN... GR: CP.

Jarrick, James — G — Sr. — 6'0" — 160

Coaches dream who directs an off with sense of tempo/pace... Passes are pinpoint & proper... Does not look to score a lot and outside efficiency somewhat in doubt... His great 1st step spurs driving success... GR: CP, C, FE.

Payne, Don — F/C — Jr. — 6'3" — 175

At his best driving where it often takes him to the line... Range is just 17' & lowers ball before shooting off pass... Quick/strong, he can dominate def... LH... GR: 275/512, CP, C.
APPENDIX D

HIGH POTENTIAL BASKETBALL RECRUITING SERVICE
HIGH POTENTIAL BASKETBALL RECRUITING SERVICE'S CALENDAR FOR THE "1981-82 SEASON"

Dates newsletters will be mailed: (* denotes bulk-rate mailings)

September 19  List and evaluations of top prospects for Kentucky and Washington, D.C., for the 1981-82 season. Top prospects for summer camps and summer leagues too.
October 24  List and evaluations of top prospects for Indiana, Illinois and St. Louis. Top prospects for summer camps and summer leagues too.
November 7  List and evaluations of top prospects for Ohio, Tennessee and Atlanta. Top prospects for summer camps and summer leagues too.
December 5  Season progress report for Midwest, South and D.C. area, along with the listing of the nation's top prospects. Top juco players for country and top girl Kentucky basketballers too.
January 16  Top tournament reports for Thanksgiving and Christmas as well as additional prospects for the Midwest, South and D.C. area.
February 20  Season progress report for Indiana, Kentucky, St. Louis and Washington, D.C.
March 13  Season progress report for Illinois, Ohio, Tennessee and Atlanta.
May 1  State Tournament report for Midwest, South and D.C.; workout report; Derby Classic report; signed players, and unsigned players.
*May 15  Top rising prospects for the nation for the 1982-83 season.
*June 1  Detailed listing of the top rising prospects for the Midwest, South and D.C. area, along with additional signees.

(NOTE: Prospects for other parts of the country outside the Midwest will appear on September 19, October 24, November 7, December 5, and May 15 issues.)

(Please fill out below application if interested)

HIGH POTENTIAL ORDER BLANK

☐ I want to order the 1981-82 High Potential newsletters for $50.00. Enclosed is a check for $50.00.

☐ I want to order the 1981-82 High Potential newsletters for $50.00. Please bill me for $50.00 on the first newsletter that goes out on September 19, 1981.

Name of Coach________________________________________ College_____________________
Address_________________________________________ Town________ State________ Zip_____
Comments:_______________________________________________________________________

(Mail to: HIGH POTENTIAL BASKETBALL, Box 155, Shepherdsville, Kentucky, 40165) Make all checks payable to HIGH POTENTIAL BASKETBALL. For further information, call 1-502-543-7308.

NOTE: High Potential newsletters will be $55.00 in September. Subscribe now and save $5.00.
Dear Coach,

High Potential is proud to present its first newsletter for the 1981-82 season. This newsletter deals with the following:

* Top prospects for Kentucky
* Top prospects for Washington, D.C., metro area
* Coverage of the 2nd annual Cage Scope/High Potential "Blue-Chip" Basketball Camp which was held June 21-26, 1981, at Bellarmine College in Louisville, Kentucky.
* Coverage of Glenn Wilkes' "Superstar" Camp at Stetson University in DeLand, Florida, on July 17, 1981.
* Listings of the top prospects for the southern states
* Pro-Keds' advertisement

Below is the key which will be used throughout the season:

**College Caliber**

- M - Major college (i.e., Big Ten, SEC, Atlantic Coast)
- MM - Midmajor (i.e., Southern Conference, Mid-American, Ohio Valley)
- LMM - Low-midmajor (i.e., NCAA Division II)
- SC - Small college (i.e., NCAA Division III)
- JC - Junior College
- TMM - Possible midmajor
- LMM+ - Possible low-midmajor
- SC+ - Lower Division II & top Division III

**Wait** - Too early to predict

**Class or Grade**

- Sr. - Senior
- Jr. - Junior
- Soph - Sophomore
- Frosh - Freshman
- 8th - Eighth grader
- Race
- C = Caucasian
- N = Negro

**Positions**

- C = Center
- F = Forward
- G = Guard
- PT = Point Guard
- PG = Second Guard
- LP = Low Post
- HP = High Post

**Grades/Academics**

- Exc. = Excellent (A)
- Good = B student
- Ave. = Average (C student)
- Poor = Student & below
- GPA = Grade Point Average

**Abbreviations**

- PGP = Points per game
- RPG = Rebounds per game
- C.C. = College caliber
- Ft. = Feet
- CH = Coach's home phone number
- School number

Enclosed is your motel discount card which allows you a discount at many of the Holiday Inns throughout the country. You must give the corporate rate identification.

**TOP PROSPECTS FOR THE 2ND ANNUAL CAGE SCOPE/HIGH POTENTIAL
"BLUE-CHIP" BASKETBALL CAMP**

(June 21-26, 1981, at Bellarmine College in Louisville, Ky.)

**TOP 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ht./Pos</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Town-School-State/Coach</th>
<th>C.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTHONY BARGE</td>
<td>6-3/P</td>
<td>N Sr.</td>
<td>Douglasville-Douglas Co., Ga./ M Larry Ruble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eventual big-time PG who can wheel and deal. Does it all but outside shot could improve a bit more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF HALL</td>
<td>6-3/G</td>
<td>C Sr.</td>
<td>Ashland-Fairview, Ky/Jim Day</td>
<td>?M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the best shooters you'll find anywhere in the country. This big guard can drill the &quot;J&quot; with range.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRIS WEST</td>
<td>6-2 1/2/G</td>
<td>N Sr.</td>
<td>Louisville Manual, Ky/Fred Holden</td>
<td>?M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This physical specimen can play the game! Watch out when his jump shot catches up to the rest of his powerful game. Excels in football too.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT MEENTS</td>
<td>6-8/C</td>
<td>C Sr.</td>
<td>Herscher, Il/Ed Senett</td>
<td>MM+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong insider who plays smart and does a fine job of hitting the open man. Low-post is best bet until outside shot comes around.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN HESSLEY</td>
<td>6-11/C</td>
<td>C Jr.</td>
<td>Columbus Yearling, OH/Russ Gregg</td>
<td>M+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This big man made unbelievable progress in just one week of camp. Has a nice touch to go with his powerful rebounding and out-letting ability. Time is on his side.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODROW EDWARDS</td>
<td>6-2/G</td>
<td>N Jr.</td>
<td>Clarkston, Ga./Mike Haremski</td>
<td>MM+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a junior with great tools and makes major college moves. Plays very unselfish which blends in with his fine passing and scoring ability. If range improves as well as intensity, he'll be major by end of senior year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID VAUGHT</td>
<td>6-8/F-C</td>
<td>C Sr.</td>
<td>Knoxville Central, Th/David Courtney</td>
<td>M+</td>
<td>JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile big man who handles and shoots the ball as well as any big man is capable. Grades are borderline but should predict.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIM MCCINKEY</td>
<td>6-8/C</td>
<td>C Sr.</td>
<td>Collinsville, IL/Gene Catalpa</td>
<td>MM+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possesses a mighty fine touch for a big man out to 15 feet and knows the game extremely well. Speed and quickness need to improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICK OLSON</td>
<td>6-9/P</td>
<td>C Sr.</td>
<td>Madison LaFollette, WI/Pete Olson</td>
<td>M+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second best PG at camp (Barge was best). This heady floor general can drill the jump shot with range and can drive to the hoop as well. His size isn't a factor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY GALLAHAR</td>
<td>6-3/G</td>
<td>N Sr.</td>
<td>Jeffersonville, In/George Marshall</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An unknown who'll become K-H-O-N-N-N soon. Has an excellent body and goes to the basket explosively or can pull up for the &quot;J&quot; off dribble. Just needs experience. 2nd guard now and possible PG in future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JOHN COLLINS 6-6/F Sr. Nashville Hillwood, TN/Harvin Jinnette

Strong forward who can power the ball to the hoop or shoot the jump shot. Still needs to smooth out the rough edges of his overall game but I love his future!

ROBERT BUCHERDT 6-0 1/2/G C Sr. Toledo St. John's, OH/Ed Haentschel

Pure shooter who seldom misses the jump shot. Has unlimited range and hits the open man. This second guard's only weakness is having only adequate speed and quicks.

TOP SLEEPER
KIRK FRANCIS 6-6/G-F C Sr. Kewanee, IL/Mike Kirkham

Great range shooter out to 20 ft. Jumps well and extremely quick for his size. Physical strength limits him for now.

