

July 28, 2014

To: All Men's Division I Collegiate Coaches
From: MDTA – Coaches: Randy Bloemendaal; Gene Orlando; Brian Boland; Adam Herendeen; Jon Choboy; Chuck Kriese; Josh Goffi; Thomas Mozur.....up to 100 tba.....
Subject: ITA Procedure to Mandate Scoring System

Fellow Coaches,

The following pages include:

- a) *The cover letter that our MDTA (Men's Division I Tennis Association) has sent to the NCAA tennis committee on July 17.*
- b) *The letter and facts sheet sent to that same NCAA committee;*
- c.) *A copy of a letter from NCAA president calling upon us to listen to our student-athletes.*
- d.) *The reference letter and article of 'The Vote of 21-19' which describes December ITA meeting*

Please Take Time to Read and study the entire contents below as we will hopefully be able to discuss it thoroughly and decide its relevance or non-relevance for our conference.

Thank you, chuck kriese

Ps. Entire contents sent to all MDTA coaches the week of July 28 as well.



A.) Cover letter to the NCAA tennis committee:

From: "Bloemendaal, Randy Kenneth" <rbloemen@indiana.edu>

Date: July 17, 2014 at 7:06:26 PM EDT

To committee members who are: "mtp@athletics.wisc.edu" <mtp@athletics.wisc.edu>, "Robert.E.Bayliss.1@nd.edu" <Robert.E.Bayliss.1@nd.edu>, "tadb@arizona.edu" <tadb@arizona.edu>, "Robert.Trego@usafa.edu" <Robert.Trego@usafa.edu>, "ludwicle@drexel.edu" <ludwicle@drexel.edu>, "jeffconyers@usa.net" <jeffconyers@usa.net>, "steve.moore@tamucc.edu" <steve.moore@tamucc.edu>, "ppilote@stetson.edu" <ppilote@stetson.edu>, "gurule@athletics.gonzaga.edu" <gurule@athletics.gonzaga.edu>

Cc: MDTA reps "Chuck Kriese (ckriese@citadel.edu)" <ckriese@citadel.edu>, "Orlando, Gene (orlando@ath.msu.edu)" <orlando@ath.msu.edu>, Brian Boland "bpb8n@virginia.edu" <bpb8n@virginia.edu>

Subject: MDTA Scoring Protest/NCAA Tennis Committee

To: NCAA Tennis Committee: (**Cover Letter sent July 17, 2014**)

Please read our attached letter regarding the scoring format brought forward by the ITA. We are getting a lot of pushback from many coaches speaking privately about their disapproval of the

scoring change. They state that it surely does not solve the real problems at the NCAA championships, (which this entire movement since 2012 has stemmed from) while it adds multiple problems to both the fall season and the championship seasons in the spring. The student/athletes have also started a social media uprising again because they do not want to play no add scoring. 1348 votes against that change have been collected. An ITA poll showed 81 percent of student athletes being against the change for singles and 85% being against it for doubles. All of this and much more are in the letter below. Also enclosed is a copy of the letter written by NCAA President Mark Emmert which speaks to his concern for always giving voice to our student athletes. Lastly, a poll taken by MDTA has showed men's division I coaches voting 65-11 against the ITA mandate. The ITA has never produced 2/3 support for such a move.

Our recommendation is to have each conference review these issues in the fall and for you to consider the data that we have collected. We would like for you at very least to table this action. We believe that unless the entire coaching body can come up with a 66 percent majority of coaches, and to also have the approval from our current players, the ITA agenda should not be followed.

To solve our current problem we have to address the fact that concerns stem from scheduling problem at the NCAA championships and not the format-fundamentals of our sport. TV matches can easily have a separate format when needed and individual teams/coaches should be responsible to solve their own attendance problems. The potential upsides of such a drastic move from the base norms of our sport do not outweigh the multiple downsides of such a move. One of these unfortunately includes further diminishment of our sport's relevance and skewed results for the work done by our student-athletes. Thank You, MDTA

B.) June 24, 2014

To: NCAA Tennis Committee

From: Representing Men's Division 1 Tennis Association are: Randy Bloemendaal (Indiana University); Chuck Kriese; (The Citadel); Gene Orlando (Michigan State University), Brian Boland (University of Virginia), Adam Herendeen (Presbyterian College)

