

SUNDAY EVENING SESSION

January 11, 1976

The meeting of the Board of Directors was reconvened at eight-forty-five o'clock p.m., President George presiding and with the other Board Members present as indicated on the first sheet of this transcript.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I believe we are ready to proceed and we will next take up item 50 having to do with the hand cast.

We would like to talk about a material that football players be allowed to wear during a game. They could, of course, likewise wear this during the practice but to wear it during a game, we need the NCAA rules changed in order to be allowed to do this.

Do you all know what the NCAA rule says? It provides that no hard or unyielding substance be used below the elbow.

MR. JORDAN: Now, by way of explanation, let me say that I have had an opportunity, in the last four years, to become involved in this. I guess I might say that lady luck has not been on my side during that period of time because I have had, I believe, five kids who, for example, lost the tip of a finger, running anywhere from an industrial accident just prior of the season to this year, when a kid had one bit off in a fraternity fracas over a ball game.

However, in each case, after the initial healing phase has taken place, the doctor has indicated it was okay for him to participate if he could wear a protective cap over it.

Now, when we first did this some four years ago, it never entered my mind but what we were doing was legal.

We made a cap like this (indicating) for

2

just a single digit and I knew what the rule was and yet it never entered my mind that this was illegal and that the official would not then under these circumstances, let the boy play.

This involved a freshman game and so I went down and met with the local high school officials who were working the game and the following week they did allow the boy to play wearing this cap.

Now, we have not had any luck at the varsity level with this and I don't think, further, this is a weapon.

I had this particular one made for my own hand and, as I say, I don't think it is a weapon and, further, it can be padded.

I have made this (indicating) plastic type of thing out of soft sponge to cover it and you can do anything you want with it.

I have made one for a single finger and then, in some cases, we have gone to two for a little bit more support, a little bit more protection.

We do have new products coming out.

With regard to the rule, I feel that the initial intent of the rule was to protect not only the injured boy but the others as well.

Now, initially, the plaster cast was heavy but this is a very light-weight material. As I say, it is foam rubber.

As a matter of fact, this is some of the Johnson and Johnson foam rubber, which is pretty resilient.

I would like to see some change made to allow a boy at least to wear this.

3

I also brought along a hand cast as well. I am in favor of even going that far. Perhaps others are not but we are now in the process of trying to compile some statistics on this, particularly in relationship to recovery time on injuries.

I spoke with Dave Nelson of the NCAA about this and he told me that any change, the initial input from this would have to come from our group and from the medical profession.

Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to sound ~~you~~ people out -- to get your feelings.

There are, of course, trainers who are abusing the rule now. That is an awful thing to say but I guess it is true.

I have had, for example, some very well respected trainers tell me of things they do to circumvent the rule on non-yielding substances.

I have also brought along a couple of clippings here. One of them is from the New York Times of October 25, 1975 and one from the Boston Globe, the same day, about a boy playing with a broken thumb in a cast and who recovered a fumble, etc.

Now, if you have read the story, I am sure you will agree that what is written in the paper and as to what actually happened, these are two different things. However, I do know that the rule is presently being abused and I would like to see it changed.

We lost a boy for half of a season with a finger type injury whereby, if he could have worn this, he could have played.

As I say, I would like to get some feeling from you people.

Do you think this is worth pushing to the NCAA Rules Committee? Obviously, I do.

4

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Insofar as the professionals go, I think they would allow that substance as long as it is covered by a half-inch or three-eighths inch sponge rubber.

Now, with that, are there any comments?

MR. SMITH: Personally, I am in favor of letting a boy play with a cast like that if it is covered with sponge rubber.

From what I can say, I have used it for two years now during practice and padded it very well with the same type of sponge rubber that Wes has there in front of him and I think if they had made it legal, a lot of stuff like Wes talked about would not be run into.

I think that the officials, at least those in my league, are very, very suspicious of any trainer trying to do something like this and, further, they really check things.

It is amazing the lengths to which they will go to check material like this, especially if they have any degree of suspicion.

MR. JORDAN: I have had no problems with the checking of it but each week for a period of five or six weeks, I took this cap to show to officials and asked them if there was any way the boy could play with this. However, none of them wanted to take the initiative themselves to say he could play, even though the rules say "no." Of course, there is also the degree of common sense involved here. This was something that was implied to me, for example, in relation to this boy who received this first injury while a freshman. Dave Nelson told me, for example, that even though the rule was quite specific, it was up to the discretion of the official as to how he wanted to handle it.

However, as I say, I could not get any official who wanted to take that chance.

5 MR. WHITE: I would not think that the officials should. In other words, if the rule says that is not permissible, then I would assume that the official has to stay within that particular rule.

MR. DAVIS: In the final analysis, it is still up to the official. He can let the individual play with it. It is still up to him.

MR. WHITE: Of course, if this is an unyielding piece of material or an unyielding substance, that puts a different aspect on it.

MR. JORDAN: Let me also say that the same rule applies in relation to basketball and, again, we had a boy, although not in my school but another school in the state, who, in a basketball game, fell and broke the novicula and had a cast made for this which, to all intents and purposes, is a non-yielding substance. The boy made it through the season with no problem, got complete healing in nine weeks and didn't have to miss any games.

They got it past the official for the first game and once you get one guy to accept it, then it is easy the next time around.

I also have a boy playing soccer with one of these on and who had it on for the entire season.

MR. LEE: There is no rule in soccer in relation to this now, is there?

MR. JORDAN: Yes, there is. However, it is a little bit more vague because, in soccer, with the exception of the goalie, you are not supposed to be using your hands anyway, although you can be using this.

Now, when I wrote this thing up, one of the things I said in here was that I thought it was important that the doctor be there when the official comes to check as to whether or not this were going to be approved.

I said this for three reasons, the first being to assure the official it is safe for the boy to play and, secondly, to make sure that everything is going to be legitimate insofar as the material is concerned.

MR. WHITE: How about the boy who is away from home and his physician isn't with him?

MR. JORDAN: Well, I did talk to a couple of people about this today, with both Bruce and Bill at lunch, and this was brought up and I agree this is a problem.

I also made the statement that we have used this material here and they pointed out that there are many, many places that do not have this and, again, this is another problem.

MR. WHITE: You would not dare say, for example, "light cast number two."

MR. DAVIS: You want to say "a casting material".

I would like to see us push for this.

I will be very frank with you gentlemen -- I have probably been one of the worst there was at one time in relation to circumventing this rule and even to the extent that we even had an exhibit on hand fractures and the way we got around it, of course, was through the use of plastic tape and regular adhesive tape.

We would take a big hammer and two-inch-wide strips of adhesive, say, and put them on a two-by-four and keep laminating the material up until you got to about half an inch and then hammer down until it is about half the size and you have a piece of sole leather.