ERIC NEWSOME 5-9 1/2/G Jr. Toledo Rogers, OH/Bill Gladieux

If you believe there's a place in the game for the little man then you'll love this roadrunner who possesses blazing speed and quickness. Drills the jumper all day long. Size is only handicap.

AL ROTH 6-5/F C Sr. Sandusky St. Mary's Central/Mike Smith Catholic, OH

Strong player who boards well, powers it inside, and shoots it between 15-17 ft. Excellent passer who handles it fair. Brother plays for Toledo.

PEPPER BEGO 6-0/G N Sr. Springfield South, OH/Wayne Wiseman

Has the tools to become a big-league guard. Can score on the drive or the jump shot. Blazing speed and quicks make up for his size.

MIKE MASSING 6-3/G C Sr. Indianapolis Ben Davis, IN/Gayle Towle

Mid American Conference type player who shoots the eyes out. Possesses very good quickness and leaping ability. Handles okay for a 2nd guard.

RANDY HANN 6-1/PG C Sr. Georgetown Scott Co., KY/Everett Varney

Handler and shooter who will be an eventual MM+ PG in time. A strong athlete too.

WAYNE MILLS 6-4/F N Sr. Dayton Jefferson, OH/John Watkins

Small forward who has big time jumping ability and a super attitude. Outside shot is streaky and needs to add some more weight to his frame. Can put it on floor.

JOHN STRONG 6-4/G C Sr. Hudson, OH/Dwight Greer

Strength is the key word here but a great jump shooter who rebounds and leaps. Defense also has a ways to go. Reminds me a lot of Troy McKinley (University of Kentucky bound).

JEFFREY SCHEN 6-8/C C Sr. Jeffersonville, IN/George Marshall

Excellent touch for a big man within 15 ft. but needs to improve his strength, weight and stamina for Division I play. Showed flashed of skills at times—will improve tremendously.

STEVEN MAILEY 6-8/C C Sr. Manito Forman, IL/Rich Vana

Perhaps the most improved big man at camp. This big man has a nice touch, works and blocks the shots. Extremely mobile but needs 20 pounds on a weight program.
RORY DAHLINGHAUS  6-8/C  CSr. Maria Stein Marion Local, OH/ Jack Alberts  ?MM
Improved leaps and bounds during the week of the camp. Has a nice touch and
decent feel for the game. Showed some big-time moves at times but two years away
still.

DAVE NAEDEKER  6-6 1/2/F  CJr. Springfield Griffin, IL/Bill Fleischli  ?MM
Definite MM with the help of a weight program. This shooting forward does
everything well and improved steadily all week.

GREG DONN Y  6'4/OG  N Sr. Jeffersontown, Ky./Butch Bartz     LMM+
Dandy floor general who handles and makes pinpoint passes. Offense needs to
come around more. ?MM with right supporting cast. Also, quick as a cat.

SECOND SLEEPER
JERRY OSINSKI  6-5 1/2/F  C Sr. Chicago St. Benedict, IL/Tom Stiglic  LMM+
His final fate will depend on growth and the acquisition of more strength.
Decent shooter within 15 ft, and has a tough inside game. Needs to develop wing
concepts.

THE THIRD 12
DOUG PAULKNER  6-4/G-F  C Sr. Kokomo Northwestern, IN/Wayne Allen  LMM+
Fundamentally sound player who handles, passes and shoots it. Takes it to the
hoop well and plays good defense. Boards well for size too.

SCOTT THOMAS  5-11/G  N Sr. Springfield South, OH/Wayne Wiseman  LMM+
Two more inches makes him a big (gamer but a very good passer, shooter and
handler who is at his best in the running game. A good defender in a wide open
game. 2-U-I-C-X.

DALE FEIXEN  6-5/F  C Jr. St. Charles Francis Howell, MO/Jerry Boehm  LMM+
Only a junior who must grow two inches and put on 20 more pounds for a higher
level. Good shooter with a great attitude.

CHARLIE RODGERS  6-4/G  C Sr. Indianapolis Avon, IN/Rick Peckinpaugh  LMM+
Can stroke it from the perimeter and fundamentals are there. This good passer
and handler must get stronger.

THURMAN DENTON  6-4/F  N Sr. Memphis Central, TN/James Adams  LMM+
Explosive leaper with a fine inside game. His turnaround "J" is his forte.
Intensity is the key word here.

JOHN MCCALLISTER  6-2/C  C Sr. Huntington Vinson, WV/Don Smith  LMM+
Big time shooter who maybe a step slow but can fill it up from 18-25 ft.
Possesses a strong upper body.

TIM O'TOOLE  6-3/G  C Sr. White Plains Archbishop Stepinac, NY/Gene Doris  LMM+
Great player on the wing slot especially on the break. Hard-nosed player who
gives blood all the time. His biggest attribute is his ability to anticipate on
defense.

JON TAYLOR  6-3/F  N Jr. Lexington Bryan Station, KY/Bob Barlow  LMM+
Keep an eye on this junior who is a smooth athlete with a lot of savvy. Really
tough going to the hole and great timing on the boards. Range and handling are the
key for his MM success.
APPENDIX E

BLUE-CHIP BASKETBALL CAMP
High Potential Basketball  
Recruiting Service  
Box 155  
Shepherdsville, Kentucky 40165  
502 543-7368  

Volume 8, Number 8  
May 5, 1981

Dear Coach,

Enclosed is the 8th newsletter for the 1980-81 season. It contains the following pieces of information:

* Top prospects for the post-season tournaments that I covered as well as the state tournament roundup report.
* Additional senior newcomers for the 1980-81 season (Better late than never!) and top rapid risers for Midwest, South and D.C. areas.
* Overlooked players for the Midwest, South and Washington, D.C. area.
* Update of recent newsletters
* All-Star games roundup report
* Jeffersontown workout report held on April 25th and a copy of the program.
* Subscription blank for the 1981-82 newsletters which will mark High Potential's ninth straight year of operation.

The "Blue-Chip" Basketball Camp has attracted these additional players since my last correspondence with you:

Mark Van Hoose  6-5/Sr.  Ashland Boyd Co., KY/Strong insider  
Kartin Nessley  6-11/Jr.  Whitehall-Whitehall Yearling, OH/Diamond in the rough  
Greg Underwood  6-1/Sr.  Salem, IN/One of the best for south Indiana  
Joey Wells  6-5/Sr.  Ashland Boyd Co., KY/Impressive state tourney  
Kevin Wright  6-2/Sr.  Frankton, IN/Had 25 in sectional against Anderson  

The "Blue-Chip" Camp is set for June 21-26, 1981, at Bellarmine College in Louisville, Kentucky, and will feature around 150 players across the country who have demonstrated the ability to play some level of college basketball. Regardless of what level you coach (NCAA I, II or III; NAIA; NJCAA), this camp will introduce you to players who can play on all levels in college. I know you will benefit from it.

The next two newsletters will be mailed bulk-rate and will go out on these dates:

May 19-List of the nation's top rising prospects for 1981-82 with heavy emphasis on the Midwest, South & D.C. areas.
APPENDIX F

HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL ILLUSTRATED REPORT
Vol. 17 No. 7
February 15, 1981

FIRST EASTERN UPDATE

and FOR IVIES ONLY

Editor's Note: Through the grapevine or via first-hand knowledge we've made some mistakes in our first four Progress Reports. Time to correct our slightings or overratings is now. We've found 18 prospects that need a transfusion but none are more than a level away from the target. These updates will appear in the same format as our Progress Reports with the exception of an additional column headlined IS./PRO. (original issue number and first projection). The page entitled For Ivies Only includes players with excellent grades who haven't appeared in a Progress Report to date. They are all Ivy or similar grade-wise and talent-wise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME AND PROJECT</th>
<th>IS/PRO</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>HT</th>
<th>WT</th>
<th>SCHOOL--CITY--STATE</th>
<th>COACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BILL CLEMENS (****+/3+)</td>
<td>4/2+</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>6-14</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>M. BERGTRAUM--NEW YORK, NY</td>
<td>JEFF BIEDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JODI COLEMAN (****-/3-)</td>
<td>6/3+</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>BRIGHTON, MA</td>
<td>BILL MAHONEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOMMY DAVIS (******/5)</td>
<td>5/4+</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>ABERDEEN, MD</td>
<td>BOB MC CONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT FARRELL (****/4)</td>
<td>3/4+</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>CENTRAL CATH.--PITTSBURGH, PA</td>
<td>DAN PACELLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDDIE HARRIS (****/4)</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>A.JACKSON--CAMBRIA HTS., NY</td>
<td>CHUCK GRANBY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE HAWKINS (*****-/5-)</td>
<td>5/4+</td>
<td>C/PF</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>MALVERNE, NY</td>
<td>HANK WILLIAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON JOHNSON (****/4)</td>
<td>4/4+</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>W. PHILADELPHIA--PHILA, PA</td>
<td>JOEY GOLDSBERG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others tell us where they've been
We tell you where they're going!

