

Championship Transportation Guaranteed 100%

During the 1977-78 academic year, the Association will guarantee payment of 100 per cent of transportation expenses incurred by teams and individual medal winners in all NCAA championships, it has been announced by Edgar A. Sherman, NCAA secretary-treasurer. The increase was approved by the NCAA Executive Committee at its August 1977 meeting.

Last year, the Association guaranteed 80 per cent of transportation costs only in those sports which did not produce sufficient revenue to pay these costs.

The full cost of transportation for teams and medal winners in the NCAA's 39 national championships will be approximately \$1.3 million in 1977-78. To meet

these expenses, the Executive Committee allocated \$482,000 from 1976-77 excess receipts and \$588,000 from the 1977-78 general operating budget. The remaining amount will be realized from transportation funds not expended in 1976-77.

New Procedure

The Executive Committee also adopted a significant change in championship accounting procedures. In the past, after payment of game expenses, receipts were used first to pay transportation and per diem to the competing institutions. Beginning in 1977-78, transportation will be paid from separate funds established for each division. Therefore, an additional \$250,000 will be available for distribution to



EDGAR A. SHERMAN
NCAA Secretary-Treasurer

competing teams in those championships which generate net receipts.

A substantial increase in the football television rights fees as well as an increase in net receipts from the National Collegiate Basketball Championship will produce sufficient funds to guarantee transportation and a per diem allowance to every student-athlete who competes in an NCAA championship in 1978-79.

"We estimated the cost of this program to be \$3 million during the 1978-79 academic year," Sherman said. "However, the governing sports committees must establish stringent entry requirements in the individual sports to insure that only the

most qualified persons are permitted to enter and receive the expense allowance."

The Executive Committee has authorized the Officers to appoint a special committee to review the qualifying standards in all sports prior to the 1978-79 season.

Interim Step

As an interim step toward full funding of championships expenses in 1978-79, the Executive Committee voted that before dividing net receipts (above and beyond expense payments) among the competing institutions in the individual-team championships of 1977-78, transportation and per diem of a number of additional competitors (approximately equal to the number of medal winners) will be paid or prorated.



NEWS



VOL. 14 • NO. 10

OCTOBER 15, 1977



JOHN NABER
University of Southern California



CRAIG VIRGIN
University of Illinois



DANIEL MACKESEY
Cornell University

Winter-Spring

"Top Five" Finalists Selected

Two Olympic gold medalists and a two-sport all-America head an outstanding group of six individuals selected as winter-spring finalists for "Today's Top Five Student-Athlete Award."

John Naber, a ten-time NCAA swimming champion and four-time Olympic gold medalist, and Rodney Strachan, a two-time NCAA swimming champion and Olympic gold medalist, provide the University of Southern California with two finalists.

Daniel Mackesey, an all-America goalie in soccer and lacrosse at Cornell University, joins Naber and Strachan, along with other finalists Michael Bourdeau, a two-sport star in soccer and baseball at Randolph-Macon College; Bryan Rogers, an Academic all-America baseball player at Delta State University; and Craig Virgin, one of America's premier distance runners at the University of Illinois.

These six finalists were selected for participation in winter-spring sports during the 1976-77 academic year, and will be joined by other finalists at the conclusion of fall competition for selection as Top Five recipients.

Each finalist is selected on the basis of his athletic ability and achievement, character, leadership, extracurricular activities and academic achievement. Only seniors from the current calendar year are eligible for the honor.

Key Leaders

Naber and Strachan were instrumental in leading Southern California to four consecutive National Collegiate Swimming Championships during their colorful four-year careers.

No other swimmer in NCAA history accomplished Naber's feat of winning ten individual championships. He also became the first swimmer to capture four consecutive individual titles in two different events.

Naber won both the 100-yard backstroke and the 200-yard backstroke four straight years. He holds American and NCAA records with a 49.36 in the 100-yard event and a 1:46.09 in the 200.

In addition, Naber won the 500-yard freestyle in 1974 and 1975, and was a member of five first-place relay teams at USC

for a total of 15 NCAA titles overall.