You can then take a scalpel, you can cut the material, form it and mold it right to the body, to the hand, fingers, etc., and you have a rigid cast.

According to the rule this is legal.

You can even put more tape on top of it and when the official asks you what it is, you say it is an adhesive tape, and he in turn let's you play. This is one way we got around it. We used regular electrician's tape.

We took a model of the hand, the wrist and made a cast and the kid stayed with this cast all week long. He then took it off for game time and put the gauntlet on there -- he was then bound up and they let him play.

In spite of all of this, it was still legal.

MR. MALACREA: However, as I understand it, that was "hard and unyielding", was it not?

MR. DAVIS: The substance itself is not. When they ask you what it is made of, really, it is legal. It is adhesive tape.

Another thing we used was the soft plastic. You can take this stuff, take an air gun and form it right to the limb in the same way. That stuff really gets hard but, brother, there is no problem with this. You can play with a cast on your hand with this form as long as it is covered with rubber.

The official knows about it. However, while you may have difficulty, if you still present all of this in the proper manner, you can generally find the officials going along with it.

Now, I talked to Warren Morris about this the other day. I knew that Wes was concerned about this and that is that if you have an X-ray there and a statement by the team physician for the official to see, or at least a statement or letter from the physician, indicating this individual has a problem, that is why he was wearing the cast, this, in turn, might be one of the ways of getting around it and bringing it before the officials.

8

MR. SMITH: Have you gone to the Commissioner of your Conference with this?

MR. JORDAN: No. I did, however, as I said, go to Dave Nelson, who is Secretary of the Rules Committee and his reply to me was that this is what the rule says.

He also implied to me that any of these rules are subject to change and he thought that in connection with any change, the initial work on this should be done by our group and then by the medical group.

MR. SMITH: The reason I asked this is that if you went to the Commissioner -- well, several years ago we had the same thing you are talking about there and the doctors finally approved it after the young man and his dad set up such a howl.

What they did was they went ahead and bivalved the cast. He wore the cast all week. The brace shop went ahead and fixed leather laces and then this laced material was put on without any metal or anything.

All of this information was, in turn, sent to the Commissioner's Office. At that time we were operating out of the SEC, the Southeast Conference, using those officials, and they said it was up to the umpire and so they gave this information to all of their umpires so that they knew it was coming up and we were never turned down. The kid in question here played the whole year.

MR. JORDAN: On the other hand, I had a boy with the same problem and got turned down on that.

MR. DAVIS: At what point in time was that?

MR. SMITH: That was during the sixties.

MR. DAVIS: During that same period, we were using the same thing -- leather and tape. We were using

9
leather before and when we had to go in and play an SEC school, it was illegal.

MR. SMITH: Well, in our case, we went to them first and they okayed it -- they put it to them.

MR. JORDAN: Technically, leather is illegal.

Archie Manning was in his senior year when he broke his forearm. He wore a leather gauntlet which is in strict defiance of the rules as such.

Again, if the rule is there, then let's enforce it a hundred percent and, if not, then let's change it.

I personally think it is time to change it.

I think this material has changed the whole cast situation.

I think this other material here is far superior to what they had fifteen years ago for padding.

The only thing that concerns me now is the fact that you can still use it as a weapon but, also, an umpire can warn a player that unnatural use of a cast can involve expulsion from the game.

I personally believe that a kid who really wants to play will generally play by the rules.

I lost a tackle for five weeks with a fractured metacarpal and there was no reason that boy could not play with one of these things on.

MR. WHITE: I see this as being a potential and greater problem, create more problems than it will do good and that you are going to get coaches saying, "okay, why can't the guy play? Just pad it up and go in." You are going to have coaches putting pressure on you for every fracture that occurs.

MR. JORDAN: The only pressure that you will be exposed to is that of the doctor. I still think all of this has to involve a medical decision.

For example, when my doctor says that a kid can play with one of these casts on and we say that we cannot let him play because it is illegal, then I lose a kid for some four or five weeks.

MR. WHITE: Of course, that is a very unfortunate situation there but I think, in the long run, we are going to be confronted with a lot more problems.

MR. JORDAN: I think the time is right to ask the rules people to consider this.

MR. FLENTJE: I would agree with Bob, for one reason.

Here we are asking people not to spear any more -- there are rules against it -- and yet we are not willing to come out and say you cannot do this any more and we will not support it.

Sure, we make a little stand that everybody thinks is pretty good. However, here we are turning around and wanting to create a potential weapon again. I think we are running double standards here.

MR. DAVIS: I don't think you will have a potential weapon.

MR. WHITE: I would be against it more from the standpoint that you are going to get so much pressure from the coaches and everybody else to let the young kid play before he is ready to participate, even with that protective mechanism on.

MR. JORDAN: However, you are protected by the medical people.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Of course, you get involved in some of these pressure situations, such as in the big time schools.

11 MR. WHITE: There are, however, likewise the gray line areas, where, for example, there is involved a hair line fracture and that type of thing.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: How do you fell, Dick?

MR. MELHART: Well, in our conference, they do not allow anything, they will not consider anything. It is automatically out.

I would hate to see some of this but this finger type of thing, I could go for. On the other hand, the big wrist-lock device, I cannot go for that.

MR. WHITE: Well, you are going to say "one finger, yes" and then you are going to talk about two fingers and then, in turn, how about the whole hand?

MR. MELHART: Well, I think all of that has to be spelled out. If it is spelled out, then I guess it is all right.

MR. LANE: I frankly agree with Dick -- the fingers, yes, but I cannot go along with the other and I do not go along with it because the same thing that Otho has mentioned he has been doing, I have likewise been doing it but I only have been using black friction tape and using something like fifty yards to make the same thing and I can come up with a satisfactory substitute for what Dick has in his hands right there.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: On the other hand, who decides which one you are going to make it for?

MR. LANE: Well, the doctor in the situation we are in now, which isn't difficult for me to get, especially at the high school situation.

At the college level, it was decided between the doctor and myself, as to whether or not something can be satisfactorily made for protection.

Now, personally, I would never even consider

12
playing a kid that has a double fracture or two fractures in one bone or in two bones but a kid that has a crack or an incomplete fracture, I feel like I can protect him, particularly if it is three and four.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, Bill, what do you think?

MR. CHAMBERS: I don't like the great big thing like this but, I am like everybody, I have played kids, have used the J and J Othoplast.

MR. DAVIS: It is illegal.

MR. CHAMBERS: Right.

We had a kid and there was no reason in the world why he could not play -- kind of like your guy -- some kid tried to make it with his girl friend and so he just went over and took a swing at him and missed and hit a garage door and cracked his knuckles. Well, if we did not let the kid play, it ruined his chances of going to a four-year school and so we taped him up, had him inspected with the tape on there and then I had a little piece that fit right over that and then, as I say, after he was inspected, he played.