HOWARD M. GARFINKEL
EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

TOM KONCHALSKY
ASSOCIATE EDITOR

HSBI Report
60 WEST 55TH ST. APT. 10E
NEW YORK, NY 10019

NAME AND PROJECT | IS/PRO | P | HT | WT | SCHOOL--CITY--STATE | COACH |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BILL CLEMENS (****+/3+)</td>
<td>4/2+</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>6-14</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>M. BERGTRAUM--NEW YORK, NY</td>
<td>JEFF BIEDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports good control running talented club while occasional line-drive jumper goes steady with nets--last year we saw non-shooting point with limited quicks...still no speedster--won't create magic yet owns low ratio of turnovers--strength ok--pref. Marketing--CP/80--ADEPT LOWER-MAJOR FLOOR LEADER--B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JODI COLEMAN (****-/3-)</td>
<td>6/3+</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>BRIGHTON, MA</td>
<td>BILL MAHONEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quick turnaround from last report...college trying to help kid went bit overboard...hey fellows,help us!!--good body but very unpolished and our statement about “best days ahead” was certainly true--rebounding rep overstated...just not ready for action in ML pits--nice touch to 12' when unhindered/ runs court with ambition/coachable--no pivot moves--CP/2.1--WORTHY LOW-MAJOR POWER-FORWARD GAMBLE-B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOMMY DAVIS (******/5)</td>
<td>5/4+</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>ABERDEEN, MD</td>
<td>BOB MC CONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we were expecting another Quintin Dailey and when we failed to see one went tad too low...we forgot that Dailey was and is a super...5-plus if you will--also stressed his jumper on our outside courts but now burying everything in recent outing--great strength,bounce,durability,deaneree--pref.Bus/ Nova-Hinny-Syr-Iona-Lye-Rutgers--CP/2.0--BIG-TIME SCORING-GUARD--B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT FARRELL (****/4)</td>
<td>3/4+</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>CENTRAL CATH.--PITTSBURGH, PA</td>
<td>DAN PACELLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can stink out the joint in a 100 high school games and you'll never convince us he can't play but having a God-awful season so got to tell it like it seems to be--lack of control main enemy but if he gets it together will pat rock &amp; create the play with best--CP/78--STILL VIABLE MID-MAJOR QB--W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDDIE HARRIS (****/4)</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>A.JACKSON--CAMBRIA HTS., NY</td>
<td>CHUCK GRANBY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having terrific season on PSAL's # 2 ranked quint and summer woes can be traced directly to family problems, none of which were his doing!--playing with enthusiasm &amp; energy &amp; could always run with best--Intense,quick defensive potential &amp; dangerous to the goal--range BT ?--MID-MAJOR 2ND-GUARD--B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRE HAWKINS (*****-/5-)</td>
<td>5/4+</td>
<td>C/PF</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>MALVERNE, NY</td>
<td>HANK WILLIAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making minuscule change because many of you are asking...more flexible offensively than first realized but still not to be confused with Connie--might have gained a few lbs (looks 240 and counting) which doesn't help ability to guard a &quot;4-man&quot; but wins consistently by utilizing huge frame to make defenders disappear--it's Big-East + Cavs--CP/78/84 of 225/SAT (900)--BIG-TIME POWER-FORWARD HOPE-B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON JOHNSON (****/4)</td>
<td>4/4+</td>
<td>2G</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>W. PHILADELPHIA--PHILA, PA</td>
<td>JOEY GOLDSBERG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we tried hard to upgrade the city this year but fought losing battle--remains good sticker despite low-slow release but hasn't assumed leadership role worthy of BT backup (4+/5-)--passes well, good athletic equipment, appears coachable--pref.Computer Sci.--CP/C--VALID MIDDLE-MAJOR 1ST-GUARD--B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JARRETT KING (****/4) 3/4 SW 6-3 190 ST. ANTHONY’S—JERSEY CITY, NJ BOB HURLEY
IQ (Intensity Quotient) pushing 100% so must get uptick though still not true 2-guard in handling or savvy areas—sticking the 18’ jumper, exciting defensive promise (well-schooled here) and could always get out on break with best—N’eastern-Creighton-Peter’s—CP/2.5—VAST MID-MAJOR SLEEPER—B

WARREN MARTIN (****/4) 3/3 HP 6-11 210 TUNSTALL--DRY FORK, VA HOWARD WEST
( or rather come) much further and faster than folks expected—rejecting & defending have aged so long wing span no longer ”potential”--outstanding turnaround jump shooter & maker...if he’s a 5 they won’t tell us!-Ve. & UNC recent entrants!—CP/2.3—HIGH-MAJOR HIGH-POST...POTENT BT BACKUP—B

MARTY MAY (**/3) 3/4 PF 6-4 180 INDIANA, PA FREDERICK YUN
we hoped lean, long-legged forward would move outside & display small-corner skills but as of this writing it’s not to be-effective 12’ & in baseline jump shooter and driver, hard-nosed competitor, covers court well—pref.Law-Criminology—CP/61 of 316/SAT (V/460-M/540)—EXCELLENT FOR LOU-MAJORS—W

CLARENCE MOSS (****/4) 5/3 26 6-2% 175 STEVENSON—BRONX, NY STEVE POST
there’s good news and bad news...the good news is he’s better than we thought, the bad news is he’s ineligible!—smooth stroke within 15’ radius of hoop leads one to project his J to bona fide major-college range—drives hard either hand, sees floor, clever passer—bel. 2.0—FINE 2G JUCO FODDER—B

CAREY SCURRY (****/4-) 5/4 PF 6-7 185 ALEX.HAMILTON—B’KLYN, NY RAY HASKINS
despite our recantation from earlier upper-major projection this skinny antelope has made gigantic strides for one with little to no h.s. experience—unfortunately it shows each time he spectates during hectic rebounding action...must learn to play hard all the time & may learn the key to greatness in prep school...won’t graduate on time—has all the physical tools needed to run court & wipe glass like Windex—good touch to 12’—spindly frame will fill in time—MID-MAJOR POTENTIAL—B

JOHN STEVENS (****/4) 3/4 PF 6-6 190 NORTWALK SR.—NORTWALK, CONN RAY BARRY
battles anyone underneath but big-timers wary of limited speed & bounce so perhaps we were mite too high...but only a tad--can’t discount courage in the pits, strength & bulk for night-in, night-out ML pounding & more than adequate standstill jumper—needs more & varied offensive moves & quickness to the board—being under-recruited!!!—pref.Bus/N’east—CP/2.4—HIGH-MAJOR MUST BITE!—W

KEITH WALKER (****/4-) 3/5 SF 6-5% 185 BEN FRANKLIN—PHILA., PA KEN HAMILTON
viable athlete if not bbk player being overshadowed by teammate Vic Alexander, a 4* PF in issue #3--can’t shoot a lick from out & sometimes conscientious objector on the boards—runs like reindeer & endowed with superior elevation...now must learn how to play—HIGH-MAJOR SMALL-FORWARD POSSIBILITY—B

ANDRE WILLIAMS (****/4+) 4/4 PF 6-7 180 M.BERTRAUM—NEW YORK, NY JEFF BIEDE
more active, more intense but biggest gain is added flexibility which enables keen-eyed evaluators to project angular frontliner to any one of three frontcourt positions...SF, PF or HP—not quite a blue-chip defender on SF but handles aptly vs. extended pressure; won’t king-kong your PF but will create problems offensively with quick-bounce feet & good touch back to basket—hands work & mouth constantly chattering on “O”--Niag-Bona-Pitt-Utica visits—CP/75—UPPER-MAJOR UPPER-POST—W

PETER WYNN (****+/4+) 4/4 PF 6-7 220 BEVERLY, MASS KEITH ARNOLD
we had adhered to advice of in-state critics last summer we’d have rated bearded-postman a 2 in lieu of our rather gutsy Mid-Major evaluation—now it appears our intuition could have been a shade more liberal...performing with reckless abandon & plays string music to 16’—not the runner or jumper big-time prospect should be—UConn-Marshall-Syr.-Cross—CP/SAT (800)—HIGH-MAJOR STRONG-FORWARD—W

LATE ADDITIONS

AL HOLLAND (****+/3+) 4/4+ C 6-10 190 MASSANUTTEN—WOODSTOCK, VA BOB RONAI
little to no offensive advancement since we asked the question, “can you teach him how to play?”--the answer for upper-majors and their ilk is emphatic. "NO!"—fine runner & jumper will date at 6-8 backs at both ends if not pitted too high—still non predictor—LOW-MAJOR PIVOT—MM BACKUP—B