Subject: Opposition to ITA Mandate

The MDTA (Men's Division 1 Tennis Association) is conducting an on-going poll that shows a current vote of 65-11 against the recent ITA (Intercollegiate Tennis Association) mandate to abbreviate the traditional scoring system for collegiate tennis. In an ITA conducted poll this spring, student-athletes voted an unprecedented 81percent disapproval to that mandate for singles and 85%disapproval for its use in doubles. Just as well, a privately conducted poll by a top USA collegiate player has 1,348 signatures that speak against the system that is being proposed by the ITA. In 2012, there was an independent poll taken that produced near 10,000 signatures in opposition to radical changes in the scoring system of tennis. These, and the lack of

acknowledgement by ITA, support the fact that voices of multiple coaches and players are not being heard.

The disregard for the opinions of our student-athletes explicitly contradicts the points made by NCAA president Mark Emmert in a recent NCAA magazine article. (see this attached article in Adobe format) In normal instances, changes of such magnitude should also require a minimum 2/3 majority vote of support from coaches. This should also be taken only after adequate and fair procedure of debate. In December of 2013, there was good debate taken on the floor of the ITA convention. That result has been ignored as well. (see attached article below: ‘The vote of 21-19’) Therefore; On Behalf of fellow Division 1 Men’s tennis coaches, we voice to you our serious opposition to the actions being taken by the ITA to fundamentally change our sport and the fundamental scoring system that been proven by championship play around the world for over a century.

Our organization of coaches requests feedback from you on the following questions and points of concern. Coaches believe that this is necessary in order to take positive direction with their programs.

1. Does the ITA have the power, the right and the moral authority to force this drastic change upon NCAA college tennis without proper parliamentary procedures of at least 2/3 majority vote etc.?
2. We object whole-heartedly to the methods used by ITA in forcing through this scoring change without enough support of coaches.
3. We strongly believe that the creation of the movement to change the scoring system does not solve our current problems at the NCAA championship, and it seriously adds problems for our traditional fall and spring seasons. We have a scheduling problem; not a format problem. The reality is that a 32-team event is too large to be accommodated properly.
4. We strongly suggest that fundamental changes in collegiate scoring system be stopped immediately to preserve our sports sacred heritage.
5. We request a meeting with your organization as soon as it can be arranged.

In Conclusion:

There is surely great concern about the current lack of relevance of the sport of college tennis. Our professional organizations such as the USTA, USPTA, PTR, ITA and MDTA are deeply concerned as this lack of relevance affects many aspects in the lives of our student-athletes and our coaches. However, the overwhelming evidence shows that coaches and players do not want the scoring change! The decline of our sport absolutely needs to be addressed on many fronts; however, the continuing focus on scoring formats does not help our cause enough while the risk to our great sport is overwhelming. Meanwhile, we are continuing to lose opportunities to grow and to put our sport onto higher plateaus.

Real, and much needed, solutions can be found without dismantling the most sacred heirloom of our sport. Our scoring system is time-tested and the great cornerstone of our sport around the world. The loss of relevance and the dropping of so many teams (400+) is much more complex than the simplistic explanation that has been continuously promoted. We ask you to table the change promoted by ITA and also wait until individual conferences have better opportunity to discuss the situation in depth.

We look forward to your response and thank you for the opportunity to present this at a critical time in our collegiate game's history.

With Unity and sincere Conviction, we are:

Chuck Kriese, Randy Bloemendaal, Gene Orlando, Brian Boland, Adam Herendeen and many other coaches, student-athletes and lovers of our sport.

Please read the attached letter from NCAA President Mark Emmert (Adobe Attachment) and the article 'The vote of 21-19' which is below.

C.) *The article by Mark Emmert from the NCAA magazine of May 2014 is an Adobe Attachment*

D.) 'The Vote of 21-19' (summary of ITA meeting of 2013 in Naples, FL.)
by chuck kriese

"An unjust law is no law at all" St. Augustine

The Scoring System of tennis is one of its most sacred heirlooms. The fluctuation of pressures from one lead to the next is why tennis dwarfs other racquet sports in comparison. The tennis player must not only become adept in skill-sets of physical performance, but the scoring forces him/her to develop good abilities in mental and emotional aspects as well. The intrigue and drama of the game happen largely because of the implications of rapidly changing momentum swings enhanced by a scoring system established over 100 years ago.