With something this small, as you indicated, Wes, I don't think it is going to hurt anything.

MR. DAVIS: In the final analysis, the kid wearing this is the one who is going to suffer. He is going to use it for a weapon.

MR. JORDAN: On the other hand, what is the liability here to a kid if you are doing this -- if he has a fracture and you take him out of the cast and put him on something else that may or may not be as good for protection of it and, secondly, how about our ethics? Are we very ethical?

You know, we talk about the Code of Ethics and yet we all sit here and say "I do this and that."

Well, damn it, how ethical is that?

MR. FLENTJE: You are exactly right.

MR. JORDAN: As I said -- we either make a rule and everybody lives by it, which is impossible, or we see if we can change it.

MR. CHAMBERS: This might keep people from violating it.

MR. LEE: I have had a lot of experience with this stuff and I think there is some real possibility offered here.

In fact, to be honest with you, the big wrist thing, this, when I pad it up, is not as dangerous as you think it is and hell, if the guy is dumb enough to hit somebody with it, it is going to hurt like hell.

I have not yet had a problem with people using them as a weapon. They are, protecting themselves when they use it.

If he has a fracture, he certainly is not going to bang anybody with that thing.

MR. JORDAN: I don't think that is actually any harder than the forearm is if padded.

MR. LEE: All you have to do is to put one layer of that on there and put a sponge on it too and that is plenty and it is all the protection in the world and, further, when you hit anything, you are not going to be hitting anything too hard with it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: On the other hand, would you mind if one of my kids was playing against you with that on?

MR. MELHART: The defensive end would not like it.

14

MR. MALACREA: Let me say that I have managed to work within the rules pretty well with the foam rubber and with some of these other things.

We use splints during the week and then, come the time of the game, they go into padding, adhesives and so on -- master splints and a dry dressing.

We have, for example, a dry dressing which is very soft. However, just before the game, you put it in water and let it set up. This also works very nicely.

In our league, for example, a piece of Orthoplast that big (indicating) that long and a half inch wide (further indicating) was worn on the tip of the index finger by a center and was disallowed. However, that is only our league. This is essentially what we have to live with and, remember, we show it to them before the game.

MR. DAVIS: It is in the rule book.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Now, I can see a reason for change, for a number of reasons.

One is, for example, to let a kid who is hurt or who has a fracture be allowed to play and not have to miss a whole season. I like that idea of it.

I also like the idea that trainers will stop breaking the Code of Ethics or stop doing unethical things, especially if they are allowed to use something like that and cover it and everybody knows about it.

MR. MALACREA: Everybody then has too much access to this.

MR. DAVIS: No, no.

MR. MALACREA: Well, he is playing with a plaster cast on.

MR. DAVIS: Sure.

15 MR. JORDAN: Well, plaster scares me a little bit because of the weight. Not everybody has access to it. You can make plaster that (indicating) thick.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, this other is harder than the plaster.

MR. WHITE: Another thing you have to consider is that these reporters at these games are generally looking for a feature story and so every kid with a fracture is going to be the feature of every story written about football participation -- for example, he played with a broken arm, sacrificed himself for his school and all this. In other words, every fracture that ever occurred is going to involve headlines in every one of your papers.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I believe we have heard from everybody but you, Craig.

MR. LEWELLYN: Well, I could possibly see something like this in plaster.

I think the problem is that in most of the schools, if you had somebody that would be in need of something like this, I think that most of these schools are within a distance of a place where they can get it if they need it for somebody and if they needed a heavy padding, I think they would try to find somebody to give it to them.

MR. JORDAN: Again, plaster scares me mainly because of the bulk but in connection with something like this Orthoplast, well, where do you draw the line, I just don't know. However, as I say, the plaster scares me a little bit mainly because of the weight.

You can take and make a plaster cast and pad it as much as you want.

MR. LANE: Can the word "synthetic" be used, with the plaster being included?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I think we should specify.

MR. JORDAN: This is why I specified.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In other words, with a light cast, that is one in connection with which you use ultraviolet to set up. However, there are new products on the market now in relation to which you do not need ultraviolet light to set up -- all you need is a hair dryer and it is much quicker but, on the other hand, it is more flammable than a light casting and so you have to be careful.

MR. DAVIS: There is still another one that can be used on top of that and that is you can dip it in hot water, 180 degrees, and roll it on.

MR. LANE: Could we use a synthetic product? In other words, plaster of Paris would not be considered a synthetic product, would it?

MR. DAVIS: It could be "synthetic products, excluding plaster of Paris."

MR. LANE: I am sure that would cover it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, we can talk on and on here and, further, I think I am getting a mixed indication.

I think, for example, Wes would like it and, Dick, I don't know how you feel.

MR. MELHART: I don't think we should have the whole arm type of thing.

MR. MALACREA: With regard to some of these fractures, our orthopedist cautioned us about that at one time. He said "I think it will heal no matter what you try to do with it."

MR. CHAMBERS: Perhaps we could say "from the

wrist up to maybe three inches," rather than going up further.

MR. JORDAN: However, that would involve a decision by an orthopedic man. Further, no two are alike.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, gentlemen, we have to get on here.

MR. LEE: Let me ask you this.

What decision do we have to make in order to take it to the Rules Committee, or are we just discussing it?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Should we have Wayne Morris present this to the NCAA Rules Committee, seeking a rule change to allow this substance to be used below the elbow?

MR. MALACREA: I think I cannot just go with that. I think what you have to have is a complete proposal, not just involving that one substance.

I think, for example, Orthoplast should be allowed, especially if this is allowed.

Also, fiber glass should be allowed.

MR. WHITE: Also, whatever is invented next year should be allowed.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think the rule can be very general and just say "casting materials other than plaster."

MR. MALACREA: Who certifies it and when it is to be used? Officials ought to rule on this.

What you are saying is that this is protecting an injury and so you now have this in your proposal and you have to stipulate all the guidelines.

18 PRESIDENT GEORGE: Again "casting material other than plaster may be used."

MR. WHITE: When?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: If the athlete otherwise could not play.

MR. WHITE: Perhaps we should do what Otho said -- in other words, have the X-rays there, a letter from the doctor or something such as that.

MR. SMITH: Again, why not have it presented to your Commissioner for appraisal.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We have done that. The officials have to be notified a week before the game.

MR. DAVIS: Your doctor can call your Conference Commissioner.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, gentlemen, we have been discussing this at quite some length -- what are we going to do about it?

In other words, do you want something like this? How many of you, for example, would like to see something like this? For example, in the event it is not more than five, then I don't think we need talk any more about it. I think, on that basis, we would be talking about a moot point.