PIERRE LAMITTE (****/4-) 4/5 PF 6-8 185 MASSANUTTEN—WOODSTOCK, VA BOB RONAI
just too weak physically to stand game-in, game-out rigorous of high-major or similar comp...lack of power and touch disturbing—can’t deny potential for transition five and with added weight will be no less than serviceable factor under glass—iffy shooter—predicts—LOW-MAJOR POWER-FWD HOPES—B
AARON GLOVER (**-/2-) HP 6-7 185 LA SALLE ACADEMY—NEW YORK, NY MATT WHITE
good size, coachability, attitude and nearly decent stroke but rest is all downhill—totally lack­
ing in self-confidence and appears to play scared—lacks speed, ability to change ends & all kinds
of lateral quicks—poor hands & physical strength—Ivies saw early promise but have pulled plug—

LARRY LAMPERE (**+/2+) PF 6-6 180 XAVIER—NEW YORK, NY TOM CARPENTER
prime prep prospect and he and coach know it...go to work!—built and looks like 14-year-old & can't
advance embryonic run & jump till physical maturity comes—owns enormous hands, long arms & commend­
able head—good outlet passer, dribble moves too ponderous to create own shot tho no doubting soft,
open touch to 15’—pref.Math—CP/92/23 of 220/SAT (V/660-M/640)—TOP SC STRONG FWD...LM BACKUP—W

SCOTT MASCIOLI (****+/3+) 2G 6-2y 180 WYOMING VALLEY—PLYMOUTH, PA JOHN MASCIOLI
fine deep-range bomber, physical kid and obviously knows game (what coach's son doesn't?)—only a
half-step slow tho some put him in tortoise class and they have missed the boat—handling probably
main drawback/hasn't needed a lot of moves—CP/90/SAT (1200)—EX.LOW-MAJOR 2ND-GUARD ..  . MM BACKUP—W

JIM MC LAUGHLIN (**+/3+) 1G 6-2 175 CLARKSTOWN NORTH—NEW CITY, NY PAUL TOSCANO
handled with surprising alacrity versus lightning-quick team down stretch so switch him to 1st-guard
role in college—sharp transition passer, takes it hard to hole, one of hardest noses around—faulty
shot mechanics, no freeing moves, lacks experience to lead big major five—pref. Engn.—CP/82/
197 of 553/SAT (V/530-M/580)—LOW-MAJOR 1 G SLEEPER/M M BACKUP—W...6-1 JOE INGENTI is Div. III 2G—W

DAVE NUTTALL (***/3) 2G 6-1 170 SIDWELL FRIENDS—WASHINGTON, DC ED SAAM
Wooden goes ecstatic over this kid’s attitude but unfortunately was step slow for Stags—adequate
shooter and handler and as brainy a floorman as grades indicate—caught between a 1 & 2 here so
strictly off-guard for you—pref.Bus./CP/0/3 of 242/SAT (V/930-M/610)—LEGIT LOW-MAJOR SCORER—B

TOM REILLY (**+/1+) 2G 5-11 160 ST.ANTHONY'S—SMITHTOWN, NY GUS ALFIERI
prior to season-ending knee operation little sparkplug stuck open J to 16’ & worked frantically in
team's half-court traps—limited handler—pref.Journ.—CP/91/70 of 213/SAT (1010)—HIGH DIV. III 2G—W

HOWARD RINGER (***/3) PG 6-0 175 FRANCIS LEWIS—FRESH MEADOWS, NY RANDY JONES
can't always tell book by cover...heavyset frame belies ability to accelerate to hole, split double­
team & motor for transition club...quick feet make him enigma—gifted passer on break—void of out­
side shot make him liability against zones—matador defense also holds him back—under recruited as
of this writing—pref.Engn.—CP/97/129 of 603/SAT (V/380-M/590)—UNDERRATED LOW-MAJOR POINTMAN—B

JAY SAMONSKY (**+/3-) 5-11 170 DE MATHA—HYATTSVILLE, MD MORGAN WOODEN
small scoring guard comes off bench 11ike Hertz-Rent-A-Jump-Shooter and when in stroke sticks around
for about 25 minutes a game—can be your DS (Designated Shooter) against zones provided strongly-
built competitor doesn't have to snake around foes to get shot...lacks top body control—size ob­
vious ML deterrent on "D"—AU leads—CP/3.7/SAT (1000+)--POSSIBLE LOWER-MAJOR ZONE-BREAKER—W

CHRIS SCHAEFER (***/3+) SF 6-6 185 ST.ANTHONY'S—SMITHTOWN, NY GUS ALFIERI
plays the hole for one of shrewdest coaches in East but moves outside when fitted against slower foe
and then can show his stuff...buries stationary southpaw J to 17’, good 1st-step to hoop (must learn
when to pull up), looks for 4 finds open man...only uses right hand to salute flag,however—lateral
moves won't fool quicker now—pref.Bus./N'east—CP/83/SAT (970)—ANOTHER CORNER SPOT IN LOW-MAJORS—W

HERB SENDEK (***/3+) PF 6-0 170 PENN HILLS—PITTSBURGH, PA BILL BLICK
possesses usual tough nose of typical P.Hills product and will do adequate job of protecting pill
and initiating offense the void of big-league quicks & creativity—pretty good open jump shooter—
C.Hel!on leads—CP/4.0/spectacular 1 of 1062/SAT (V/500-M/600)—POSSIBLE LOW-MAJOR FLOOR LEADER—W

MIKE WALTER (***/3+) PG 6-0 160 TECHNICAL—BROOKLYN, NY JIM MC MORRAN
quickness with ball makes sinewy-stronger general slightly more effective than above but if he were
more vocal leader could even move up a level...takes charge off floor!—sticks off-face push-shot
against zones (question off lateral moves) & handled adeptly when they got running—fed post neatly
in half-court set—pref.Computer Sci.—CP/81/571 of 1470/SAT (800)—SOLID LOW-MAJOR PG/MM BACKUP—B
APPENDIX G

FIVE STAR BASKETBALL CAMP
6th ANNUAL FIVE-STAR SC

STAFF AND RESIDENT COACHES

WILL KLEIN, Director & Business Mgr.
(Asst. Principal, Christopher Columbus H.S.)
HOWARD GARFINKEL, Co. & Program Director
(Founder & Publisher, HSBI Report)
MIKE FRATELLO, Head Coach
(Asst. Coach, Atlanta Hawks)
PETE GILLEN, Head Coach
(Asst. Coach, Villanova)
DAVE ODOM, Head Coach
(Head Coach, East Carolina)

ERNE BELL, Leonard H.S.
MARTY CHAMBERS, St. Ignatius H.S.
JOHN DAVIS, H.D., Woodson H.S.
BILL DONLON, Methuen H.S.
BUDDY EVANS, Rome Free Academy
BILL FOX, Father Judge H.S.
BARRY FRANK, Rogers H.S.
RAY LANG, Burlington H.S.
Randy Montgomery, Springfield H.S.
BILL NORTON, Bro. Rice H.S.
GARY NUSTAD, Clarkson H.S.
JOI PETROCELLI, Bsp., Alter H.S.
JERRY WAINWRIGHT, Highland Park H.S.
LOREN WALLACE, Lincoln Comm. H.S.
JON WARDEN, Wehrle H.S.
WOODY WILLIAMS, Lake Clifton H.S.
JOHN WIRTZ, Rancalli H.S.
TIM WOLF, Catholic Central H.S.

DIGGER PHILPS
Notre Dame
Eight NCAA tournamets & seven 20-game win seasons in ten years. Legend in his own time.

MARY KESSLER
Davidson
Dean of our staff returns for 15th straight year. Fundamental master of the game.

MORGAN WOOTEN
Virginia
Named ACC Coach of the Year. Three ACC teams make Five-Star Lecture Series.

GEORGE RAVELING
Washington State
Dynamic speaker-coach has Cougars in thick of Pac-10 race. Don't miss rebonding lecture.

DICK VITALI
ESPN
Overnight sensation on ESPN cable. One of the all-time great motivational speakers.

TERRY HOLLAND
Virginia
A grafts college-player recruitment Gimlet. Heads ACC - from makes Five-Star Lecture Series.

A TYPICAL FIVE-STAR DAY

7:30 AM Reveille
8:30 AM Morning Workout
8:30 AM Breakfast
9:30 AM Stations
11:00 AM Games or Swim
12:30 PM Lunch
1:15 PM Rest Period
2:00 PM Afternoon Lecture
3:30 PM Games, Swim or Individual Instruction
4:30 PM Games, Swim or Individual Instruction
6:00 PM Dinner
7:30 PM Games or Free Play
8:00 PM Canteen Opens
8:30 PM Games or Free Play
9:45 PM Basketball Movies
11:00 PM Retire
11:30 PM Lights Out!