It was Naber's two individual gold medals in the 100-meter and 200-meter backstroke, and legs on the gold medal 800-meter freestyle and 400-meter medley relays, which boosted the United States to a sweep in 12 of 13 men's swimming events at the 1976 Olympics in Montreal. He established world records in the 100-meter backstroke (55.49) and the 200-meter backstroke (1:59.19).

Strachan won the NCAA 400-yard individual medley in 1976 and 1977, and captured the gold medal in the 400-meter I. M. at Montreal in world record time of 4:23.68.

Two-Sport Star

Mackesey completed a brilliant career at Cornell by collecting all-America honors in both soccer and lacrosse. Twice he was a member of Cornell's National Collegiate Lacrosse Championship team, and tied the tournament record for most saves in the finals with 28 against Maryland in 1976.

Continued on page 5

Committee Outlines Seeding Details For Basketball

Details of a seeding procedure effective for the 1978 National Collegiate Basketball Championship have been outlined by the Division I Basketball Committee.

All automatic qualifiers and at-large selections for the 32-team tournament will be affected by the new seeding format, according to Committee Chairman Wayne Duke, Big Ten Conference commissioner.

A maximum of four automatic qualifying conference teams were seeded in each of the Championship's four regional brackets by the Basketball Committee in August. These teams were seeded based on their respective conferences' won-lost percentages in tournament play during the past five years.

The remaining 16 bracket berths, consisting of champions from other automatic qualifying conferences, second conference teams, independents and representatives of allied conferences which do not receive automatic qualification, will be placed in appropriate regionals and seeded by the Committee at its March 1978 meeting.

Seeding Procedure

The Committee will pair teams in each of the four regions by the following procedure:

No. 4 seeded at-large entry vs. No. 1 seeded automatic qualifying conference.

No. 3 seeded at-large entry vs. No. 2 seeded automatic qualifying conference.

No. 2 seeded at-large entry vs. No. 3 seeded automatic qualifying conference.

No. 1 seeded at-large entry vs. No. 4 seeded automatic qualifying conference.

Seeding in each region will be based on current won-lost records, strength of schedule, and eligibility status of student-athletes for postseason competition.

The Committee stated that the East Coast Conference champion will be one of the four at-large entries in the East region; the Pacific Coast Athletic Association champion will be one of the four at-large entries in the West region; and the three Eastern College Athletic Conference regional champions will be placed as at-large entries in any of the four regional brackets.

Chance Eliminated

"Seeding will provide for more balanced pairings because the possibility of the two presumably strongest teams competing in the first round, as was the case in the chance of the 'blind draw,' has been eliminated," Duke stated.

Continued on page 3

Postgraduate Scholarship Nominations Deadline Oct. 31

Nominations for NCAA Postgraduate Scholarships in the sport of football must be submitted to appropriate district vice-presidents no later than October 31.

Each member institution's faculty representative was mailed nomination forms September 30. No more than two

and preferably one candidate may be nominated from each institution.

Of the 80 scholarships worth \$1,500 each awarded annually, 33 are presented in football, 15 in basketball and 32 in "other" NCAA-sponsored sports.

Gambling Commission Hears NCAA Opinion

EDITOR'S NOTE: Andy Geiger, directory of athletics at the University of Pennsylvania, and chairman of the NCAA Governmental Affairs Committee, recently testified before the Regulation and Operation Committee of the District of Columbia Citizen's Gambling Study Commission. Geiger was accompanied by John Thompson, head basketball coach, Georgetown University. Following are excerpts from Geiger's statement.

I wish to emphasize that the NCAA's anti-gambling policies, rules and countermeasures are not based upon the arbitrary prejudices of overly-protective patrons of athletics, but rather are the responses of deeply involved administrators of and participants in intercollegiate athletics to specific abuses which on occasion have arisen as the outgrowth of sports betting activities.

Corrupt Products

The specific rules governing college basketball and Policy No. 8 were direct products of bribery and point-shaving scandals which rocked college basketball in the 1950's and early 1960's. Those incidents, which epitomized the threat which gambling activities pose to the integrity and existence of college athletics, resulted in the enactment of Federal legislation making it a crime to use bribery to influence the outcome of a sporting contest. It is precisely this type of experience which clearly shows the inadvisability of legalizing gambling on team sports and demonstrates the necessity for strict anti-gambling legislation and enforcement.