Well, how many of you would like to see some kind of rule? Then we can decide on what the rule is.

... Six hands were raised ...

MR. MALACREA: I would like to see a whole proposal.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Let's make the proposal.

MR. MALACREA: I think that is going to take

some time. You cannot do it tonight.

MR. DAVIS: You would certainly be all night on that.

MR. WHITE: Have someone bring up an actual proposal.

MR. JORDAN: However, I think you have to start somewhere.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: For example, is what Wes has in his letter enough of a proposal?

MR. WHITE: Never.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: "Casting material, other than plaster of Paris, may be used." How does that sound?

MR. FLENTJE: What is the big objection to plaster of Paris?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I don't see any at all.

MR. LEE: It does not hold up.

The only thing I can say is that I have done a lot of these kind of casts but before the plaster of Paris, we were putting those on every second day or something down there.

MR. DAVIS: They break down and they are heavy.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I would never use plaster.

MR. LEE: I am not as worried about plaster being heavy as just breaking down all the time.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Again, I would never use plaster. It is not near as good, especially when a kid starts to sweat.

20 If one of Dick's kids were playing against me, he could play as long as he did not use it. I think that stipulation would have to be in there.

MR. FLENTJE: Why can't we refer this to the Rules Committee?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We rarely get anything back from them.

MR. DAVIS: You need something to refer to Warren.

MR. LEE: As I remember it, a few years ago we took some requests to him and they got turned down.

MR. DAVIS: That involved silicon rubber.

MR. JORDAN: That was going to be used in the Atlantic Coast Conference.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: What about this -- "casting material may be used to protect fractures or partial amputations below the elbow?"

MR. WHITE: I really think it isn't within our realm to try to come up with something that is going to be feasible to try to take to the NCAA Rules Committee tonight. I don't feel we can do something like that tonight.

At any rate, that is my thinking on it.

MR. DAVIS: Fractures made of light casting, they are legal already.

MR. JORDAN: With this material here, you do not need any great thickness. Around a cap like that, I don't think you need as much as you do on the elbow type of thing.

The concern the officials give me in relation to the cap is being boxed in and my contention, of course,

21 is that there is less chance of that going into the eye than the bare finger. Not only that, if I lose the tip of my finger, I will be damned if I am going to stick that into somebody's eye or anywhere because that is sore enough on the end of that for awhile so that I would not want to touch anything with it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, okay, do we have a proposal?

MR. LANE: Well, let's see how this sounds. I changed a couple of words in the proposal made by Wes here:

"A player may legally wear a protective cast on the hand, wrist, forearm or elbow (omit provided the cast is made of light cast material) and is adequately covered by a slow recovery foam rubber. The physician must present to the umpire who checks the player to assure the umpire that it is safe for the player to complete. The player has to wear the protective cast to protect the fracture or partial amputation. The umpire will inform the player that any flagrant use of the protective cast will warrant immediate expulsion from the game."

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That, to me, seems like a good enough proposal.

Perhaps you should put in the size of the sponge rubber -- three-eighths of an inch.

MR. LANE: If you put the size in, then you are going to have to make it compatible with what it says now -- a half-inch on the knee pads, a half-inch of this pad.

MR. MALACREA: No, no.

MR. JORDAN: I don't think the rule specifies that.

MR. LANE: Yes, it does.

22 MR. LEWELLYN: There also needs to be something in there about a team that doesn't have a doctor.

MR. LANE: That is why I took out the team physician and changed it to read "the physician must present to the umpire."

Now, of course, there are different vehicles involved. For example, the physician can physically be present at the inspection of it. He can cover it with a letter, with a note.

MR. SMITH: One thing they did insofar as we were concerned is that they went through the Commissioner's Office and it had to be agreed to by all of the opposing teams that we were playing.

However, for example, in the case of Archie, at Old Miss, where he was playing, they had to agree it was all right for him to wear that and for our boy to wear that.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, we are looking for more than that.

We are looking, for example, for an entire rules change so that there will not have to be any agreement.

MR. JORDAN: How about some help, on the Joint Commission, or somebody else? I am just trying to initiate something but it was implied to me there might be a possibility now, with the new materials coming into vogue, to provide the impetus of it. I don't know, however, that we can do it by ourselves.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I think my coach would like this.

MR. JORDAN: My team physician is strong for this.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: My coach would like to say

23 "Okay, that guy can wear one," and if it happens to my kid, then he can play.

MR. JORDAN: How about your team physician?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: He is strongly in favor of it, as long as he can decide who plays and who does not.

MR. JORDAN: I really don't know if the NCAA would buy this from us.

MR. DAVIS: You had better come up with something to charge Warren with to discuss.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: For example, do you want to put the size of the foam down in there? I would think so. I think that was a good statement.

Did anyone not think it was good?

MR. MALACREA: I have just one small point. Let's change "rubber" to "foam material," because very few of these are rubber.

MR. LANE: Okay.

MR. JORDAN: Then, on that basis, would you like to run through that again?

MR. LANE: Let me add a couple of things in here.

"A player may legally wear a protective cast on the hand, wrist, forearm or elbow if the cast is adequately covered by one-half inch slow recovery foam material. The physician must present to the umpire who checks the player to insure the umpire that it is (1) safe for the player to compete; and (2) the player has to wear the protective cast to protect a fracture or a partial amputation. The umpire will inform the player that any flagrant use of the protective cast will warrant

24 immediate expulsion."

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is that a motion?

MR. JORDAN: I would like to make the motion.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: There is a motion, is there a second?

MR. LANE: Bill brought up another point that might make it a little more valid.

Instead of saying "any flagrant use", "any flagrant misuse" would make that a stronger statement.

MR. JORDAN: How about "abuse"?

MR. LANE: "Abuse" would be a better word than "misuse."

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Okay, will you read it again, please?

MR. JORDAN: I have it written -- "A player may legally wear a protective cast on the hand, wrist, forearm or elbow if the cast is adequately covered by slow recovery foam material, it is covered by one-half inch foam material. The physician must present the umpire" -- and I don't believe the rest of this I have down perfectly as yet.

MR. LANE: "The physician must present to the umpire who checks the player, to insure the umpire that (1) it is safe for the player to compete; and (2) the player has to wear the protective cast to protect a fracture or amputation. The umpire will inform the player that any flagrant abuse of the protective cast will warrant immediate expulsion from the game."

I will second the motion to adopt this wording.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Do you all have it?

Perhaps we should read it one more time.

MR. JORDAN: "A player may legally wear a protective cast on the hand, wrist or forearm or elbow if the cast is adequately covered by one-half inch slow recovery foam material. The physician must present to the umpire who checks the player to assure the umpire that (1) it is safe for the player to compete; and (2) the player has to wear the protective cast to protect a fracture or amputation. The umpire will inform the player that any flagrant abuse of the protective cast will warrant immediate expulsion from the game."