The ITA (Intercollegiate Tennis Association) had its annual convention and coaches meeting in December. The hottest and the most pressing topic of 2013-14 has become 'Collegiate Dual-match Formats and Scoring Systems.' The overused talking point being promoted this year is: 'College tennis will not survive unless dual match format starts and finishes under 3 hours.' Interestingly, this same issue was also the hot topic in the spring of 2012 a collegiate committee had randomly injected a radical system destined to drastically change college tennis' long-used traditional format. There had been obvious

scheduling problems at the 2012 NCAA tournament as 32 teams (16 men and 16 women's) had to play late into the night making the event look much less than professional.

The college committee reacted to long days of tennis at the NCAA event by trying to push forward a deviation from the normal format. The new dual match proposal in summer of 2012 was met with 10,000-plus signatures of protest from around the country. An internet site had been set up by tennis student-athletes in protest. Tennis coaches, players and college tennis supporters expressed serious disapproval. To slow down the fire-storm, the committee tabled their idea and waited. The movement continued this summer as a joint USTA/college group introduced a 'morphed' version of what they had tried to do a year earlier.

Prior to 2006, men and women's teams played at different sites. A 51-2 vote by men's coaches in 2005 wanted to keep it that way, but the board pushed forward an agenda to combine all men and women's teams to be the same site anyway. Scheduling before that move was always a challenge, but it was never a great issue as the unique needs of both groups were handled well.

Multiple collegiate coaches believe that the 3-hour time limit for college match is a talking-point and a potential 'Ruse.' It is primarily based on entertainment objectives with little regard for player development issues. 'Brian Boland, coach of the National Championship Virginia Cavaliers stated at the ITA meeting, "The real problem is not the time, but more it is that there were too many moving parts at our NCAA championships with 32 teams to take care of." "It has created a logistical nightmare." In agreement are traditional coaches who believe that the educational aspects of tennis are a more important part of the college game. Those coaches disdain the abbreviated and bastardized formats for scoring. To not use traditional scoring drastically deemphasizes important elements of work ethic, conditioning and important learning aspects that only come from tough matches.

The December meeting of the ITA brought the fight between 'Education vs. Entertainment' to the floor. After nearly 5 hours of debate and heated emotions of philosophical divisions, the board members eliminated all options but two from the black-board and gave the men's coaches a choice and a vote. Both were designed to shorten the matches and no-other option would be acceptable for the first one third of the season of 2014. . *'There was never an agreement of the coaches in the room that 'Time' was the true reason for the problems of college tennis'.* That early talking- point and need to shorten the match seemed to have become as an assumption of truth.

The two formats were presented. The First format was that singles matches would be 2 out of 3 sets with traditional scoring. However, a tie-breaker would be played at 5-5 instead of 6-6. The doubles would only be a 6 game set instead of a pro-set. The Second proposed format was that the players would play full singles matches and a pro-set for doubles. However, the abbreviated system of no-ad would be used. The vote was made. Coaches voted to protect the integrity of traditional tennis scoring with a 21-19 vote in favor of using regular scoring with TB's at 5-5 instead of 6-6. A vote had been made, and most left the room feeling that a small victory had been won in the preservation of a scoring system that would not diminish the game.

The board of directors met for a separate meeting later that day to finalize the matter. It was decided that the vote taken in the afternoon was too close to call, and there was definitely not a mandate for either system. In a turn-of-events, the decision made by the board was that it should therefore be allowable for

another format to be promoted as the solution. As if an election between two political candidates was too close to call, an outside candidate was put into place. The format decided on to be played for the first six weeks of the season would therefore be abbreviated sets with TBs at 5 and the use of No-ad scoring. Arguably, this new option actually took the worst aspect of the first two proposals and pushed them into play. The mandate to be put into place had never been debated by the general coaching body nor had been brought up as an alternative in the coaches meeting.

The great game of tennis should be protected and not be compromised by political agenda. College tennis is one of the most important developmental tools that our country has for our youngsters to hone their skills and develop important leadership abilities. It is simplistic at best to conclude that the saving of a few minutes in a tennis match is worth all that is lost by the dismantling of its scoring system.