

**World Class Coaching
International Coaching Seminar
Feb 20-22, 2004
Kansas City, MO**

**Anson Dorrance Presentation on
The UNC Competitive Cauldron**

For Further Detail:

- “Training Soccer Champions” – by Anson Dorrance
- “The Vision of a Champion” – by Anson Dorrance
 - Both available at
www.athletics.unc.edu/wsoccer/shop/shop.htm

Team Trains the Keeper



Organization

- Played within the 18
- Three Attackers
- Two Defenders
- One Goalkeeper
- Two to three shooters at the top of the D with a pile of balls
- Arc of servers outside the 18, each has a ball.

Exercise starts with a flank service. Ball is dead when it is in the goal, out of play or cleared over the arc of servers who may one touch the ball back into the box.

One touch restriction for all players outside the box

When ball is dead, shooter at the top of the “D” takes a two touch shot. When ball is dead, move to the second server and repeat until all players have served from the left to the right.

Tactical Coaching Points by Position

➤ Strikers



Coaching Point

When ball is being served from the flank

Two attackers closest to the flank service front the defenders putting themselves in a

- Goal scoring position,
- Position to flick on or play it back to the supporting central midfielder

▪ And making it impossible for defender to clear service

Third striker reads service and reacts to the situation

- Can head or shoot to goal if it is served directly to her
- Can serve it back post
- Can redirect ball to supporting midfielder
- Frame outside back post to finish balls that make it through the crowd by flicks or poor clearances



Coaching Point

Framing the goal on the shot from the box

- Central attacker positions herself approximately 5 yards in front of the goalkeeper to provide a screen for the shot
- Move toward shot to avoid goalkeeper
- Must keep this distance so that no obstruction call is made
- Redirect or dummy over the shot and quickly turn to put away

second chances

- Wide strikers position themselves two yards wide of the post to redirect any shots going wide
- Finish any balls deflected by goalkeeper or shanked by defenders.

➤ **Defending**



Dealing with flighted ball service, three strikers, and shooting midfielders.

- Starting position to defend danger areas in box
- Clearance decisions:
- Heading: flicking it wide if going over her head or heading it back where it came from, preferably outside the 18, high and wide
- Kicking: Clear ball so that it goes over arc of players and kills the play.
- Aggression to win all service: tackling and heading
- If goalkeeper calls for ball, shield players off keeper or drop into the goal to provide cover
- Proper pressure/cover defense when the attack have possession in the box

Transition to shot:

- Drop in to post to make goal smaller for the goalkeeper
- Clear balls off line and ultimately over arc of servers

➤ **Midfielders**



Shooting from Top of Box

- Midfielders strike long range on frame with focus on finishing
- Read goalkeeper: if she is out, chip it. If she is screened or out of position, shoot to most advantageous spot.
- Finish redirects back from strikers – one touch
- Finish poor clearances from defenders – one touch

Role of Perimeter

- Concentrate on accurate service between strikers and goalkeepers. Alternate service; one that favors the goalkeeper, then one that favors the strikers.
- First time (one touch) redirects on poor defensive clearances into dangerous parts of box for attacking personalities to finish.

➤ **Goalkeeping:**

Dealing with crosses in a crowded box.

- Starting position for crosses: Yard or two off line and roughly in the center of the goal
- Decision Making:
- Call “Keeper” and win cross
- Extend range based on type of cross: driven, high and looping.
 - One handed to redirect and continue ball in the direction it was going
 - Two handed to send the ball back where it came from. Ideally high, far and wide (outside 18 is acceptable)
- If going for cross and under heavy pressure and ball cannot be caught comfortably must box.
- If not coming for cross, call “Away” and get one step off the line to deal with header or shot.

Transition to the shot

- Read the first touch from striker at the top of the D
- Steal ground to improve angle play and make save
- Must contend with player in front obstructing vision and flicking ball on to goal.
- Must have the ability to seize opportunity to pounce on loose ball if it is deflected or attackers have bad touch.

Anson’s 3-4-3 Coaching Philosophy

In our coaching evolution one of the critical areas of expertise that we all feel is a part of our personal fabric is our ability to develop players. If we did not feel that this coaching quality was a part of our makeup we would not coach. And yet with this as a given it is interesting how rarely we address at any level whether systems can develop players. Usually when systems are addressed they are discussed within the context of maximizing the unique talents or hiding the deficiencies of our player pools: what system should I play to take advantage of my strength? What system should I play to hide and protect my weaknesses? Also if we sing the praises of a system it is because, for most of us, that is the system we feel most confident coaching, or in the international arena, that is the system that is mandated by our coaching leadership and everyone in our country, from national teams down, play the same system.

We have a wonderful advantage when it comes to systems here in the United States. We have no historical tradition that traps us into one particular way to play, no nationally consistent weather condition that would guide us towards a direct game to avoid playing on the ground (because of rain and muddy conditions) or an indirect game to survive the heat and conserve energy. Since we are a melting pot of culture we have passionate and persuasive advocates for every style within our borders and see these influences at every level and this is very healthy. It forces us to think and evaluate what we do on a regular basis. Even the evolution of our U.S. Women's National Team reflects ideas stolen from respected opponents as we try to continually get better.

So with this ambition to constantly improve as a backdrop, let's seriously address the question can systems develop players? Or more pointedly does playing one system do more for player development than playing another? Or even more specifically is the semi flat back 3-4-3 the best system for the player development of our girls and women here in the United States?

The Premier Course of the NSCAA has begun this dialogue. Their course materials kick off the conversation in an outline about the 3-4-3:

Advantages of a Three-Front

Defending

1. The three-front system allows a team to apply pressure closer to the opponent's goal. The three-front does not steer the opposing team's attack as a two-front does, but attempts to intercept the ball immediately.
2. This system puts tremendous pressure on a weak opponent. It is particularly effective against a team that cannot serve long balls to strikers. It is also considered to be a good system against players who cannot hit long passes that get behind defenses.
3. The system encourages opposing teams to play the ball forward predictably – making it difficult to play the ball sideways and change the point.
4. The system tends to force opponents back players into smaller spaces.
5. A three-front can mask a slow player both offensively and defensively.
6. A three-front forces an opponent to adjust. Few teams are willing to play 3v3 in their defensive third and are not used to the additional pressure even if they are in a four back.
7. Changing into a three-front can frequently change a teams' rhythm and makes a team more aggressive.
8. When playing against a 4-4-2, the back three in a 3-4-3 can play man-to-man with a sweeper or in a zone (which for the purposes of this paper is the defense of choice).

Attacking

1. The front line is already positioned to attack when the ball is won.
2. It is easier to play directly with three targets rather than two.
3. A three-front evenly spreads physical demands on strikers. The runs of the strikers are shorter defensively and offensively compared to a two-front.
4. It is easier for a three-front to attack near, middle and far post spaces because of numbers in the box.
5. The three-front creates immediate width as forwards going wide have a shorter run to make. The width provided by a three-front makes it effective against low-pressure defenses since width is a fundamental building block in breaking down bunkers and packed defenses.
6. A three-front sweeping to one side can pull a man-to-man defense to one side, exposing an opponent's weak side and with the same concept of "flooding zones" can cause zonal defenses "numbers down" issues.
7. The team is psychologically in an attacking mode when structured with three forwards. That is a powerful mentality to take into every game

Negatives of a Three-Front

1. Three players can be played out of a game immediately with one forward pass.
2. Three players receive ball with their back to goal.
3. Team can be out numbered in midfield if opponents play with five.
4. More effective against players who do not have the ability to hit the ball over the top of a three-front.
5. Team generally defends with seven rather than eight field players.
6. Three-back system is vulnerable on outside corners.
7. Tends to pull more opponents defenders back into the vital area, thus compacting more defenders into important attacking spaces.