Now, let me say, I don't like the middle part of this.

MR. CHAMBERS: Should it not be "provided"? In other words "provided the cast is adequately covered by one-half inch?"

MR. JORDAN: What I have is "provided" and they changed that. However, I don't like the middle section here -- "the physician must present".

MR. MALACREA: There is a word missing -- "previous evidence."

He has to present something to the umpire who checks the player to assure ...

PRESIDENT GEORGE: And evidence may be a written letter, if you are on the road.

MR. JORDAN: However, do we have to spell that out as a letter or X-ray?

MR. MALACREA: That is evidence.

MR. JORDAN: However, the official says is to what is evidence, a letter or X-ray. He may ask.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I would think that a

letter from the official would be satisfactory.

MR. MALACREA: "Present a statement."

MR. CHAMBERS: For example, he can give it orally. I think that "evidence" covers a multitude of sins.

MR. MELIN: For example, you can say that the umpire must be assured by the team physician that it is safe for the player to compete. Then, if you say "the umpire must be assured by the team physician", then he can use any means to assure himself.

MR. MALACREA: Now, I am mis-using a cast when I hit him with it. That is a clear definition. In other words, it should be "mis-use" rather than "abuse."

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I believe we have the proposal.

MR. JORDAN: I would like to go back and change that to "provided" on the second line, "a player may legally wear a protective cast on the hand, wrist, forearm or elbow, provided the cast is adequately covered by one-half inch slow recovery foam material."

Now then, let's change the next two lines here.

"The physician must present evidence to the umpire, who checks the player, to assure the umpire that (1) it is safe for the player to compete; and (2) the player has to wear the protective cast to protect a fracture or amputation. The umpire will inform the player that any flagrant mis-use of the protective cast will warrant immediate expulsion from the game."

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is the motion before us -- to adopt that wording.

It was made by District 1 and seconded by

District 6. Is there more discussion?

This is a motion to present this to Warren Morris so he can, in turn, present it to the Rules Committee and, also, a motion to Otho Davis to take it to the Joint Commission for presentation to the Rules Committee.

MR. DAVIS: I think you are going to get a better shot at it just from Warren -- just from the Rules Committee -- not to the Joint Commission.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, okay, the motion is to present this to Warren -- to have Warren present this to the NCAA Rules Committee.

All in favor of that motion raise your hands. It is five in favor and four against.

All right, are we ready to move on?

Now, you all have the report of the Certification Committee. Lindsay would like a change in procedure of certification to change what has been agreed upon by the Education Committee.

Basically, as you know, there is a procedure for certification which allows a member to be actively engaged in athletic training for five years -- no other qualifications. He must have a college degree, be an athletic trainer for five years, have a CPR and first aid course, and he may take a certification examination.

Now, this has been a source of embarrassment. It has been a source of not really a very professional way to become an athletic trainer.

There are very, very few professions where all you can do is practice it for five years and then become qualified in relation to that profession.

Lindsay would like a change in the procedures of Certification. They would now like to state that

28 anyone who has come in through that section must attend and then he goes on to say what it is. Have you all read it and understand it? Okay, I will read it slowly.

"Must be a graduate of an NATA approved faculty trainer educational program.

"Have transcripts of undergraduate and graduate course work which would be evaluated by a member of the Certification Committee and the Education Committee at least one year prior to the taking of the examination, to show proof of essentially equivalent course work requirements to that of NATA curriculum graduates.

"A minimum of one year or eight hundred hours apprenticeship directly under a certified athletic trainer."

Therefore, now this person must do one of these three things -- he either goes to a faculty trainer approved program and graduates from it, and that takes three summers to do ---

MR. WHITE: And I don't believe we have any of those, do we?

MR. LANE: I have a question right down here-- in other words, how many and where available?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, as of now, I don't think we have one. At least not one that is operating.

Transcripts of undergraduate and/or graduate course work, which would be evaluated by members of the Certification Committee and the Education Committee at least one year prior to the candidate taking the examination to show proof of essentially equivalent course work requirements to those of the NATA curriculum draft.

Now, can that be? Well, I guess that can be.

Perhaps, Dick, you would like to comment upon that?

MR. MELHART: We talk about them being transferred.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: And, thirdly, "must work at least one year of apprenticeship under a certified athletic trainer."

Now, what that would do is to do away with that procedure where a man can just practice for five years and become a trainer. Now he must practice the five years and do one of three things -- he must work as an assistant trainer for eight hundred hours, or, he must show that he took the proper course work in another school or he must be a graduate of a faculty trainer approved curriculum.

Are there any comments?

MR. LANE: I have a comment in relation to number two.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Just a moment, before we get any further, do you want to do away with the method that a man can just practice -- that a member can just be a trainer for five years and, therefore, be eligible to take the certification examination? Do you want to do away with that or do you want to keep it?

The Education Committee wants to do away with it. The Certification Committee wants to do away with it. It is the weakest method that we have to become certified. It is the group that scores the lowest on the certification examination and it is the group that has the most failures on the certification examination.

MR. SMITH: Are you talking about Section 5?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Sections 3 and 5 now, which would be become one. It would be both sections.

MR. SMITH: What you are talking about is the old Section 5?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Both of them, Sections 3 and 5. We have not had a number 5, I believe. We have never had an endorsement. No one has ever applied that way.

MR. MELHART: I think that Lindsay said that of the people taking the certification examination at this time, eight out of approximately one hundred forty or whatever it is, they are taking it under their five-year experience factor.

MR. FLENTJE: However, how many of those pass?

MR. MELHART: It is coming up in January.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes, it is coming up in January.

MR. LANE: There has never been anybody before this time?

MR. MELHART: Yes, there has been.

MR. FLENTJE: How many of those have passed?

MR. MELHART: I don't know.

MR. CHAMBERS: My only concern with this is that, say, an individual -- and this is particularly troublesome in the San Diego area where you have a large military concentration and you get guys that have worked as physical therapy specialists -- some of them have had good medical training and so they get out after twenty years of being in service and they have been a trainer for base teams or something like that, and then would this do away with his ever being able to pass a certification examination?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, most of those guys cannot do it now. They don't have the degree.

MR. CHAMBERS: He still would be eligible?

31 PRESIDENT GEORGE: Everyone has to have a degree.

MR. CHAMBERS: Well, okay, I understand.

MR. DAVIS: Are you talking about Section 3?

MR. WHITE: I think we should not pass something -- well, I am for this recommendation, but I don't think we should put something in as one of the ways of doing it which is not yet possible.

I think if we want to pass this now, we have to eliminate one.

MR. LEE: You are going to eliminate?