The NCAA wishes to go on record in the clearest and most emphatic way that it opposes the legalization of gambling on team sports, whether amateur or professional. The NCAA believes that all sports are intertwined in

the public mind to such a degree that doubts about the integrity of any one sport would quickly spread to others. It would be especially unwise to legalize betting on high school and college sports because of the particular vulnerability which these programs and their participants have to the undesirable side-effects of gambling.

First, whereas the scope of professional sports is rather limited, making regulation prob-



ANDY GEIGER

Governmental Affairs Committee

lems possibly of manageable proportions, the extensive scope of college sports activities would make it impossible to protect participants from the increased attempts to influence the outcome of sporting events which would surely follow legalization.

In football there are but 26 professional teams having 40-man rosters, while 460 colleges have football teams comprised of 60, 70 or even 80 players per squad. There are some 28 professional basketball teams; there

are nearly 700 NCAA college basketball teams playing some 9,000 games each season. When high school contests are taken into account, the numbers of events and participants are even more staggering.

To ensure the integrity of the competition and individual participants in the context of legalized sports betting would at best be prohibitively expensive and at worst, simply impossible.

Legalization

Secondly, legalization — to say nothing of official government sanctioning — of gambling on these events will bring gambling onto the campus, openly and to an extent far greater than appears to be the case at present. The result, we firmly believe, will be to increase tremendously the exposure of student-athletes to pressures from gamblers, and to confuse student-athletes as to the morality and legality of yielding to those pressures.

In this regard, the particular vulnerability of the college student-athlete must be borne in mind. They are 17 to 20-year-old boys and girls. These youngsters already are under considerable academic and competitive pressure. To subject them to the added pressures of defending themselves against improper attempts to influence the outcome of the events in which they participate, harassment by gamblers seeking to gain an "edge" from "inside information," and the suspicions which would arise in the public mind when a dropped pass or a fumble in the closing minutes of a game has an apparent impact on the "point spread," would be unconscionable.

Surely, neither this Commission nor any legislative body would deliberately heighten the pressures and responsibilities already placed on high school and college athletes or increase

their exposure to the corrupting influences which experience has shown are associated with sports betting.

Thirdly, legalization of gambling on college sports would thrust intercollegiate programs into an environment hostile to their basic principles. Open and widespread wagering on contests is clearly inconsistent with fundamental concepts of amateurism in sports. Moreover, for many institutions it would raise



JOHN THOMPSON

Head Basketball Coach
Georgetown University

questions whether college sports conducted in such an atmosphere remain valid education programs. As a consequence, a grave threat would be posed to the continuation of competitive college athletic programs.

Recent surveys by the NCAA and the Commission on the Review of the National Policy Toward Gambling have confirmed that, because of these concerns, college presidents, athletic directors and coaches are

unified in their strong opposition to legalization of gambling on college sports events under any circumstances.

In its recent report (entitled *Gambling in America*), the National Commission concluded after three years of study that:

"States should not undertake any kind of legal sports wagering. . . ."

and that:
"in the event that a State does legalize sports wagering it should incorporate into its enabling legislation a prohibition against wagering on amateur sporting events."

We wholeheartedly endorse these conclusions and recommend that they be adopted by the Citizen's Commission.

Laissez-Faire

In closing I would like to speak quite frankly with you. The NCAA and its members are deeply disturbed by what we sense to be a developing laissez-faire attitude towards sports betting which totally ignores the realities of sports competition.

In considering any legislation on legalized or decriminalized gambling on team sports you must take account of the impact on the lives and futures of thousands of young men and women and the integrity of competitions which are of great importance to the development of the individual participants, to the educational institutions for which they compete and to the many fans of such institutions.

Today, I ask your assurances that the Citizen's Gambling Study Commission will seriously consider the possibilities for mischief and corruption which legalization would foster. I in turn can assure you that the NCAA and its members will in the future, as they have in the past, vigorously oppose action which we believe threatens to destroy the athletic programs of this nation's high schools and colleges.

Committee Provides Check List

Sports Safety Guidelines Offered

The world of college athletics has not been able to avoid the "sue syndrome" which has permeated present day society.