We can make this conversation gender specific and culturally specific by stating that the women's game has not evolved technically to the point where early and high pressure with numbers does not benefit you. It is also a part of the American cultural fabric to go after opponents with a high work rate and maximum pressure from our players all over the field so playing with three high and compacting the game is going to play into our aggressive and hard working personalities well. And the same reason the early pressure with three works is why the semi flat three in the back works . . . technically and tactically our game (the women's game) has not evolved to a point where beating an organized flat three is easy to do when there is pressure all over the field. And this is the beginning of why playing the semi flat 3-4-3 is so good for player development. In this system everyone has to play, no one can take a mental or physical vacation and everyone is stretched offensively and defensively . . . everyone has to defend or you will be picked apart and everyone has to have the skill to attack because you don't have a traditional numbers up zone (the back) where you can hide your technically inefficient players and start your build up.

Starting with the player development demands that are clear: this system mandates that the goalkeeper have the courage to play high off her line, be able to play with her feet and read the game like a sweeper as well as have all of the traditional qualities of a line goalkeeper. The playing demands on the goalkeeper and their additional responsibilities to stay totally focused and make constant positional adjustments to come out quickly to cut out through balls or drop back quickly into goal if opponents are played in behind the line will take goalkeepers to another level of responsibility that in turn will take them to another ability level.

One of the complaints we often hear from national coaches is how few players, even high level ones, can defend one v. one. Surely part of the problem is because so many of our youth defenders are used to playing in a 4-4-2 where they have such numerical superiority all match that their 1v1 requirements are few and rarely exposed. The 1v1 responsibility in a flat three are greater because the players are more often isolated in these 1v1 duels forcing them to develop a tackling capacity to just survive the match.

Defensively the flat three also forces all three defenders (and the goalkeeper obviously) to read the game and anticipate service. There is so much space behind and to the sides of the flat three defenders they are in constant motion stepping up when the opponent plays the ball square or back and getting side on and sprinting straight back when the opponent is serving over the top or through. Beyond reading the game there are wonderful leadership requirement for all three players in the semi flat three. The central player is constantly moving the line left and right, forward and back . . . based on ball position and pressure. The weak side flank players are organizing the flat line and taking over like a sweeper verbally since this weak side defender is the only one able to see the ball, the line and the opponents running at or through the line . . . “ordering” people into the correct shape and warning teammates of blind side runs spreads the leadership responsibility to all three back players. Like the 1v1 exposure of these three backs the organizational requirements are “lead” or “die”. And anyone that is involved in women’s soccer development knows the challenge of finding verbal leaders. This system not only needs it, it can’t survive without it.

One other thing the system needs to survive . . . a commitment from all the players to play hell bent for leather defense . . . because of the huge risk of a flat three and all the space you are giving up behind, EVERY player has to pressure, work hard and tackle. The classic condition of the “I will attack but not defend” front runner has no place in this system because the system collapses if the opponents backs have time to pick you apart with balls played forward accurately and with the correct texture and pace. So even though theoretically all players are expected to defend and all coaches ask all their players to, this system forces every player to defend or you get shredded . . . there is a system incentive to work and you are punished immediately when you don’t.

Offensively this system is designed to allow everyone to go forward and get maximum numbers in the attacking box (if any of the back three go, the holding midfielder sits in the middle of the flat back). Ideally, five people can be committed to the attacking box with all the front runners expected to be committed on every attack with the weak side midfielder and the attacking midfielder as well . . . leaving a defensive midfielder and the flat three ready for the counter if the strong side midfielder is bypassed. It becomes six in the attacking box if a flank midfielder gets end line. Another fringe benefit of the three up high is that you will always have at least one player attacking the restraining line to get in through or over the top. Many systems have little balance between the direct and indirect game because the only consistent options are indirect and short permitting defenders to over-commit or get lazy with everything forever in front of them. Like the individual defending issue, another consistent issue is our technical problem with serving the ball accurately over distance. How could this be a surprise with 90% of the running in our most popular systems to check and play the ball to someone's feet 20 yards away or closer? When in a game do our young players have a chance to serve the ball long? Usually our flank midfielders do have the energy early in the game when we change the point to make that death run over the top in the 4-4-2 but as the game wears on we see that run less and less. It is just too long a run in the women's game to be made all game long because if you think about it our women are playing on a field originally designed for men so a 120 yard by 75 yards men's field feels like a 129 yard by 80 yard for these women and after a while for the people sprinting on the flank it wears on you. So should any of us be surprised that no one can serve accurately over distance? It is not a required skill for the way most of us are playing.

Before I go too far without addressing this: one of the greatest things about this semi flat back 3-4-3 system is the number of players who have opportunities to face players and run at them 1v1. Lets face it the best teams always seem to have many of these talented 1v1 artists, so why not play a system that gives the highest number of players these 1v1 opportunities. In the semi flat back 3-4-3 you have five players that are called upon regularly to run at defenses . . . all three front-runners and both flank midfielders. One interesting development was to read in Soccer America last year that the English youth national teams changed to a three front. Through Jack Detcheon former FA staff coach and now an NSCAA staff coach we found out this decision was made by the English national staff to encourage more 1v1 play on the flank.

Developmentally there is no mystery to the positions in our game that require the greatest technical mastery and challenge: the attacking positions and the players that are played further forward are the ones that game in, game out are "developed" the most. Those are the areas that players have the least time and space and are dealing with the most pressure, so why not play as many players as you can as forward as possible. And if you do want to develop your defenders offensively why not challenge them by not giving them such a numerical superiority so they too have an opportunity to experience the stress of numbers even or close to it. This system also puts wonderful pressure on your midfielders to go forward because sometimes

passing backwards with a three back is not such a safe haven of numerical superiority or ball possession.

And then the scrimmage training environment for this is a competitive caldron of pressure and a minimum of time and space where both your practice scrimmage units of your 3-4-3 matched up against you 3-4-3 create so much constant pressure all over the field that when you finally get to a game against an opponent who plays a more classical 4-4-2 you feel like you are on vacation and so do your players.

PRINCIPLES OF ATTACK AND DEFENSE

Demonstration:

- Attacking and Defensive Shape in the Semi-flat back 3-4-3 Zone

Principles of the semi flat back three.

11v11 in a semi-flat back 3-4-3 zone

Team Offensive Shape Choreography

Principles of attack- get into attacking shape immediately !!!

- 1) Expansion-Diagram
 - a) Penetration.
 - b) Width.
 - c) Support.
- 2) Width in midfield in defensive half; up top in attacking half.
- 3) Flooding zones up top.
- 4) Change of Fields.