MR. WHITE: You have to eliminate one.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Perhaps I should add at this point that when this was originally proposed, it was proposed with a date of five years from now.

In other words, what if there is a man now doing this, who thinks that if he practices for five years from now, 1981, that would be one stipulation. I think we should add that.

MR. WHITE: Did Lindsay indicate this?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, that was in the first one but I don't see it written in here. He has now cut on it.

MR. LEE: He wants to do it immediately, right now.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Have you talked to Lindsay?

MR. LEE: He wants to put it in and do away with it right now.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: What if a guy has been

32
doing this for four years?

MR. DAVIS: He is always arguing, in relation to the other material, to extend it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, what if an individual has been doing this for four years and expects to take the examination next year?

MR. MALACREA: You have to have an effective date.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We did this once five years ago, just about, and it got buried in the minutes of the meeting and never got found and one day, a year ago, don't ask me how I found it, but it was brought out again.

MR. DAVIS: You have, under Section 3, being examined this month, twelve new ones and five retakes, for a total of seventeen who are applying for certification under Section 3 this month.

MR. FLENTJE: When you say "five retakes", does that mean they have to take the entire examination again?

MR. DAVIS: No.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Take whatever they flunked.

MR. DAVIS: Oral-practical, oral-practical-written.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Let's get the feeling of the Board here.

Do you want to do away with that method?

MR. LEE: That is seventeen people taking jobs from people in curriculums. At least that is the way a lot of people look at that.

33 This is the biggest bone of contention I get from people in my District right there.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: So you want to do away with it?

MR. LEE: Correct.

MR. JORDAN: I have two thoughts here.

First of all, one of the people taking this is a man from the State of Maine. He is not taking a job away from your curriculum because this school will not hire anybody else. He is providing a service in that school and he is doing it because of his interest in athletic training. If he left, they would just hire another teacher -- they would not hire an individual out of your curriculum.

The second point I want to make is this -- I wonder if one of the things we are not saying here is one of the points that was brought up and also something we will talk about later -- for example, that anybody can call himself a trainer. We have not reached a point yet where the certification is known by enough people and so what is to prevent a guy from going into a high school and saying "I am the trainer there"? He doesn't have to bother to take the certification examination.

MR. LEE: Then you get other arguments. As long as we keep doing this, it is going to take forever for certification to mean anything.

MR. JORDAN: I will certainly buy that part of it.

The only other thing, though, that I don't know is the fact that in a case like this, one person here -- well, I know damn well that if he leaves the school system, they are just going to hire another science teacher or whatever.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: You think we should keep

it then, Wes?

MR. JORDAN: I think we have to keep it at least for awhile. I don't know, however, that I would want to keep it forever.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think we are going to put a date on it because I think we have to protect the guy who has been doing this for four years.

MR. JORDAN: Also the guy who just started in yesterday.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, five years from now would be my idea.

MR. MELHART: Of course, I am on the Board for the Education Committee and we have always been against it but it has been brought before the Board of Directors every year for the last three years to have it dropped and it has always been strongly without much question.

Now, I don't know what the debate is tonight about it but it has been given to both the chairmen of Certification and Education to get together and come up with a compromise and this is the compromise and, of course, Education, the day before yesterday, at Penn State, approved of this.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In other words you are saying that Education wants it dropped completely?

MR. MELHART: Yes.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, Gene, what do you think?

MR. SMITH: Well, I think you have to protect the people starting right now -- put a date on it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: And then what -- drop it five years from now?

35 MR. SMITH: Well, these two committees are the ones we have made responsible for it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Do you then think we should take their advice?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MR. MALACREA: I think I would go along with the committees' advice. I think it is in keeping with everything else we are doing -- trying to upgrade.

I have one question, however, and that is this -- what does the "R" mean?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: It means "Retake."

How about you, Bill, do you agree with Gene?

MR. CHAMBERS: I feel the same way as Gene. These people have gotten together and worked something out.

For example, somewhere in the record here it said there was a lot of compromising both ways and that we as a Board charged them to do this and they have done their job. I am sure they have researched and studied it, talked about it, discussed it and whatever and they have come up with something we should take their advice on.

MR. WHITE: Insofar as I am concerned, I think we should pass it with a date.

MR. FLENTJE: Well, I was one of the ones that wanted to leave this in as strongly as before.

I mean, we need to put a date on it. I think there are a lot of other things going on in relation to ourselves and other people and, on this basis, we are going to have to take a stand some place and we might as well start here.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: How about you, Eddie?

MR. LANE: I will go along with it, with a future date on it -- five years and one day from when it becomes effective. To be completely fair to anybody, I would go along with it, on the basis of somebody possibly desiring to go that route and also, with some changes in the wording of the recommendation.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Here is something that both committees have asked me in relation to the Board. They would not like us to change the wording in connection with any of these proposals. They would rather we send the proposal back to them for a word change.

In other words, we can tell them whatever wording we want but then let us not pass it but, on the other hand, send it back to them and see if they would like to make another proposal.

Am I correct in saying that?

MR. MELHART: Yes.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That was a big request to the Board because we sometimes change things they would rather have had the way they brought it to us.

MR. FLENTJE: Before we go further here, I have a question.

I don't know whether it was on purpose or whether it was just a slip in terminology but under Section 4, the Physical Therapy Degree, it says "by presentation of a document of recommendation from an NATA certified athletic trainer," and the other is just a "letter."

MR. DAVIS: Yes, I see your point, and it goes on through there using both the words "document" and "letter."

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We are in Section 4 of

the new proposal.

MR. FLENTJE: Are they consistent in this one?

In relation to the one I read at home, there was a discrepancy.

MR. LEE: On the other hand, don't they mean the same thing?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think it should all be the same.

MR. MELHART: I am sure it does. I also agree it should be the same.

Now, I cannot answer everything about this because it has basically been written by Lindsay. However, I would think it should be the same.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: For example, Section 2 says "letter."

MR. DAVIS: It was "letter" in June, 1975.

MR. MALACREA: Section 4, reading from line to line, line 4 says "document" and line 5 says "letter".

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, that ought to be the same.

Wait, I know what that "document" is. It is "certified athletic trainer."

I think, for example, that Lindsay sends them a form to fill out.

MR. MELHART: That is right.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Lindsay does send them a form and he calls that a "document." It is not a "letter." It is a form he sends them to fill out.

Do you know what I mean?

For example, when they apply for certification, Lindsay sends them a form which they must fill out.

Well, okay, let's get back to the first one because we are way ahead of ourselves with that.

We are talking about changing it so we do away with Section 3 and Section 5 and combine it into one section.

Now, in relation to that one section, you can no longer just practice for five years now -- you have to practice for five years and/or be a graduate of one of these faculty trainer programs; secondly, show you have taken proper course work within the five years and, thirdly, take at least eight hundred hours under a certified trainer.