HOW TO ENROLL

See Your Coach for Application Card or Write to:

COACH WILL KLEIN
58 Seminary Avenue
Yonkers, NY 10704
(914) 423-5062 (212) 246-3063

SUGGESTED CLOTHING

14 pairs sweatsocks, 1 pair good basketball sneakers, 7 tee shirts,
3 pairs shorts, 1 sweat suit or sweat shirt, 2 pairs jeans or slacks,
3 athletic supporters, 1 pair pajamas, 1 raincoat, 1 swim trunks,
4 towels, 1 blanket, 2 sheets, 1 pillow and pillowcase, handkerchiefs
and toilet articles.
SOUTH BASKETBALL CAMP
for boys: 13 to 18
AGE, PITTSBURGH, PA. — JULY 10-17 • JULY 18-25 • JULY 27-AUG.3

• ACTIVITIES — Individual instruction on all phases of game, daily lectures by prominent college, high school and pro coaches, "station" teaching of all fundamentals, drills, strategy and attitude sessions, team practices, league tournaments and playoffs, one-on-one toursneys, full shooting contests, All-Star games, optional weight and universal training, basketball movies, swim sessions, free play and concerts.

• FACILITIES — Eight mercatorum-surfaced, 90 x 50 outdoor courts (floors 6 and 7 court play) plus a multiskit fieldhouse seating over 1000 people. Included in this facility are: training room, whirlpool treatment room, lounge canteen and lounge, play theatre, meeting rooms for skill sessions, and an Olympic-size indoor pool under the watchful eye of Red Cross instructors.

• AWARDS — Trophies are awarded in our three leagues to the following: Outstanding Player, Most Improved, Best Defender, Best Offensive Player, Most Valuable Player, Most Promising Prospect specials, are presented at our traditional award ceremony which is a highlight of our session! In addition, complete modern medical facilities are available in nearby Sewickley, Pa.

• HEALTH — Professional trainers, DAVE PERRIN (Univ. of Pittsburgh) and DAVE SYNOWKA (Robert Morris College) and their assistants are in residence at camp for all sessions. In addition, complete modern medical facilities are immediately available in nearby Sewickley, Pa.

• SLEEPING ACCOMMODATIONS — Campers live 2-4 to a room in modern, AIR CONDITIONED dorms. Each room is airy and well-light with ample closet and dresser space and a writing desk. Large bathrooms with hot water and showers are located on every floor.

• REGISTRATION FEE — $180.00 per session includes: ACCIDENT AND INJURY INSURANCE, MEALS, LODGING, and ROUND-TRIP TRANSPORTATION from the Pittsburgh Airport or Pittsburgh Greyhound Bus Depot. A $50.00 deposit should be sent with application card to insure reservation. Balance is due on June 15th for these awards, along with the Keith Moon Sportsmanship and Most Promising Prospect specials, are presented at our traditional award ceremony which is a highlight of our session! In addition, complete modern medical facilities are available in nearby Sewickley, Pa.

• LOCATION AND DIRECTIONS — Robert Morris College is located near the Pittsburgh Airport in Coraopolis, Pa. From East take the Pa. Turnpike to Interstate 70 West. West on 1-70 to 1-79 North to Pittsburgh. 1-79 North to Airport Exit Rt. 22 & 60 West. Rt. 60 West to Airport, turn right at light past Howard Johnson & Holiday Inn to 3rd light, turn right onto campus. From West take I-71 North to Columbus; 1-70 East to 1-79 North to Pittsburgh, follow airport signs. From North take Ohio Turnpike to 1-79 South to Exit 18 (Sewickley), follow Rt. 65 North (yellow belt & Airport signs) cross Ohio River into Sewickley. Turn Right at next light. Robert Morris College entrance on left. Address: Narrow Run Road, Coraopolis, Pa.

Typically intense morning station period as Gary Nutred of Clarkston H.S. in Michigan demonstrates basic-out technique.

WE OFFER THE TOP COMPETITION IN THE NATION! ASK A "FIVE-STAR CAMPER WHO'S BEEN HERE!"
15th ANNUAL FIVE-STAR B
JUNE 15-22 • AUGUST 24-31 at CAM

STAFF AND RESIDENT COACHES

WILL KLEIN, Director & Business Mgr.
(Asst. Principal, Christopher Columbus H.S.)

HOWARD GARFINKEL, Co. & Program Director
(Asst. Principal, HSBI Reporter)

TOM McCORRY, Head Coach
(Head Coach, Trenton State College)

BILL ABERER, LaSalle Academy

HERMAN CANNON, Eastern H.S.

SCOTT DOUGLAS, Loudoun Valley H.S.

JERRY FRANCIS, Forsyth H.S.

BILL ABERER, LaSalle Academy

HERMAN CANNON, Eastern H.S.

SCOTT DOUGLAS, Loudoun Valley H.S.

JERRY FRANCIS, Forsyth H.S.

BOB WEINHAUER, (Head Coach, Boston U.)

Pennsylvania

Eastern Coach of the Year

Hotel National

“Crazy” George Schaus

Outstanding College Varsity Stars and Pro Coaches.

A WEEK TO LIVE BASKETBALL:

★ To Develop individual offensive and defensive skills
★ To Develop concepts of team offense and defense
★ To Develop basketball intensity and desire
★ To Participate in tournament and league competition
★ To Derive the benefits of individual instruction

Minimum supervision of 1 coach to every 5 campers!

HOW TO ENROLL

See your coach for application Card or Write to:

Coach Will Klein
58 Seminary Avenue
Yonkers, N.Y. 10704
(914) 423-5062 (212) 246-3063

SUGGESTED CLOTHING

14 pair sweatsocks, 1 pair good basketball sneakers, 7 tee shirts, 3 pairs shorts, 1 sweat suit or sweat shirt, 2 pairs jeans or slacks, 3 athletic supporters, 1 pair pajamas, 1 raincoat, 1 swim trunks, 4 towels, 3 blankets, 2 sheets, pillow, pillowcase, handkerchiefs and toilet articles.
ASKETBALL CAMP
BRYN MAWR, HONESDALE, PA.

• ACTIVITIES — Individual instruction on all phases of game, daily lectures by prominent college, high school and pro coaches, “station” teaching of all fundamentals and drills, strategy and attitude sessions, team practices, league tournament and playoffs, one-on-one tourneys, foul shooting contests, All-Star Games, optional weight and isometric training, basketball movies, swim periods, free play and canteen.

• FACILITIES — Ten basketball courts including eight floodlit, mercatum-surfaced, regulation sized outdoor courts for day and night play, plus four spacious, well lit indoor courts. Also canteen, movie theatre, ping pong and pool tables and our private lake front and dock area for swimming under the watchful eye of Red Cross Water Safety Instructors.

• AWARDS — Trophies are awarded in our three leagues to the following: Outstanding Player, Most Improved, Best Rebounder, Best Defensive Player, Best Playmaker, High Scorer, One-on-One Tourney and Foul Shooting contest winners, All-Star Game MVP’s, Mr. Hustle and to each member of our League and Playoff champs. These awards, along with the Shaun Mannion Sportsmanship and Most Promising Prospect specials, are presented at our traditional award ceremony which is a highlight of camp. Official camp shirts are given to each boy compliments of the Camp Directors.

• HEALTH AND SLEEPING ACCOMMODATIONS — Campers live in modern, weatherproof cabins each containing a private bathroom with hot and cold water, show, shower and individual linen cabinets. Professional trainer CHARLES "DOC" TURNER (Head Trainer of Long Island Univ. and the Harlem Pro Rucker League) and his staff are in residence at camp. In addition, complete modern medical facilities are immediately available in nearby Honesdale.

• REGISTRATION FEE — $180.00 per session includes: ACCIDENT AND INJURY INSURANCE, MEALS, LODGING, and ROUND-TRIP TRANSPORTATION to and from Midtown New York. A $50.00 deposit should be sent with application card to insure reservation and balance by June 1st for June session and August 1st for August session. Enrollment is limited! Deposits are not refundable after June 1st for June session or August 1st for August session. Due to N.C.A.A. regulations we cannot accept high school graduates in any session.

• LOCATION AND DIRECTIONS — Lake Bryn Mawr Camp is set on 110 acres of beautiful lawns and wooded land outside of Honesdale, Pa. in the lush Pocono Mountain countryside only 110 miles from New York City. Take Parkes Parkway North for 14 miles to U.S. 6 West for 7 miles to N.Y. 17 West — on 17 West for 18 miles to U.S. 84 West — for 44 miles to Pa. and exit at Blooming Grove onto Rt. 402 (Right turn onto 402 for 5 miles) — to Rt. 6 West for 9 miles thru Hawley and Honesdale — follow signs and go thru length of Main Street to Rt. 191 North — stay on 191 North for 5 miles — Right turn at camp sign (near the Fireside Tavern) and another right turn into camp.

2 SESSIONS: for boys 13 to 18

WE OFFER THE TOP COMPETITION IN THE NATION!
ASK A "FIVE-STAR CAMPER" WHO'S BEEN HERE!