Team Defensive Shape Choreography

- 1) Principles of Team Defense- get into defensive shape immediately
- 2) Attacking third (diagram)
 - a) Pressure.
 - b) Cover.
 - c) Balance.

Midfield

Defense



Notes to Coach

Defenders tactical decisions are all based on the pressure on the ball and reading the intention of the player with the ball



Coaching Point

Some examples:

- If the ball is under heavy pressure and the player cannot serve forward then the defense can step up in support.
- If the ball is passed back defenders can step out but must read player receiving the ball.
- If she has her head up and is looking behind the line, the defense must get side on and drop on the serve. This allows the defense to eliminate the space behind them and win the ball facing up field.
- If she is facing a sideline or turns back to her goal, the line can step out or hold based on the situation.
- If a player is faced up with the ball and running at the central defender, other two defenders pinch in and drop slightly behind to cover and deny a pass that would split them.
- Don't track straight runs through the line, just track the ball.
- Must honor horizontal run across the line. One zone can pass the player on to the next defender.
- Not playing an offside trap. Must track the ball when it is being served
- Only leave shape if you are going to win the ball or if the player you are closing has no support. If you leave and do not win it, there is too much space exposed and two people will have difficulty covering it. Be patient!
- If ball is played over the defense, play the ball back to the goalkeeper as quickly as possible and expand to support a pass if she is under pressure and cannot clear it long.
- Staying aligned and moving constantly left, right, forward, and back
- Staying close together in the column the ball is in even on offense
- The semi flat line is drawn just underneath the opponent's highest striker.
- It is the responsibility of the midfielder sitting on the semi flat three to pressure the player checking below the flat three. This is a sideline to sideline responsibility

North Carolina Women's Soccer

Measuring the Wind: Tracking
Technical Development

University of North Carolina

Women's Soccer

2001 Final Statistical Composite Rankings

Rank	Player	Preseason Testing																	Aerobic Fitness			Anaerobic Fitness		Bogies		Iv1's	Iv1's to Goal		Three Tier Shooting	Shooting	Triangle Passing	Long Service	LS/LR	Heading			Most Competitive	Total Points	Player	Rank
		Sub-Category	Ave Spd	Fastest Spd	An Fit	Accel	Agil	Vert J	Beep	Cooper	120's	Cones	Test	Season Comp	Offensive	Defensive	Offensive	Defensive	Power I	Power II	A&D																			
		Sub-Cat Multiplier	1/2X*	1/2X*	1/2X	1X	1/2X	1X	1X	1/2X	1X	1X	1/2X	1 1/2 X	2X	2X	2X	2X	1X	1X	2X																			
		Category Multiplier	5X							2 1/2 X			2 1/2 X		2X		4X	4X		1X	1/2 X	1X	1/2X	2X	4X															
1.	Kluegel, Jena	3,7,9	3	3	5	16	7	10	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	4	11	6	10	22	11	3	9	8	14	11	3	2090	Kluegel, Jena	3,7,9	1.								
2.	Reddick, Catherine	11,-,-	10	17	4	18	9	5	12	16	14	12	8	12	8	10	2	2	3	5	21	5	1	1	1	5	10	2333	Reddick, Catherine	11,-,-	2.									
3.	Gaston, Leslie	14,17,-	4	2	11	2	12	4	7	6	4	15	5	8	1	13	11	8	18	9	9	4	10	3	2	2	3	4	2410	Gaston, Leslie	14,17,-	3.								
4.	Remy, Anne	6,2,13	7	8	9	7	6	5	5	4	7	9	7	9	5	5	10	9	5	1	1	12	14	6	10	10	6	7	2475	Remy, Anne	6,2,13	4.								
5.	Ramsey, Alyssa	9,-,-	7	12	5	16	4	12	3	6	9	10	5	7	14	5	3	5	2	8	3	10	4	2	4	4	4	16	2495	Ramsey, Alyssa	9,-,-	5.								
6.	Borgman, Danielle	1,9,14	2	1	15	12	3	5	2	2	12	1	2	5	10	3	1	6	4	16	15	6	7	16	15	16	12	8	2540	Borgman, Danielle	1,9,14	6.								
7.	Randolph, Sara	-,-,-	6	7	10	5	2	12	3	5	1	1	3	4	6	3	7	4	12	3	6	2	6	5	12	11	16	17	2665	Randolph, Sara	-,-,-	7.								
8.	Bush, Susan	8,6,-	1	6	6	3	1	9	5	8	4	1	4	2	7	1	8	13	7	21	4	4	16	10	14	14	16	12	2890	Bush, Susan	8,6,-	8.								
9.	Felts, Anne	-,-,-	16	20	8	17	18	17	7	6	6	1	4	6	4	12	4	10	8	14	13	19	10	3	19	9	14	6	2895	Felts, Anne	-,-,-	9.								
10.	Morrell, Anne	-,-,-	11	19	1	22	13	3	15	12	19	20	10	14	2	5	15	1	1	6	9	13	7	12	10	7	10	5	3190	Morrell, Anne	-,-,-	10.								
11.	Tomecka, Maggie	7,-,-	11	15	7	14	4	1	17	19	13	10	10	11	19	14	12	12	14	7	2	15	13	14	18	9	3	1	3360	Tomecka, Maggie	7,-,-	11.								
12.	McDowell, Mary	-,-,-	4	12	2	15	15	12	3	3	1	1	10	15	11	11	6	15	16	19	15	3	5	11	6	5	8	12	3445	McDowell, Mary	-,-,-	12.								
13.	Walker, Jordan	16,19,-	18	21	3	23	20	12	13	9	10	1	13	19	18	22	9	18	17	12	19	1	9	8	7	12	17	2	4098	Walker, Jordan	16,19,-	13.								
14.	Ball, Elizabeth	19,22,-	21	13	21	8	19	18	16	18	22	16	12	19	20	18	13	3	10	4	13	8	2	7	3	5	2	14	4160	Ball, Elizabeth	19,22,-	14.								
15.	Watley, Carmen	17,-,-	8	2	19	11	4	9	18	9	21	17	1	1	9	5	16	7	9	22	4	15	13	15	5	13	12	19	4165	Watley, Carmen	17,-,-	15.								
16.	Whittier, Amy	-20,-	8	5	18	10	11	12	9	7	16	14	5	13	16	9	19	16	11	15	9	17	17	13	18	21	7	11	4555	Whittier, Amy	-20,-	16.								
17.	Smith, Jane	23,-,-	15	9	14	4	7	5	11	15	17	20	12	16	12	17	14	20	19	18	6	21	20	14	13	8	9	15	4880	Smith, Jane	23,-,-	17.								
18.	Costa, Johanna	21,23,22	13	18	12	11	21	11	9	11	15	1	15	17	21	21	17	19	13	11	15	9	20	9	16	18	20	9	4990	Costa, Johanna	21,23,22	18.								
19.	Winslow, Laura	-,-,-	13	13	22	19	10	23	21	14	11	19	11	10	17	18	17	17	15	17	6	18	23	24	21	17	21	20	6090	Winslow, Laura	-,-,-	19.								
20.	Gervais, Sophie	-,-,-	20	16	19	13	14	20	20	17	17	18	17	17	13	15	20	21	21	13	19	20	19	22	20	15	14	18	6160	Gervais, Sophie	-,-,-	20.								
21.	Blomgren, Leigh	-,-,-	19	10	20	1	17	21	17	13	23	23	16	21	22	15	22	14	20	2	15	13	17	23	17	19	18	22	6310	Blomgren, Leigh	-,-,-	21.								
22.	Ball, Susie	24,-,-	22	24	16	20	22	22	22	20	26	26	18	22	15	20	20	22	22	20	9	22	24	18	22	20	19	21	7065	Ball, Susie	24,-,-	22.								