It is one of three methods and that is the only way now. I think that I also kind of agree that this is the way to do it.

Is this a proposal?

MR. MALACREA: I have a question first.

Am I correct in believing that Section 5 would now be eliminated?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

MR. MALACREA: And those people who are planning also have to be given this five-year grace period?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

MR. MALACREA: In which to apply and take the certification examination?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

39 MR. MALACREA: And this would be effective on January 1st, 1981, did someone tell me? In other words all of the applications must be done before that time?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

MR. LEE: In other words Section 3 would be effective when?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: It would be effective January 12, 1981.

MR. WHITE: Again, going back to something that was said previously, being as to how they do not want us to pass on something that is amended, therefore, all we can do is to send this back saying we agree with them in essence if it were to be dated and then if they okay it for the June meeting, then we can pass it as of June. However, we cannot pass it as of January 12th.

MR. DAVIS: I don't think it should be passed until you have a faculty training program. You have none.

MR. WHITE: However, we are assuming that in five years we are going to have something.

MR. DAVIS: Well, you don't know.

MR. WHITE: Well, at the end of five years, if we don't have it, nobody is going to be making that approach and then you can delete that aspect of it.

I agree, I think it is kind of corny to recommend something, a way of becoming certified, if you do not have it.

MR. LANE: I would have to vote against it right now on the same basis that you just mentioned, plus I will object to some of the wording of this.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Let's get down to what

you would like changed and then we will send it back to the committee, if that is what we want.

Now, would everybody like to delete the faculty trainer programs until there are some?

MR. WHITE: Until there are some, yes.

I think we need to send it back with the essence of our thoughts. I think the wording problem should be theirs.

MR. LANE: Well, I don't like (a) up in the part just beyond that, of the student trainer at the undergraduate level -- "are to be granted special consideration." I think that the wording "may be granted" would be more fair.

MR. WHITE: Just a moment, where is that?

MR. LANE: Up at the top part.

MR. MALACRAE: However, further back he has it outlined, all the sections.

It is about twelve or thirteen pages back.

MR. DAVIS: All right now, there is a page facing each other. The one on the left is June of 1975, the last time this thing was changed, which is every six months.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Essentially then, you want to send it back to Lindsay with two things -- to put a date on it?

MR. FLENTJE: And the five years.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Five years, because that is what they are doing now -- five years from the date of approval.

Now, are there any other changes you would

like Lindsay to make, both Lindsay and Bud's committees?

MR. DAVIS: Under Section 3, item 7: The words "or equivalent." Those have been added in there.

MR. LANE: However, that is not consistent with Sections 1, 2, 3 and 4.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is new, is it not?

MR. DAVIS: He does not ask for it over here and it is not in June of 1975 and it not in either Sections 1 or 2.

MR. MALACRAE: It is in June, 1975. The only thing is there is "or equivalent."

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I don't know why he has changed.

MR. MALACRAE: I think in one of these things maybe we have in here it says EMT. I believe that is somewhere in here, in which case there has to be a requisite in order to get your EMT.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Page 5 at the bottom -- American Red Cross or equivalency.

MR. FLENTJE: That is to upgrade the Associate. That is a second request.

MR. LEE: It must mean that.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is where he explains. He doesn't explain -- I don't know.

MR. LEE: I read that over also and the only thing I can figure out is that you must be an EMT, what they are now teaching in the schools, you either go for the Red Cross and the CPR or they have what they call "advanced."

MR. MALACRAE: You don't get that at school.

You have to go to a hospital.

MR. LEE: However, some are taking them at the schools now. Penn State is one example.

This, at Arizona, is being taught through the Pharmacy Department.

MR. MELHART: I think that is what he is referring to. You have EMT training there and that certificate is the road.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Are there any more requests to send back to this committee?

MR. MALACRAE: On the bottom of page 6, there is something here about EMT.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Are there any other changes for Lindsay?

MR. FLENTJE: Like a clarification as to "letter" and "document."

MR. LEE: I know what that is -- one of them.

The letter, in other words, was used to send the form back. In addition to that, they want a letter of recommendation from the trainer -- just checking a couple of things, signing your name, etc. They want an official letter of recommendation.

I have heard that discussed here in the last month and that is what that means, Bill.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: And the "document" is what Lindsay sends to the student to be filled out or to the applicant to be filled out.

MR. LEE: The trainer fills it out, yes.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, it comes from

Lindsay. Then the letter is something the trainer must write to him.

MR. LEE: Yes. It would be a letter of recommendation.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Are there any more changes in this now before we get away from it? Do I tell Lindsay now, for example, we are going to ask him to put a date five years from the date of approval and delete faculty trainer programs or do you want to leave the faculty trainer programs in? What do you want?

MR. LANE: Take it out.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: May I have a motion to refer that back to the Certification and Education Committees with the following changes -- to delete faculty trainer programs until some are established; put a date for five years from the date of approval? Is there such a motion?

MR. SMITH: This is on the first request?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

MR. FLENTJE: Are you including anything on equivalency in there?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: The EMT, I thought equivalency meant EMT.

MR. DAVIS: Make it specific or don't put it in there at all. It is not in the other ones.

MR. FLENTJE: I think you have to be consistent one way or another.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Leave it out "or equivalency" or add it in the other ones and say what it is.

MR. LANE: Going to number four, documents of recommendation.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: What page are you on, Eddie?

MR. LANE: It is page two. Did we get that one set?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think so.

MR. LANE: Do we know what it is?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think the "document" is what Lindsay signs and the "letter" is what the trainer signs.

MR. LANE: Well, again it is not consistent, especially if you look at 4 and 5. You are asking for a letter of recommendation from the acting team physician and for a document of recommendation from the certified trainer.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: It says a document which you must fill out. It is a form, really, which you must fill out, that says, for example, how many hours the man worked under you, was he good, was he average, was his work way above average. In other words, there are a number of forms, a number of things to check on that.

MR. FLENTJE: However, in relation to the apprenticeship aspect, it says "by presentation of a letter of recommendation."

MR. LEE: All right.

They want you to be more specific than just checking something.

MR. LANE: The document is going to be more demanding than the letter in Section 2.

MR. LEE: The letter is going to be the more demanding of the two things.

MR. LANE: For the apprentice.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: How about explaining the difference between "letter" and "document"?

... Cries of "yes" ...

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Now, the changes I have are as follows: Delete faculty trainer programs until some are established; put a date of five years from the date of approval; leave out "equivalency" or add another section and explain "equivalency" and then I also have the EMT as a question mark. Also, explain the difference between "letter" and "document".

Now, is there anything else anyone desires clarified as to this before you vote on it in June?

Okay, will somebody please make that motion?