Rick Pinino (Boston U.) draws crowd at individual instruction session.
APPENDIX H

B/C SCOUTING SERVICE
KENTUCKY'S TOP 10 ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winston Bennett</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Louisville Male/Maurice Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbie Valentine</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Radcliff North Hardin/Ron Bevars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd May</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Virgie/Bob Osborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Conner</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Lexington Bryan Station/Bob Barlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Berry</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Lexington Bryan Station/Bob Barlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Burrow</td>
<td>6-8½</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Radcliff North Hardin/Ron Bevars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Karl</td>
<td>6-4</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>London Laurel County/Chuck Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Tipton</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Fairdale/Stan Hardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Mitchell</td>
<td>6-4½</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Lexington Catholic/Jim Lankster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Clay</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Lexington Bryan Station/Bob Barlow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOUTH MUST BE SERVED: A DYNAMIC 1-2-3 UNDERCLASS PUNCH ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Crook</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>Middletown Eastern/Bill Johnson (transfer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Miller</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>Lexington Henry Clay/Al Prewitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Kimbro</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Louisville Bishop David/Myron Huey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KENTUCKY'S SECOND 10 ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Johnson</td>
<td>6-4</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Morganfield Union County/Tris Kington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Trigg</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Lexington Catholic/Jim Lankster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Worth</td>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Owensboro Daviess County/Mike West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Griffin</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Buckner Oldham County/Dave Hart Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris West</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Manual/Fred Holden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve McDonald</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Burkesville Cumberland County/Terry Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Hall</td>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Ashland Fairview/Jim Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Glass</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Elkin Todd County Central/Fred Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kip Hagan</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Lexington Henry Clay/Al Prewitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Able</td>
<td>5-11</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Fairdale/Stan Hardin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KENTUCKY'S THIRD 10 ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Todd Holt</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Doss/Leon Mudd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Myers</td>
<td>6-4</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Barlow Ballard Memorial/Hugh Wear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Andrews</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>London Laurel County/Chuck Broughton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Sullivan</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Shelbyville Shelby County/Tom Creamer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Fiepke</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Elizabethtown/Roy Woolum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Mann</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Georgetown Scott County/Everette Varney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delbert Willis</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Thomas Jefferson/new coach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10 More Big Men of Note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>School/Public/Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Burdette</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Lexington Lafayette/Don Harville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Moore</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Southern/Rick Shadburne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Sergeant</td>
<td>6-0</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Male/Maurice Payne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Prince</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisa Lawrence County/Ron Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Matlock</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Bowling Green Warren Central/Curtis Turley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Turner</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>McDowell/David Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Olliges</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Louisville St. Xavier/Marty Donan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Groves</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Covington Holmes/Reynolds Flynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clint Kasinger</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Owensboro Daviess County/Michael West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy Jones</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Louisville DeSales/Lucian Raque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Phelps</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Moore/new coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Lane</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Morehead Rowan County/Ted Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris Stoner</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Shelbyville Shelby County/Tom Creamer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10 More Forwards of Note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>School/Public/Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Lester</td>
<td>6-5½</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Middlesboro/Larry Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Norris</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Paducah Tilghman/Berny Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Kinney</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Frankfort/John Lykins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Sanford</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Lexington Lafayette/Don Harville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Epperson</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Middlesboro/Larry Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Bates</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Lexington Henry Clay/Al Prewitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Jackson</td>
<td>6-4½</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Manual/Fred Holden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Bosley</td>
<td>6-4</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Richmond Madison/Tommy Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Harrison</td>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Shawnee/Lloyd Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Whitaker</td>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Hyden Leslie County/Wendel Wilson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10 More Guards of Note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>School/Public/Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Lawson</td>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Valley/Glenn Collie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoskins Carroll</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Compton Wolfe County/Arch Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Goff</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Iroquois/Charlie Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny Brown</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Moore/new coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Key</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Murray Calloway County/Coach Nebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete Grigsby</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>McDowell/David Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbie Davis</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Albany Clinton County/Gary Dunlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John DeCamillis</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville St. Xavier/Marty Donan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hamilton</td>
<td>6-1</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Danville Ky. School For Deaf/Arlene Finkle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont Porter</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Thomas Jefferson/new coach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Filling Out the Top 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>School/Public/Coach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark George</td>
<td>6-0</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Shelbyville Shelby County/Tom Creamer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddie Haltsley</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Bremen/Brian Whitaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty Stubblefield</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Lexington Tates Creek/Nolan Barger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Veach</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Covington Holmes/Reynolds Flynn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rondal Trigg</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Glasgow/Bobby Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Nesley</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Campbellsville Taylor County/Fred Waddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyville Wood</td>
<td>6-4</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Louisville Central/Robert Graves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Stewart</td>
<td>6-2</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Louisville Ballard/Don Salyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricky James</td>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Frankfort Franklin County/David Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Hagrane</td>
<td>6-5</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Morehead University Breckenridge/D. Dennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon Jacobs</td>
<td>6-3</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Louisville Butler/Mike Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Miller</td>
<td>6-4</td>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Shepherdsville Bullitt Central/Bill Schott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepphane Bishop</td>
<td>6-0</td>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Lexington Tates Creek/Nolan Barger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

B/C ALL STAR BASKETBALL CAMP
You're Invited!

Dear Coaches,

Yes, you're invited to attend all three of our talent-laden B/C All-Stars Basketball Camp boys sessions this summer.

We tip off with our Rensselaer, Indiana, camp June 14-19, followed by two weeks in Milledgeville, Georgia -- July 5-10 and July 26-31.

All three sessions will be ultra-competitive and we'll make this immediate prediction: the upcoming Indiana camp will be the No. 1 camp week in America this summer! Still not excited? Well, how about this: the tallest camp EVER! We will feature a minimum of 40 (!) players 6-foot-7/up, along with at least 10 of the top 15 returnees in all four Midwest big states (Ohio/Michigan/Indiana/Illinois). It will be a SUPER session of national scope.

Meanwhile back in Milledgeville, we're far ahead of the game. Thus far, we have committed the No. 1 player in eight of the 12 Southern states! Again, there will be tremendous size (four 7-footers already) as well as never-ending depth as the Eastern contingent lines up en masse.

Almost totally different players will participate in each camp. Campers play four games daily in addition to fundamentals, team practice, lectures, etc. Our Top 60 All-Star games will be conducted on Friday afternoons. All B/C subscribers have been mailed copies of our camp brochure which contains maps, phone numbers for motels, etc. New subscribers will be furnished a brochure upon request.

It's three weeks of intense basketball at its B/C best. We hope to see you all this summer! Bill Cronauer/Bill Bolton
**B/C All-Stars Boys Basketball Camp's 1980 College Counselors**

**JUNE 15-20**

**(Georgia):**

- Steve Neal: 6'-11" So Georgia Tech
- Elvis Rolle: 6'-10" Jr Florida State
- Maurice McDaniel: 6'-8" So Florida
- Dominique Wilkins: 6'-7" Fr Georgia
- Ed Rains: 6'-7" Jr South Alabama
- Derrick Hord: 6'-6½" Fr Kentucky
- Derek Perry: 6'-6" Fr Michigan State
- Elston Turner: 6'-5" Jr Mississippi
- Michael Davis: 6'-4½" Fr Alabama
- Michael Wilson: 6'-3" So Marquette
- Gary Carter: 6'-3" So Tennessee
- Bruce Jones: 6'-0" Jr Eastern Kentucky

**JUNE 20-25**

**(Georgia):**

- Rudy Woods: 6'-11" So Texas A&M
- Scott Hastings: 6'-10½" So Arkansas
- Craig McCormick: 6'-9½" So Western Kentucky
- Dale Solomon: 6'-9" So Virginia Tech
- Rudy Williams: 6'-7" Jr Providence
- Kevin Boyle: 6'-6" So Iowa
- Charles Bradley: 6'-5" Jr Wyoming
- Ricky Ross: 6'-5" Fr Kansas
- Darryl Mitchell: 6'-4" So Minnesota
- Raymond Whitley: 6'-3" Jr Oklahoma
- Billy Allen: 6'-0" So SMU

**JULY 13-18**

**(Indiana):**

- Greg Kite: 6'-11" Fr Brigham Young
- Larry Nance: 6'-10½" Jr Clemson
- Antoine Carr: 6'-9" Fr Wichita State
- Micah Blunt: 6'-9" So Tulane
- Alvis Rogers: 6'-6" So Wake Forest
- Michael Johnson: 6'-6" Fr UNCG-Charlotte
- Michael Hunt: 6'-4" Fr Furman
- Tony Washam: 6'-3" So South Florida
- Jimmy Bradock: 6'-1" Fr North Carolina
- Andy Kolesar: 6'-1" Jr VMI
- Grant Robinson: 6'-1" Fr Old Dominion

---

**Bill Cronauer**

**Larry Conley**

**Bill Bolton**

6200 20th Street South
St. Petersburg, Florida 33712
Phone (813) 867-4138
First-Class Staff

COACHES: B/C incorporates the finest high school coaches nationwide into a superb teaching staff. Dedication is the byword of B/C’s staff — our coaches drove from as far away as California and New York last summer to participate, and Dan Richardson, coach of defending national champion Macon Southwest (Ga.), has never missed a B/C session.