Rank	Keeper	Preseason Testing																	Aerobic Fitness			Bogies		Iv1's	Iv1's to Goal		Three Tier Shooting	Triangle Passing	Long Service	LS/LR	Most Competitive			Total Points	Keeper	Rank
		Sub-Category	Ave Spd	Fastest Spd	An Fit	Accel	Agil	Vert J	Beep	Cooper	120's	Cones	Test	Season Comp	Offensive	Defensive	Offensive	Defensive	Power I	Power II	A&D															
		Sub-Cat Multiplier	1/2X*	1/2X*	1/2X	1X	1/2X	1X	1X	1/2X	1X	1X	1/2X	1 1/2 X	2X	2X	2X	2X	1X	1X	2X															
		Category Multiplier	5X							1 1/2 X			2X		4X	2X		4X	1X	1/2X	2X	4X														
1.	DePlatchett, Kristin	2,2,2	8	3	13	9	16	2	14	10	8			1		3	2			2		6	10	16				2	1350	DePlatchett, Kristin	2,2,2	1.				
2.	Branam, Jenni	1,1,-	17	11	17	6	5	12	17	18	24			3		1	3			1		25	16	25				1	2000	Branam, Jenni	1,1,-	2.				
3.	Simmons, Katie	3,-,-	23	22	23	21	23	18	23	21	20			2		2	4			3		24	25	20				4	2625	Simmons, Katie	3,-,-	3.				
4.	Winget, Aly	-,-,-	24	22	24	24	24	24	24	24	24			4		4	1			4		23	20	21				3	2860	Winget, Aly	-,-,-	4.				

NOTES: FINAL RANKINGS FOR EACH CATEGORY ARE INDICATED IN BOXES (1 to 22)

: RANKING IS MULTIPLIED BY MULTIPLIER (IMPORTANCE OF CATEGORY)

: ALL CATEGORIES' MULTIPLIED SCORES ARE ADDED FOR TOTAL

* CENTRAL PLAYERS (Felts, Tomecka, McDowell, Walker, Reddick, Gaston) HAVE MULTIPLIER 1/2 OF OTHER PLAYERS' (1/4 X)

** large italic # RANKS DERIVED FROM COMPARABLE DRILLS SINCE PLAYERS DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN TESTS

University of North Carolina
Women's Soccer

2001 Fall Fit Test Revised

8/15/01

<u>Vert Jump</u>		<u>Agility</u>		<u>Acceleration</u>		<u>Fastest Speed</u>		
<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	
	<u>(in)</u>		<u>(seconds)</u>		<u>(m/s)</u>		<u>(m/s)</u>	
1.	Tomecka	27.0	1. Bush	15.24	1. Blomgren	5.760	1. Borgman	6.80
2.	DePlatchett	25.0	2. Randolph	15.37	2. Gaston	5.540	2. Gaston	6.61
3.	Morrell	23.5	3. Borgman	15.55	3. Bush	5.537	3. DePlatchett	6.59
4.	Gaston	22.0	4. Tomecka	15.99	4. Smith	5.473	3. Kluegel	6.59
5.	Borgman	21.5	5. Branam	16.09	5. Randolph	5.464	5. Whittier	6.57
5.	Reddick	21.5	6. Remy	16.14	6. Branam	5.456	6. Bush	6.55
5.	Remy	21.5	7. Kluegel	16.17	7. Remy	5.447	7. Randolph	6.53
5.	Smith	21.5	7. Smith	16.17	8. EB	5.441	8. Remy	6.51
9.	Bush	21.0	9. Reddick	16.19	9. DePlatchett	5.405	9. Smith	6.49
10.	Kluegel	20.5	10. Winslow	16.20	10. Whittier	5.388	10. Blomgren	6.46
11.	Costa	20.0	11. Whittier	16.22	11. Costa	5.368	11. Branam	6.44
12.	Branam	19.5	12. Gaston	16.23	12. Borgman	5.365	12. McDowell	6.40
12.	McDowell	19.5	13. Morrell	16.24	13. Gervais	5.353	13. EB	6.38
12.	Randolph	19.5	14. Gervais	16.25	14. Tomecka	5.336	13. Winslow	6.38
12.	Walker	19.5	15. McDowell	16.28	15. McDowell	5.294	15. Tomecka	6.34
12.	Whittier	19.5	16. DePlatchett	16.32	16. Kluegel	5.184	16. Gervais	6.33
17.	Felts	19.0	17. Blomgren	16.35	17. Felts	5.168	17. Reddick	6.32
18.	EB	18.5	18. Felts	16.40	18. Reddick	5.160	18. Costa	6.31
18.	Simmons	18.5	19. EB	16.41	19. Winslow	5.157	19. Morrell	6.18
20.	Gervais	18.0	20. Walker	16.84	20. Ball	5.155	20. Felts	6.16
21.	Blomgren	17.0	21. Costa	16.90	21. Simmons	5.147	21. Walker	6.05
22.	Ball	15.5	22. Ball	17.26	22. Morrell	5.074	22. Simmons	5.92
22.	Winslow	15.5	23. Simmons	18.44	23. Walker	4.985	22. Winget	5.92
24.	Winget	14.0	24. Winget	19.16	24. Winget	4.965	24. Ball	5.75
	Ramsey		Ramsey		Ramsey		Ramsey	
	Watley		Watley		Watley		Watley	