In fact, the January issue of *Trial Magazine* devoted an entire article which provided guidelines for plaintiff attorneys in the preparation of a sports injury negligence case. The likelihood that a lawsuit is apt to be filed after any athletic injury of a serious nature puts an excessive amount of pressure on administrators, coaches and all involved with athletics. Sports injury litigation is a legitimate concern.

Liability

Liability — its responsibilities and ramifications — has always been a concern of responsible athletic administrators and coaches. However, in recent years, those associated with intercollegiate athletics have been exposed to a much broader interpretation of liability than ever before.

The "government immunity" concept under which educational institutions operated for many years is no longer commonly accepted. In addition, the "assumed risk" theory has been redefined. In the past, it was accepted that athletics possessed certain hazards and those who participated assumed the risk of injury.

To a certain extent, the theory is still accepted. However, if it

can be proven the injured athlete was unaware of the potential dangers involved in the sport then the theory is not applicable.

The NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports has considered the sports injury litigation problem. The Committee assumes that those who sponsor and govern athletic programs have accepted the responsibility of attempting to keep the risk of injury reasonable.

However, lawsuits only need a complaint to exist. It is the Committee's contention the principal defense against an unwarranted complaint is documentation that adequate measures have been taken and programs have been established to minimize the risk inherent in sport. It must be noted no checklist is ever complete, but the following should serve as a review of considerations for those responsible for the administration of intercollegiate sports programs:

Preparticipation Medical Exam—Before an athlete accepts the rigors of organized sport, his/her health status should be evaluated. When the athlete first enters the college athletic program, a thorough exam should be required. Subsequently, an annual health history update with use of referral exams when warranted is sufficient. (A formal statement in this regard has been prepared for consideration

by the membership during the annual Convention.)

Health Insurance—Each student-athlete should have or secure, by parental coverage or institutional plan, access to customary hospitalization and physician benefits for defraying the costs of a significant injury or illness.

Preseason Preparation — Particular practices and controls should protect the candidate from premature exposure to the full rigors of the sport. Preseason conditioning recommendations will help the candidate arrive at the first practice at optimal readiness. Attention to heat stress and cautious matching of candidates during the first weeks are additional considerations.

Acceptance of Risk—"Implied consent" or "waiver of responsibility" by athletes, or their parents if of minority age, should be based on an informed awareness of the risk of injury being accepted as a result of the student-athlete's participation in the sport involved. Not only does the individual share responsibility in preventive measures, but he or she should appreciate the nature and significance of these measures.

Planning and Supervision—Competent attention to a sizable group of energetic and highly motivated student-athletes can only come from appropriate

planning. Such planning should ensure both general supervision and organized instruction. Instruction should include individualized attention to the refinements of skill development and conditioning. In addition, first aid evaluations should be included with the instruction. Such planning for particular health and safety concerns should take into consideration conditions which are encountered during travel for competitive purposes as well.

Equipment

Equipment—As a result of the increase in product liability litigation, purchasers of equipment should be aware of impending as well as current safety standards being recommended by authoritative groups and utilize only known reputable dealers. In addition, attention should be directed to the proper repair and fitting of equipment.

The National Operating Committee on Standards for Athletic Equipment (NOCSAE) has established a voluntary football helmet standard which has been adopted by the NCAA Football Rules Committee. By 1978, all new helmet models being worn must meet the NOCSAE Standard.

Facility—The adequacy and conditions of the facilities used for particular activities should not be overlooked, and periodic examination of the facilities should be conducted. Inspection

of the facilities should include not only the competitive area, but warm-up and adjacent areas.

Emergency Care—Reasonable attention to all possible preventive measures will not eliminate sports injuries. Each scheduled session, practice or contest of an institution-sponsored sport therefore should have the following:

The presence or immediate availability of a person qualified and delegated to render emergency care to a stricken participant.

Planned access to a physician by phone or nearby presence for prompt medical evaluation of the situation when warranted.

Planned access to a medical facility including a plan for communication and transportation between the athletic site and medical facility — for prompt medical services when warranted.

A thorough understanding by all affected parties, including the leadership of visiting teams, of the personnel and procedures involved.

Records—Documentation is fundamental to administration. Authoritative sports safety regulations, standards and guidelines kept current and on file provide ready reference and understanding. Waiver forms may not prevent lawsuits but they help reflect organized attention to injury control.