College Coaches

Exposure to college coaches is an added facet of B/C All-Stars participation. Each summer, the nation’s premier college head coaches and their assistants attend B/C. Our guests have included such personalities as Dean Smith of North Carolina, Joe B. Hall of Kentucky, Lefty Driesell of Maryland, Jud Heath of Michigan State, Norm Sloan of North Carolina, Bill Foster of Duke, Danny Cumm of Louisville and Elton Miller of Ohio State, to mention just a handful. It’s fact: Every B/C camp has attracted more than 200 nationwide coaches.

COUNSELORS: Each summer, B/C welcomes an All-American array of college players to assist our campers. B/C counselors have included Mike Gminski (Duke), Kyte Macy (Kentucky), Darrell Valentine (Kansas), Sam Worthington (Marquette), Jack Givens (Kentucky), Reggie Johnson (Tennessee) and Darrell Griffith (Louisville). Nothing but the best!

Superstar Manuel Forrest of Louisville, Ky., slams one as B/C.

Attendance at the invitation-only, superstar-oriented B/C All-Stars Basketball Camp provides the ultimate in instruction, competition and exposure. We call it “Saturation Basketball” — where the finest high school players across America congregate. Last summer, the best from 43 states traveled to Macon, Ga., to participate in our two sessions. This summer, we will expand into the Midwest for one week. Here’s our 1980 schedule: June 12-17 in Macon, Ga., July 10-15 in Milledgeville, Ga. Please contact B/C co-director Bill Cronauer at 6200 20th Street South, St. Petersburg, Fla. 33712 (phone 1-813-877-4138).
APPENDIX J

METRO INDEX REPORT
APPLICATION FOR SUBSCRIPTION TO METRO INDEX (1981-82)

REPORTS AVAILABLE:

A. United States High School and Junior College Coverage............................................. $ 170.
B. United States High School Coverage............................................................................ $ 130.
C. United States Junior College Coverage................................................................. $ 65.
D. Coverage of ONE area; Either East, Midwest, South, or West................................ $ 30.
   (Junior College Reports included)
E. Coverage of TWO areas; East, Midwest, South, or West...................................... $ 100.
   (Junior College Reports included)
F. Coverage of THREE areas; East, Midwest, South, or West................................... $ 120.
   (Junior College Reports included)
G. Any THREE States (List States Below).............................................................. $ 65.
H. High School Non-Predictor Reports................................................................. $ 50.

Upon request, return this form to: METRO INDEX or Call to place order
P.O. Box H6L2 (M2) 30-7099
Pittsburgh, PA 15228 ask for Joe Butler

Check space provided:

A. $170. / U.S. High School and JUCO
B. $130. / U.S. High School
C. $ 65. / U.S. Junior College
D. $ 30. / One area (Circle) and JUCO
   East, Midwest, South, West
E. $100. / Two areas (Circle) and JUCO
   East, Midwest, South, West
F. $120. / Three areas (Circle) and JUCO
   East, Midwest, South, West
G. $ 65. / Three States - List ________________
H. $ 50. / High School Non-Predictor Reports

PLEASE SEND REPORTS TO:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

SIGNATURE __________________________________________

PURCHASE ORDER # ___________________________

BILL ME LATER ______ BILLING DATE ______________

BILL WHAT DEPARTMENT __________________________

PAYMENT ENCLOSED ____________________________
POST PLAYERS

KEITH WESSON 6’9”/205 SR McKinley-Niles 44446 216/652-9753 Jerry Banaszak
Mid-Upper Div. 1/Low Post/reacts well, good hands, good runner, nice offn. player, bound by height rather than aggression, needs strength 2/7, Blk

MIKE GION 6’9”/225 SR Newark 44445 614/345-0260 Gary Walters
Mid-Upper Div. 1/Low Post/plays with back to hoop, can catch it, turn, and score on power move or short J, adeq. runner, works boards, probable #1 can 2/7.5, Prep, Wht

ALAN KORTEMAN 6’9”/210 SR St. John’s-Delphos 45833 419/692-5371 Bob Arsen
Mid Div. 1/Low Post/goes to war inside, gives a continuous effort on the glass, good runner, sure-handed, lacks the offn. punch 2/6, 89/16, Wht

MIKE GIOKI 6’8”/225 SR Newark 43055 614/345-0296 Gary Walters
Mid-Upper Div. l/Low Post/plays with back to hoop, can catch it, turn, and score on power move or short J, adeq. runner, works boards, probable 2/7.5, Prep, Wht

ALAN KORTOKRAK 6’9”/210 SR St. John’s-Delphos 45833 419/692-5371 Bob Arsen
Mid Div. 1/Low Post/goes to war inside, gives a continuous effort on the glass, good runner, sure-handed, lacks the offn. punch 2/6, 89/16, Wht

RORY DAHLINGKUS 6’8”/202 SR Marion Local-Maria Stein 45860 419/625-4997 Jack Albers
Low-Mid Div. 1/High Post/nore a finesse player than rbder., good touch within 15′, runs floor well, can catch it, needs more aggression 3/0, Wht

TROY KITCHOCK 7′2”/200 SR Winkle-Columbus 45207 614/491-427 Dave Miller
Low Div. 1/High Post/noted for his soft touch inside 15′, gets up & down floor OK, catches some passes, very, very weak body 1/7, General, Elk

JEFF TRESSLER 6’9”/200 SR Northland-Columbus 43229 614/807-9407 Art Signore
Low Div. 1/Low Post/200 lbs...not a good athlete, battles in there but not a dominate inside, good runner, can catch it, avg. shooter 2/9, Wht

RALPH WINTERS 6’9”/210 SR Orrville 44667 216/925-4597 Jack Albers
Low Div. 1/High Post/lefty who can score on baseline jumpers, above avg. speed, and tends to shy away from contact, needs toughness overall Voc., Elk

PAUL NEWMAN 6’8”/215 SR Wheelersburg 45694 614/574-2527 John Eaton
Div. 2/Low Post/active, good runner, good touch inside 15′, works at # 3 pos/Wht

ANTHONY LOVE 6’7”/196 SR Col. White-Dayton 45406 513/276-2107 Neil Rozyman
Div. 2/Low Post/strong pos. rbder., good hands, decent touch inside, adeq. speed 3/5, W

JOE BUTLER 6’6”/200 SR North Olmstead 44070 216/777-7700
Div. 3rr/back to hoop type, good pos. rbder., avg. shooter inside, above avg. speed/Wht
JOHNNIE WALTERS 6'8"/180 SR Philo 43771 614/674-6535 Dennis Booker 
Div. 3/High Post/good touch when open, is weak, needs aggression/3.0, Wht
KEN HAINES 6'7"/200 SR Worthington 43085 614/686-0030 Jon Daup 
Div. 3/high pos. rdb. who will work boards, above avg. speed, needs work on shot/2.5, Wh

JUNIORS
MARK BOODY 6'8"/200 Orange-Pepper Pike 44124 Bob Krains/ Mid Div. 1, Low Post, runs very well, good touch in lane, needs strength/2.8, Wh
MARTIN HENDRICK 6'10"/230 Whitehall 43213 Russ Gregg/ Low-Mid Div. 1, Low Post, growing, can catch ball, good scorer, avg. speed/Wht
JOHN GIBBS 6'8"/201 Lakewood 44107 Harry Graman/ Low Div. 1, Low Post, has nice touch inside 15', has good hands, decent speed, needs toughness/1.5, Wh
PAT WASHINGTON 6'4"/200 Princeton-Cincinnati 45240 John Hillard/ Low Div. 1, High Post, good runner, scorer, jumps well, adeq. 15' shooter/3.1k
LARRY KOTZMAN 6'8"/210 Ontario 44862 Pat Maurer/ Low Div. 1 Low Post, catches ball, good strength, power scorer, avg. footwork/Wht