<u>Ave Speed</u>		<u>Fatigue</u>		<u>Beep</u>		<u>Ave Rank</u>		
<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	
	<u>(m/s)</u>		<u>(%)</u>		<u>(level)</u>			
1.	Bush	6.39	1. Morrell	2.53	1. Kluegel	1920	1. Bush	4.43
2.	Borgman	6.37	2. McDowell	3.77	2. Borgman	1800	2. Borgman	5.71
3.	Kluegel	6.36	3. Walker	4.07	3. <i>McDowell</i>	1400*	3. Gaston	6.00
4.	Gaston	6.28	4. Reddick	4.61	3. <i>Randolph</i>	1400*	4. Kluegel	6.43
4.	McDowell	6.28	5. Kluegel	5.67	5. Bush	1640	4. Randolph	6.43
6.	Randolph	6.27	6. Bush	5.94	5. Remy	1640	6. Remy	6.71
7.	Remy	6.25	7. Tomecka	6.38	7. <i>Felts</i>	1400*	7. McDowell	9.00
8.	DePlatchett	6.11	8. Felts	6.81	7. Gaston	1400	8. DePlatchett	9.29
8.	Whittier	6.11	9. Remy	7.01	9. Costa	1360	8. Smith	9.29
10.	Reddick	6.10	10. Randolph	7.77	9. Whittier	1360	10. Tomecka	9.86
11.	Morrell	6.09	11. Gaston	8.21	11. Smith	1280	11. Whittier	10.43
11.	Tomecka	6.09	12. Costa	9.57	12. Reddick	1160	12. Reddick	10.71
13.	Costa	6.03	13. DePlatchett	11.02	13. Walker	1120	13. Morrell	12.00
13.	Winslow	6.03	14. Smith	11.59	14. DePlatchett	1080	14. Branam	12.14
15.	Smith	5.97	15. Borgman	12.35	15. Morrell	960	15. Costa	13.57
16.	Felts	5.94	16. Ball	12.97	16. EB	880	16. Felts	14.71
17.	Branam	5.93	17. Branam	13.02	17. Blomgren	840	17. Blomgren	15.00
18.	Walker	5.88	18. Whittier	14.12	17. Branam	840	18. Walker	15.71
19.	Blomgren	5.82	19. Gervais	14.32	17. Tomecka	840	19. EB	16.57
20.	Gervais	5.76	20. Blomgren	15.37	20. Gervais	760	20. Winslow	17.14
21.	EB	5.73	21. EB	17.02	21. Winslow	640	21. Gervais	17.43
22.	Ball	5.34	22. Winslow	21.43	22. Ball	600	22. Ball	21.14
23.	Simmons	5.06	23. Simmons	28.61	23. Simmons	360	23. Simmons	21.86
24.	Winget	4.59	24. Winget	61.52	24. Winget	240	24. Winget	23.71
	Ramsey		Ramsey		Ramsey		Ramsey	
	Watley		Watley		Watley		Watley	

* participants were stopped because of equipment failure and assigned ranks based on speculated finish

**North Carolina
Women' Soccer
Long Range Athletic Tracking**

*"People do what you inspect,
not what you expect."*

	F 1998	W 1999	SP 1999	F 1999	W 2000	SP 2000	F 2000	W 2001	SP 2001	F 2001	
EB Weight (lbs)					142	146					
Vert (in)				20.50	17.50	19.00	18.50	21.00	19.50	18.50	higher=better
Acceleration (m/s)				4.90	5.05	5.16	5.08	4.38	4.87	5.44	higher=better
Fastest Speed (m/s)				6.21	6.06	6.26	6.20	5.99	6.23	6.38	higher=better
Ave Speed (m/s)				5.39	5.58	5.70	5.68	5.47	5.80	5.73	higher=better
AA Fitness (fatigue) (%)				22.77	11.37	17.35	12.37	13.08	12.18	17.02	lower=better
Agility (s)				16.33	15.74	15.24	15.40	15.88	15.09	16.41	lower=better
Beep (m)				640	880	640	1080	1040	920	880	higher=better

	F 1998	W 1999	SP 1999	F 1999	W 2000	SP 2000	F 2000	W 2001	SP 2001	F 2001	
Borgman Weight (lbs)		149	154		149						
Vert (in)	22.00	21.50	20.50	20.50			22.00		21.50	21.50	higher=better
Acceleration (m/s)				5.43			5.42		5.39	5.36	higher=better
Fastest Speed (m/s)				6.58			6.69		6.81	6.80	higher=better
Ave Speed (m/s)		6.27	6.65	6.26			6.27		6.45	6.37	higher=better
AA Fitness (fatigue) (%)		9.59	8.42	7.89			8.54		9.20	12.35	lower=better
Agility (s)	16.90	16.10	16.20	15.03			15.30		14.78	15.55	lower=better
Beep (m)	1280	1420	1520	1400			1560		1680	1800	higher=better

	F 1998	W 1999	SP 1999	F 1999	W 2000	SP 2000	F 2000	W 2001	SP 2001	F 2001	
DePlatchett Weight (lbs)		146	153		154	157					
Vert (in)	27.50	26.50	29.00		20.50	27.50	27.50	27.00	25.50	25.00	higher=better
Acceleration (m/s)					5.18	5.16	5.48	5.50	5.31	5.40	higher=better
Fastest Speed (m/s)					6.32	6.53	6.64	6.77	6.57	6.59	higher=better
Ave Speed (m/s)		6.02	6.34		5.70	5.96	6.32	6.25	6.29	6.11	higher=better
AA Fitness (fatigue) (%)		12.06	9.93		19.57	15.95	7.84	12.90	7.58	11.02	lower=better
Agility (s)	17.50	16.40	16.40		15.96	15.70	15.20	15.75	15.31	16.32	lower=better
Beep (m)	800	880	920		1040	1120	1320	1480	680	1080	higher=better

	F 1998	W 1999	SP 1999	F 1999	W 2000	SP 2000	F 2000	W 2001	SP 2001	F 2001	
Florance Weight (lbs)											
Vert (in)	20.50	18.50	20.50	20.00	17.50	21.50	18.50				higher=better
Acceleration (m/s)				5.02	5.18	5.31	5.33				higher=better
Fastest Speed (m/s)				6.40	6.18	6.58	6.52				higher=better
Ave Speed (m/s)		6.01	6.02	5.80	5.05	6.23	6.21				higher=better
AA Fitness (fatigue) (%)		13.90	9.05	16.84	11.76	9.35	8.67				lower=better
Agility (s)	17.50	16.90	16.70	15.99	15.88	15.13	15.30				lower=better
Beep (m)	760	1080	1080	1160	1280	1600	1680				higher=better

	F 1998	W 1999	SP 1999	F 1999	W 2000	SP 2000	F 2000	W 2001	SP 2001	F 2001	
Kluegel Weight (lbs)		127	127		124						
Vert (in)	25.00	22.50	22.50					22.50	21.50	20.50	higher=better
Acceleration (m/s)								5.15	5.33	5.18	higher=better
Fastest Speed (m/s)								6.58	6.77	6.59	higher=better
Ave Speed (m/s)		6.21	6.13					6.35	6.45	6.36	higher=better
AA Fitness (fatigue) (%)		10.61	9.15					5.96	8.48	5.67	lower=better
Agility (s)	17.30	16.80	16.50					15.78	16.35	16.17	lower=better
Beep (m)	1440	1760	1440					2080	1920	1920	higher=better

	F 1998	W 1999	SP 1999	F 1999	W 2000	SP 2000	F 2000	W 2001	SP 2001	F 2001	
Remy Weight (lbs)		127	127		118	119					
Vert (in)	21.50	21.50		22.50	21.50	24.00	21.50	22.00	22.00	21.50	higher=better
Acceleration (m/s)				5.29	5.05	5.44	5.03	4.80	5.26	5.44	higher=better
Fastest Speed (m/s)				6.40	6.11	6.56	6.18	6.01	6.50	6.51	higher=better
Ave Speed (m/s)		6.22		6.06	5.78	6.38	5.98	5.88	6.36	6.25	higher=better
AA Fitness (fatigue) (%)		14.13		11.37	12.97	4.78	5.93	4.59	4.29	7.01	lower=better
Agility (s)	17.60	17.00		16.09	15.92	15.60	15.70	16.25	15.66	16.14	lower=better
Beep (m)	1040	960		1280	1720	1560	1560	1640	1640	1640	higher=better

Bogies

Bogies FINAL REPORT

12/6/01

- **Drill**

- back to pressure scoring
- alternate:
 - forwards vs defenders
 - and mids vs mids (week 1)

forwards vs ½ mids
and defenders vs ½ mids
(week 2)

- start from 2 positions on both sides of goal

- **Recording**

- record each player turn
- record each goal scored

Offensive		Goals			
Rank	Player	% Scoring	Scored	Runs	Previous Final Ranks (00,99,98)
1.	Gaston	47.06%	8.0	17	
2.	Morrell	36.17%	17.0	47	
3.	Cluegel	32.31%	21.0	65	
4.	Felts	30.34%	8.8	29	
5.	Remy	28.85%	17.6	61	
6.	Randolph	28.18%	12.4	44	
7.	Bush	23.70%	6.4	27	
8.	Reddick	21.60%	5.4	25	
9.	Watley	20.00%	1.0	5	
10.	Borgman	19.05%	4.0	21	
11.	McDowell	16.96%	7.8	46	
12.	Smith	14.29%	3.0	21	
13.	Gervais	13.60%	3.4	25	
14.	Ramsey	11.25%	3.6	32	
15.	Ball	11.00%	2.2	20	
16.	Whittier	10.91%	2.4	22	
17.	Winslow	9.52%	2.0	21	
18.	Walker	9.23%	2.4	26	
19.	Tomecka	7.14%	1.0	14	
20.	EB	6.09%	1.4	23	
21.	Costa	4.55%	1.0	22	
22.	Blomgren	2.64%	1.4	53	

Defensive		Goals			
Rank	Player	Shutout %	Allowed	Runs	Previous Final Ranks (00,99,98)
1.	Bush	100.00%	0.0	9	
1.	Cluegel	100.00%	0.0	11	
3.	Randolph	93.75%	2.0	32	
3.	Borgman	93.75%	4.0	64	
5.	Morrell	93.33%	1.0	15	
5.	Ramsey	93.33%	1.0	15	
5.	Remy	93.33%	1.0	15	
5.	Watley	93.33%	1.0	15	
9.	Whittier	88.57%	4.0	35	
10.	Reddick	87.62%	10.4	84	
11.	McDowell	84.00%	4.0	25	
12.	Felts	83.87%	5.0	31	
13.	Gaston	82.75%	13.8	80	
14.	Tomecka	77.80%	22.2	100	
15.	Blomgren	77.78%	2.0	9	
15.	Gervais	77.78%	4.0	18	
17.	Smith	76.47%	4.0	17	
18.	EB	75.00%	4.0	16	
18.	Winslow	75.00%	7.0	28	
20.	Ball	72.00%	7.0	25	
21.	Costa	71.25%	9.2	32	
22.	Walker	65.00%	7.0	20	

		Goals			
Rank	Keeper	GAA	Allowed	Runs	Previous Final Ranks (00,99,98)
1.	DePlatchett	0.13	19.0	152	
2.	Simmons	0.13	18.0	143	
3.	Branam	0.15	6.0	39	
4.	Winget	0.22	30.0	135	

Top Gun – 1v1s to Cone

University of North Carolina
Women's Soccer

Top Gun FINAL REPORT

12/6/01

• Drill

- Score by hitting cone with ball
- 2 games in big goals
 - goals on endline and top of D
 - use live goalkeepers
 - use attacking players
- Contests last 2-3 min
- No cone hanging

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	<u>Percent Won</u>	<u>Win</u>	<u>Loss</u>	<u>Tie</u>	<u>Previous Ranks (00,99,98)</u>
1.	Borgman	81.0%	15	2	4	10,11,15
2.	Reddick	78.6%	16	4	1	7
3.	Ramsey	76.7%	11	3	1	9
4.	Felts	66.7%	10	3	8	
4.	Kluegel	66.7%	12	5	4	5,11,8
6.	McDowell	64.6%	13	6	5	
7.	Randolph	60.4%	11	6	7	
8.	Bush	60.0%	9	6	0	10,11
9.	Walker	59.4%	7	4	5	14,16
10.	Remy	58.3%	12	8	4	4,3,12
11.	Gaston	57.1%	8	5	8	21,22
12.	Tomecka	56.3%	11	8	5	2
13.	EB	55.6%	7	5	6	13,18
14.	Smith, Ja	45.8%	9	11	4	19
15.	Morrell	43.8%	8	11	5	
16.	Watley	41.7%	2	4	6	20
17.	Costa	35.4%	2	9	13	18
17.	Winslow	35.4%	4	11	9	
19.	Whittier	31.0%	3	11	7	
20.	Ball	22.9%	1	14	9	24
20.	Gervais	22.9%	2	15	7	
22.	Blomgren	20.8%	2	16	6	

• Recording

- Record number of wins, losses, and ties for each player and keeper

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Keeper</u>	<u>Percent Won</u>	<u>Win</u>	<u>Loss</u>	<u>Tie</u>	
1.	Branam	83.3%	12	2	1	2,1
2.	Simmons	52.1%	9	8	7	1
3.	DePlatchett	37.5%	7	13	4	3,3,1
4.	Winget	27.1%	3	14	7	

Top Gun II – 1v1s From Midstripe

TOP GUN II (1v1's from Midstripe) FINAL REPORT

12/6/01

• Drill

- Players grouped by a matrix
- Players take turns on offense and defense
- Each player plays every-one in group once each way
- Defender serves ball from endline to midstripe
- Player takes ball to goal from midstripe to score
- Points scored depending on stuff, shot, score, etc:

<u>offense</u>	<u>defense</u>
stuffed 0	stuff 4
shot wide 1	shot wide 3
shot/face 2	shot/face 2
score 4	scored on 1

• Recording

- Points called out by staff during each run are recorded by managers

Offensive		Scoring %	Points	Runs	Previous Final Ranks (00,99,98)
1. Morrell		76.4%	55	18	
2. Reddick		75.0%	45	15	2
3. EB		64.7%	44	17	5,4
4. Randolph		60.7%	51	21	
5. Ramsey		57.7%	30	13	15
6. Borgman		55.8%	29	13	
7. Watley		53.3%	32	15	1
8. Gaston		51.6%	33	16	
9. Remy		48.7%	37	19	9,9,4
10. Felts		47.4%	36	19	
11. Kluegel		46.7%	28	15	7,2,7
12. Tomecka		46.1%	35	19	8
13. Bush		37.5%	18	12	16
14. Blomgren		36.8%	28	19	
15. McDowell		34.7%	25	18	
16. Whittier		34.4%	22	16	
17. Winslow		30.0%	24	20	
18. Walker		28.9%	22	19	10,13
19. Costa		27.8%	20	18	3,16,13
20. Smith		26.6%	17	16	14
21. Gervais		20.0%	16	20	
22. Ball		15.0%	12	20	18