POWER FORWARDS
DERRICK RUSSELL 6'6"/203 SR JF Kennedy-Cleveland 44128 216/921-1450 Bill Gabrell 
Mid Div. 1/rbder. with good strength, runs and jumps well, decent baseline jump shooter, adeq. passer, needs to play harder/2.2, Blk
KEN NIEBUHR 6'6'/200 SR South Grove 44281 216/373-3751 Dave Sladky 
Low Div. 1/rugged position rdb. with strength, when open can stick 15 jumpers, adeq. speed, hands are good, can't put ball on floor/3.3, 900, Wht
ED BRIGGS 6'5'/198 SR Rayen-East Liverpool 43339 216/747-6453 Frank Cegledy 
Low Div. 1/leaping type rdb. who is strong, runs very well, and scores on an uncanny jump shot to 15', tends to play out of control & prone to fouling/2.0, Blk
RODNEY REESE 6'4"/195 SR Princeton-Cincinnati 45240 513/771-8470 ?? 
Low Div. 1/athletic rdb. and scorer, jumps well, blocks shots, bounds, shot needs work/Bk
ARNOLD FRANKLIN 6'4"/190 SR Princeton-Cincinnati 45240 513/771-8470 ?? 
Div. 2/athletic rdb. and scorer, strong, bangs away, decent baseline touch/Bk

TOM ORLING 6'6"/208 SR St. Henry 45876 419/697-9373 Fran Guilbrault 
Div. 2/good passer, rdb., can shoot it when open, is avg., so-so speed/3.2, Wht
VINCENT JOHNSON 6'6'/188 SR Cleveland Heights 44116 216/292-7729 James Cappelletti 
Div. 2/big leaper, can work the glass, scorer but an avg. shooter 15', not quick/1.5, B
KENNY TAYLOR 6'6'/190 SR East-Cleveland 44403 216/631-5361 ?? 
Div. 2/rbder. with aggression, good speed, jumps well, needs offn. work/1.7, Blk
GERALD CHRISTIAN 6'4'/196 SR East Liverpool 43290 216/385-9900 Jim Irons 
Div. 2/strong, aggr., bangs away inside, good runner, fair offn., player/1.7, Blk
JACK GREEN 6'5'/195 SR Jackson-Hanna 44456 216/937-3501 Bruce Brown 
Div. 2/physical inside, good speed, strong, scorer predictably, within 15', shade slow/2.8, W
KAY HARRIS 6'6'/185 SR Bridge-Columbus 43223 614/274-1844 Paul Pennell 
Div. 2/strong, physical, and jumps well, quick footed, good touch in close/Bk
PETE SKINNER 6'6"/190 -SR West-Columbus 43204 614/274-5340 Dave Scheetz 
Div. 2/athletic rdb., has quick feet, more an inside scorer, can shoot it/2.4, Blk
KEITH TISDALE 6'4"/190 SR Maconahy Whitney-Toledo 43264 419/281-2277 Bart Schroeder 
Div. 2/strong over people to snare bounds, aggr., good hands, adeq. shooter/2.5, Blk
RON TAYLOR 6'5"/205 SR Rogers-Toledo 43615 419/536-3801 Bill Gladieux 
Div. 2/real strong and aggr., good runner, tough on boards, fair shooter/2.0, Bk
LUKE MURPHY 6'5'/195 SR Waite-Toledo 43605 419/691-9113 Dick Kuzma 
Div. 2/strong and bang away inside, good hands, decent shooter 15', adeq. speed/2.7, W
ED YOUNG 6'4"/190 SR Upper Sandusky 43371 419/394-1981 John Bowan/ Wh 
Div. 2/good player around hoop, fairly strong, sure-handed, OK speed, decent touch/3.1,
RON HARRIS 6'3'/190 SR Rogers-Toledo 43615 419/536-3801 Bill Gladieux 
Div. 3/athletic rbwr., runs & jumps well, just an avg. shooter/Bk
APPENDIX K

QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear Coach __________:

I am in the process of writing my doctoral dissertation at The Ohio State University. I am writing my dissertation in the area of college basketball recruiting. The problem of my study is to analyze the identification methods used by men's NCAA Division I, II, and III basketball programs to identify college basketball prospects.

I would appreciate your completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me as soon as possible. I will forward you the results of the study.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Thank you for your cooperation. I will look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Beitzel
Basketball Coach
Northern Kentucky University
1. Table I lists the methods of identifying college basketball prospects. If you use any of the methods as a means of accumulating names of potential basketball prospects, place an "X" in the appropriate box under Column I, labeled "accumulate." If you use the identification methods as a means of evaluating potential basketball prospects, place an "X" in the appropriate box under Column II, labeled "evaluate." Please specify any other methods of identifying basketball prospects which you may use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Column I</th>
<th>Column II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAU Tournaments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Star Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Scouting Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Initiated by Prospect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers or Magazines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Season Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Basketball Camps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Basketball Leagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Table II lists the methods of identifying college basketball prospects. Please rank the methods according to your preference for them. Assuming that you would have the time and money needed to implement each identification method, you should rank the methods according to how you would like to use them. Rank the methods with 1 the highest, 2 the next highest, and so on. Rank all of the methods, including those which you may prefer that are not included in the questionnaire. Under Column I, labeled "accumulate," rank the methods according to their ability to assist you in accumulating names of basketball players. Under Column II, labeled "evaluate," rank the methods according to their ability to assist you in evaluating the players' basketball ability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Column I &quot;Accumulate&quot;</th>
<th>Column II &quot;Evaluate&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAU Tournaments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Star Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Scouting Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Initiated by Prospect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers and Magazines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Season Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Basketball Camps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Basketball Leagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III requests information on the basketball players who are currently participating in your varsity basketball program. Under the column labeled "Player," numbers 1 through 15 are listed. These numbers represent the top 15 players in your basketball program. In Column I, labeled "Accumulation Method," please indicate the method or methods which were used to accumulate the players' name. In Column II, labeled "Evaluation Method," please indicate the method of methods which were used to evaluate the players' basketball ability. The identification methods are listed below with a number corresponding to each method. You may complete the Table III by writing the method used or by simply listing the appropriate number(s). For example, if you accumulated the name of player #1 through a scouting service, you may write in "scouting service" or simply list #5 in Column I in the appropriate space. If you evaluated Player #1 by going to a Summer Basketball Camp and Regular Season Games, you may write these methods or list the numbers #10 and #11 under Column II in the appropriate space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AAU Tournaments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All Star Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Audio-Visual Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Basketball Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scouting Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contact Initiated by Prospect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Form Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Newspapers or Magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Regular Season Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Summer Basketball Camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Summer Basketball Leagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tournament Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other (Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE III</th>
<th>Column I</th>
<th>Column II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Player</td>
<td>&quot;Accumulation Method&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Evaluation Method&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table III (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>&quot;Accumulation Method&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;Evaluation Method&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Table IV requests information concerning the financial costs generated by the identification methods. In Table IVa, please indicate your financial costs for identification methods used in off-campus recruiting. In Column I of Table IVa, list the average number of times you use the identification methods annually. In Column II of Table IVa, list the average financial cost per application of each identification method. Estimate your financial costs to the nearest hundred dollars. You should consider expenses related to off-campus recruiting such as transportation, meals, lodging, and any other related items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION METHODS</th>
<th>COLUMN I AVERAGE ANNUAL USAGE</th>
<th>COLUMN II AVERAGE COST PER APPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAU Tournaments</td>
<td>Average # of AAU tournaments attended annually</td>
<td>Average Cost per trip $_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Star Games</td>
<td>Average # of All Star games attended annually</td>
<td>Average Cost per trip $_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Sessions</td>
<td>Average # of Practice Sessions attended annually</td>
<td>Average Cost per trip $_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Season Games</td>
<td>Average # of Regular Season Games attended annually</td>
<td>Average Cost per trip $_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Basketball Camps</td>
<td>Average # of Summer Basketball Camps attended annually</td>
<td>Average Cost per trip $_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Basketball Leagues</td>
<td>Average # of Summer Basketball Leagues attended annually</td>
<td>Average Cost per trip $_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament Games</td>
<td>Average # of Tournament Games attended annually</td>
<td>Average Cost per trip $_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table IVb, please indicate the financial costs for identification methods used on campus. In Column I of Table IVb list the average number of times you use the identification methods annually. In Column II of Table IVb, list the average financial cost per application of each identification method. Please state your financial costs to the nearest hundred dollars.

**TABLE IVb**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION METHODS</th>
<th>COLUMN I AVERAGE ANNUAL USAGE</th>
<th>COLUMN II AVERAGE COST PER APPLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual Equipment</td>
<td>Average # of times you use film annually</td>
<td>Costs for film, maintenance, mailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scouting Services</td>
<td>Average # of services subscribed to annually</td>
<td>Average cost per service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Initiated by Prospect</td>
<td>Average # of contacts annually</td>
<td>$________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Letters</td>
<td>Average # of mass mailings made annually</td>
<td>Average cost per mailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers or Magazines</td>
<td>Average # of newspapers and magazines subscribed to annually</td>
<td>Average cost per subscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline</td>
<td># or long distance calls made monthly</td>
<td>Average cost of monthly phone bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of College or University: __________________________

NCAA Divisional Status: Division I ___ Div II ___ Div III ___

Your Name: __________________________ Title: ______________

Date: __________________________
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