Defensive		Shutout %	Points	Runs	Previous Final Ranks (00,99,98)
1. Morrell		81.9%	59	18	
2. Ramsey		78.6%	44	14	
3. Reddick		78.3%	47	15	1
4. Borgman		77.3%	34	11	7,8,11
5. Remy		71.4%	40	14	2,2
6. Kluegel		71.2%	37	13	14,13,10
7. Bush		68.8%	33	12	
8. Felts		67.6%	46	17	
9. Watley		64.7%	44	17	
10. EB		64.3%	36	14	
11. Whittier		59.2%	45	19	
12. Randolph		58.3%	49	21	
13. Costa		57.4%	39	17	9,14,6
14. Tomecka		57.1%	48	21	7
15. Winslow		55.3%	42	19	
16. McDowell		50.0%	38	19	
17. Walker		47.1%	32	17	3,4
18. Gaston		44.6%	25	14	12,10
19. Smith		36.8%	28	19	4
20. Blomgren		34.5%	29	21	
21. Gervais		27.2%	25	23	
22. Ball		23.6%	17	18	16

Rank	Keeper	GAA	GA	Runs	Previous Final Ranks (00,99,98)
1. Winget		0.12	6	51	
2. DePlatchett		0.24	16	68	
3. Branam		0.24	10	42	
4. Simmons		0.27	13	48	

Shooting

12/6/01

Right Foot

Rank	Player	% made	made	attempted
1.	Remy	87.5%	7	8
2.	Ramsey	75.0%	3	4
2.	Watley	75.0%	3	4
4.	Bush	50.0%	4	8
4.	EB	50.0%	2	4
4.	Felts	50.0%	2	4
4.	Gaston	50.0%	4	8
4.	Randolph	50.0%	4	8
9.	Ball	37.5%	3	8
9.	Gervais	37.5%	3	8
9.	McDowell	37.5%	3	8
9.	Smith	37.5%	3	8
9.	Tomecka	37.5%	3	8
9.	Whittier	37.5%	3	8
15.	Borgman	25.0%	2	8
15.	Reddick	25.0%	1	4
15.	Walker	25.0%	2	8
18.	Blomgren	12.5%	1	8
18.	Morrell	12.5%	1	8
18.	Winslow	12.5%	1	8
21.	Costa	0.0%	0	8
21.	Kluegel	0.0%	0	4

Inside Foot Bending Ball Finishing

Rank	Player	% made	made	attempted
1.	Costa	50.0%	4	8
1.	Remy	50.0%	4	8
1.	Winslow	50.0%	4	8
4.	Morrell	37.5%	3	8
5.	Ball	25.0%	2	8
5.	Blomgren	25.0%	2	8
5.	Borgman	25.0%	2	8
5.	Ramsey	25.0%	1	4
5.	Randolph	25.0%	2	8
5.	Smith	25.0%	2	8
5.	Tomecka	25.0%	2	8
5.	Whittier	25.0%	2	8
13.	Bush	12.5%	1	8
13.	Gaston	12.5%	1	8
15.	EB	0.0%	0	4
15.	Felts	0.0%	0	4
15.	Gervais	0.0%	0	8
15.	Kluegel	0.0%	0	4
15.	McDowell	0.0%	0	8
15.	Reddick	0.0%	0	4
15.	Walker	0.0%	0	8
15.	Watley	0.0%	0	4

Left Foot

Right Foot

Rank	Player	% made	made	attempted
1.	Bush	25.0%	2	8
1.	Morrell	25.0%	2	8
1.	Ramsey	25.0%	1	4
1.	Smith	25.0%	2	8
5.	Ball	12.5%	1	8
5.	Costa	12.5%	1	8
5.	Gaston	12.5%	1	8
5.	Randolph	12.5%	1	8
5.	Remy	12.5%	1	8
5.	Winslow	12.5%	1	8
11.	Blomgren	0.0%	0	8
11.	Borgman	0.0%	0	8
11.	EB	0.0%	0	4
11.	Felts	0.0%	0	4
11.	Gervais	0.0%	0	8
11.	Kluegel	0.0%	0	4
11.	McDowell	0.0%	0	8
11.	Reddick	0.0%	0	8
11.	Tomecka	0.0%	0	8
11.	Walker	0.0%	0	8
11.	Watley	0.0%	0	4
11.	Whittier	0.0%	0	8

Outside Foot Bending Ball Finishing

Rank	Player	% made	made	attempted
1.	Tomecka	37.5%	3	8
2.	Kluegel	25.0%	1	4
2.	Reddick	25.0%	1	4
4.	Blomgren	12.5%	1	8
4.	Remy	12.5%	1	8
4.	Smith	12.5%	1	8
4.	Walker	12.5%	1	8
8.	Ball	0.0%	0	8
8.	Borgman	0.0%	0	8
8.	Bush	0.0%	0	8
8.	Costa	0.0%	0	8
8.	EB	0.0%	0	4
8.	Felts	0.0%	0	4
8.	Gaston	0.0%	0	8
8.	Gervais	0.0%	0	8
8.	McDowell	0.0%	0	8
8.	Morrell	0.0%	0	8
8.	Ramsey	0.0%	0	4
8.	Randolph	0.0%	0	8
8.	Watley	0.0%	0	4
8.	Whittier	0.0%	0	8
8.	Winslow	0.0%	0	8

Left Foot

Breakaway Finishing

Rank	Player	% made	made	attempted
1.	Tomecka	75.0%	3	4
2.	Bush	50.0%	2	4
2.	McDowell	50.0%	2	4
2.	Watley	50.0%	2	4
2.	Whittier	50.0%	2	4
2.	Winslow	50.0%	2	4
7.	Ball	25.0%	1	4
7.	Blomgren	25.0%	1	4
7.	Borgman	25.0%	1	4
7.	EB	25.0%	1	4
7.	Felts	25.0%	1	4
7.	Gaston	25.0%	1	4
7.	Gervais	25.0%	1	4
7.	Morrell	25.0%	1	4
7.	Ramsey	25.0%	1	4
7.	Randolph	25.0%	1	4
7.	Remy	25.0%	1	4
7.	Walker	25.0%	1	4
19.	Costa	0.0%	0	4
19.	Smith	0.0%	0	4
19.	Kluegel	0.0%	0	0
19.	Reddick	0.0%	0	0

Total

Rank	Player	% made	made	attempted
1.	Remy	38.9%	14	36
2.	Tomecka	30.6%	11	36
3.	Ramsey	30.0%	6	20
4.	Bush	25.0%	9	36
4.	Watley	25.0%	5	20
6.	Randolph	22.2%	8	36
6.	Smith	22.2%	8	36
6.	Winslow	22.2%	8	36
9.	Ball	19.4%	7	36
9.	Gaston	19.4%	7	36
9.	Morrell	19.4%	7	36
9.	Whittier	19.4%	7	36
13.	EB	15.0%	3	20
13.	Felts	15.0%	3	20
15.	Blomgren	13.9%	5	36
15.	Borgman	13.9%	5	36
15.	Costa	13.9%	5	36
15.	McDowell	13.9%	5	36
19.	Gervais	11.1%	4	36
19.	Walker	11.1%	4	36
21.	Reddick	10.0%	2	20
22.	Kluegel	6.3%	1	16

Triangle Passing

University of North Carolina
Women's Soccer

Triangle Passing (midstripe to 18) FINAL REPORT

12/6/01

Successful

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	<u>Passes/Session</u>	<u>Previous Ranks (00,99,98)</u>
1.	Walker	4.0	12,4
2.	Randolph	3.4	
3.	Tomecka	3.3	9
4.	Gaston	3.1	12,23
5.	Reddick	3.1	11
6.	Borgman	3.0	2,10,17
6.	DePlatchett	3.0	
8.	EB	2.9	8,13
9.	Costa	2.9	14,21,21
10.	Ramsey	2.8	17
11.	Kluegel	2.8	17,9,10
12.	Remy	2.7	9,7,10
13.	Blomgren	2.6	
13.	Morrell	2.6	
15.	McDowell	2.5	
15.	Watley	2.5	19
17.	Whittier	2.3	
18.	Winslow	2.2	
19.	Felts	2.1	
20.	Gervais	2.1	
21.	Smith	1.9	23
22.	Ball	1.7	24
23.	Winget	1.6	
24.	Simmons	1.4	
25.	Branam	0.0	

• Drill

- Players grouped in threes by skill level
- Receiving player bends run wide
- Server serves flighted ball to receiver
- Ball must "beat" the "back line" of cones
- Receiver must be able to take flighted ball out of air on run
- Points scored by server for successful serves

• Recording

- Each player's points recorded

Long Service/Long Reception

University of North Carolina
Women's Soccer

Long Service Long Reception FINAL REPORT

12/6/01

• Drill

- Players face each other 20 yards apart
- In 2 minutes, serve flighted balls to partner who must chest-trap ball behind line
- Points scored for successful serves/traps
- Score kept as “team score” (both players)
- Do same thing at 30, 45 yards for 2 min each

• Recording

- Separate scores for each distance recorded

<u>Cumulative</u>		<u>Ave Successful Passes Per Session</u>			<u>Ave Total Succ Passes Per Session</u>	<u>Previous Ranks (00,99,98)</u>
<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	<u>20 yards</u>	<u>30 yards</u>	<u>44 yards</u>		
1.	Reddick	11.3	9.8	3.8	24.8	14
2.	Ramsey	11.4	7.8	4.3	23.4	8
3.	Felts	9.9	8.6	2.1	20.6	
4.	Gaston	10.1	7.0	1.8	18.9	3,4
5.	Randolph	9.8	6.9	2.1	18.8	
6.	Remy	10.1	6.9	1.5	18.5	11,9,10
7.	EB	8.6	6.6	3.1	18.4	9,14
7.	Walker	9.9	6.5	2.0	18.4	6,11
9.	Cluegel	8.0	6.1	1.9	16.0	19,19,16
10.	Costa	8.6	6.4	0.5	15.5	20,20,15
10.	McDowell	8.0	5.5	2.0	15.5	
12.	Morrell	7.0	6.6	1.4	15.0	
13.	Whittier	7.5	5.5	1.0	14.0	
14.	Smith	8.0	4.4	1.1	13.5	15
15.	Watley	6.5	6.0	0.8	13.3	-
16.	Borgman	7.4	4.1	1.5	13.0	13,23,12
17.	DePlatchett	6.4	5.9	0.6	12.9	
18.	Tomecka	6.0	4.8	1.9	12.6	16
19.	Ball	7.0	4.9	0.6	12.5	21
20.	Simmons	6.6	5.4	0.4	12.4	
21.	Winget	5.3	5.3	1.0	11.5	
22.	Gervais	6.6	4.4	0.4	11.4	
23.	Blomgren	5.3	4.3	1.6	11.1	
24.	Winslow	5.4	2.9	1.1	9.4	
25.	Branam	1.8	5.1	0.0	6.9	

Long Service

University of North Carolina
Women's Soccer

Long Service - Final Report

12/6/01

• Drill

- Players serve to partner for distance for 4 minutes
- Must get 5 serves at target distance to get that score
- Score increased/decreased if more or less than 5 at target distance
- Partners return ball with their serve

• Recording

- Distances of each serve (usually 6-7 serves) for each player recorded
- Calculations then done to come up with posted distances

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	<u>Total Distance</u>	<u>R Rank</u>	<u>Right Distance</u>	<u>L Rank</u>	<u>Left Distance</u>	<u>Previous Ranks (00,99)</u>
1.	Reddick	93	1.	53	1.	40	1
2.	EB	87	4.	47	1.	40	10,10
3.	Kluegel	86	3.	48	3.	38	3,3
4.	Ramsey	84	2.	50	8.	34	4
5.	McDowell	80	6.	45	7.	35	
6.	Randolph	79	4.	47	11.	32	
7.	Borgman	77	10.	41	5.	36	3,18
7.	Morrell	77	7.	44	9.	33	
9.	Walker	76	11.	40	5.	36	10,10
10.	DePlatchett	72	8.	43	15.	29	
10.	Felts	72	9.	42	13.	30	
10.	Gaston	72	24.	34	3.	38	3,3
13.	Watley	71	16.	38	9.	33	
14.	Remy	69	16.	38	12.	31	-,10
14.	Tomecka	69	11.	40	15.	29	3
16.	Branam	68	16.	38	13.	30	
17.	Blomgren	66	16.	38	17.	28	
17.	Whittier	66	11.	40	18.	26	
19.	Gervais	64	16.	38	18.	26	
20.	Costa	61	21.	36	20.	25	16,18
20.	Smith	61	11.	40	22.	21	16
20.	Winget	61	21.	36	20.	25	
23.	Winslow	59	11.	40	24.	19	10,10
24.	Ball	56	23.	35	22.	21	20
25.	Simmons	42	25.	26	25.	16	
	Bush						16,18

Power Heading

University of North Carolina
Women's Soccer

Power Heading Part I - Final

12/6/01

- **Drill**

- Partners face each other 40 yards apart
- One player serves ball
- If good serve, partner heads ball for distance back to server
- If bad serve, partner clears ball for distance back to server
- Header gets 4 good serves to head ball
- Partners switch

- **Recording**

- Four distances for each player recorded and averaged

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Player</u>	<u>Semester Ave Distance</u>	<u>Previous Ranks (00,99,98)</u>
1.	Reddick	25.0	4
2.	Gaston	24.5	2,13
3.	EB	24.5	5,4
4.	Ramsey	24.3	9
5.	Watley	23.3	14
6.	McDowell	22.4	
7.	Walker	22.0	15,11
8.	Kluegel	21.8	8,3,21
9.	Tomecka	21.7	5
10.	Morrell	21.6	
10.	Remy	21.6	18,7,15
12.	Randolph	21.5	
13.	Smith	21.2	15
14.	Bush	20.7	22,23
15.	Borgman	20.5	18,14,8
16.	Costa	20.1	17,18,21
17.	Blomgren	19.8	
18.	Whittier	19.2	
19.	Felts	19.2	
20.	Gervais	18.8	
21.	Winslow	17.9	
22.	Ball	14.5	24

Long Range Shooting

- **Drill**
 - Goals placed 36 yards apart with line half way between (18 yds)
 - Players may shoot anywhere behind line
 - Other player plays keeper
 - Play goes back and forth between goals for 4 minutes

- **Recording**
 - Wins and losses are recorded for each player along with number of goals scored

For Further Detail

- “Training Soccer Champions” – by Anson Dorrance
- “The Vision of a Champion” – by Anson Dorrance
- Both available at www.athletics.unc.edu/wsoccer/shop/shop.htm