MR. FLENTJE: I will so move.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there a second?

MR. SMITH: Second.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there further discussion?

If not, all in favor of the motion so signify. Are there any opposed? Any abstentions. It is carried.

Let the record indicate there is one abstention by Dick Melhart.

MR. MELHART: I did not vote against it. I just abstained.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Do you think we should vote to put a date on it now and delete faculty trainer programs?

MR. WHITE: We cannot because they asked us not to do it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, okay. Is there anything further?

If not, we can proceed to the next agenda item.

MR. MELIN: Just a moment, you still have the second request.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I don't think we are going to act on the second one until we decide on the first one -- that is, changing the Membership Code.

Lindsay would like to change the Membership Code. This is in relation to the present Membership Classification Code 2 which says "actively engaged in the profession of athletic training" -- "completion of at least two years of accredited college study applicable to physical education, coaching and athletic training."

He would like to change it to -- "completion of at least two years of accredited college study or equivalent applicable to athletic training; proof of successful completion of an athletic training course or evidence of an NATA approved workshop for credit."

What he is trying to do here is to upgrade, to make them have what every certified member has and that is, of course, first aid, CPR. In other words, we do not tell our Associate Membership that we need that now and, also, he would like them to take some course work -- that is, proof of successful completion of an athletic training course or evidence of successful completion of an NATA approved workshop.

MR. FLENTJE: Just a moment. What is the purpose of this membership classification?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: To allow people who do not qualify for certification to be members of the Association.

MR. MELIN: You might say that the inclusion of the "actively engaged sentence" in there is not part of the official current description of membership.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: He seems to think it is. He must have it coming from something, right?

MR. MELIN: He must have.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: For example, in his membership classes, he says, "June, 1970" but we have changed since then.

MR. LEE: That thing has been updated by the National Office. That is the thing they still send you.

MR. DAVIS: Let me say to you that the membership classes were updated in June, 1974.

MR. MELIN: As a matter of fact, you have received sheets on that several times.

MR. LEE: How come we have the old one in the book?

MR. DAVIS: Because that is what he said in his report. Check your book and you will have it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Okay, Bruce is speaking for the Membership Committee and he and Lindsay have discussed it.

What do you think about that change?

MR. MELIN: My letter of reply is in the membership area -- which you have in the book -- and I am in agreement with updating the membership in Class Code II to some extent and I also think it needs to be done gradually so that the status of these people is better.

However, I think there will be some, as

I indicated, in relation to which you may have to use a grandfather clause and not affect the present Associate Members. Then I also suggested that we ought to specify something about the semester credits in an athletic training course.

For example, some of the athletic training courses are one semester and some are three and there is a lot of difference in the amount of work that one would have.

I suggested that on the list in Section 10.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, how does anybody else feel about that? Do you want to upgrade it or what? Do you want to upgrade Code II or do you not, or should we leave it alone?

What do you think? Should they be made, for example, to take CPR and EMT and some athletic training or should they just be allowed to be members as they are now?

MR. MALACREA: They call themselves trainers and members of the Association.

MR. WHITE: After all, it is not too much to expect of them. I think we should upgrade them.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I have been getting the feeling we should upgrade it.

MR. FLENTJE: I want to leave it like it is because I kind of draw a parallel between this and the American College of Sports Medicine or any other organizations where, for example, your certified people are your Fellows and then you have Members and Associates.

It may not make sense to some of you. You have a student classification. There are some people that will not fit into the Certified or the Student and this is a place for those people.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, the thing about these people is that many of them are performing the same duties as the Certified Athletic Trainer.

MR. FLENTJE: So are a lot of students.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

MR. WHITE: We had better ask them to do a lot more than just be hanging around.

MR. FLENTJE: What are you then going to do with the student?

MR. DAVIS: They are going to have to have those to be certified. Therefore, you pick it up at the next step.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: He wants to improve, really, the ones that will never advance to certification.

MR. MELIN: That is correct.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: He wants to improve those people and I would not be adverse to it if someone made that proposal for the student trainers also -- have a basic first aid and CPR course.

MR. CHAMBERS: I don't think that is asking too much for a student trainer and it is not that bad, really. As a matter of fact, I think it would be good for them to have it. Most of them get it in school anyway. I don't think it is asking too much, if you want to be an Associate, to have some basic first aid and CPR.

Is that the thing in question right now?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

MR. CHAMBERS: After all, we are trying to do something to protect the athletes.

1
PRESIDENT GEORGE: I get the feeling you want to upgrade Code II. Do you want to upgrade the student code also?

MR. DAVIS: Let's take the Associate first.

MR. CHAMBERS: Leave the student alone.

MR. MELIN: The upgrading of Code II, that seems a little much for the EMT part there. Doesn't that entail considerably more than our curriculum or our minimum standards or basic first aid and CPR?

MR. MALACREA: A lot more.

MR. MELIN: For example, the CPR and the Red Cross is not anywhere near equivalent to EMT.

MR. WHITE: That is saying, for example, if you have had first aid and CPR, that is okay.

MR. MELIN: That would be okay.

MR. WHITE: That is the way it reads to me.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Would anybody like to make a proposal to accept that with a change in wording in order to be current to go along with current membership classification?

In other words, take out the "actively engaged in the profession of athletic training", because that is not in there now. Is that right, Bruce?

MR. MELIN: Well, if I were to speak for the Membership Committee, I think in view of the differences, that we ought to revise Lindsay's complete statement and further, if he wants this sent back, these minor changes would not work because he still has his proposal under the old.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In other words, to reword it using the current membership classification and

terminology?

MR. MELIN: Yes.

MR. DAVIS: Send it back.

MR. MELIN: I think if you want to really make some advances in the Code II, that you could consider making Code II members have a college degree if they made application for this after such and such a date.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, how does everybody feel about that?

MR. MELIN: In thinking it through, it might have a little difficulty.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Like Bill says, there comes a time when we will have to do that.

MR. MELIN: Then it would mean that the people in school all would not be able to get an Associate Membership until after they graduate. They would have to continue to be student members until they had a degree.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Which we make them do now.

MR. MELIN: However, not for the Code II.

MR. MELHART: No, we do not.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We do not allow a student to be a Code II member.

MR. MELIN: He can be if he wants to, if he has two years of college.

MR. LEE: Why would he be?

MR. MELIN: I don't know.

MR. DAVIS: However, there are some. They

4
PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is in your Blue Book which used to be your old Brown Book. (Laughter)

That is where it will be.

It was revised in June of 1974. When you look for that, look for the revision of 1974. It may be just a couple of months ago that Otho sent us a blue one like this and it was on that. It is in there.

MR. DAVIS: No.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I am sorry.

At any rate, is there a motion to send it back? I believe there was a motion. Is there a second?

MR. LANE: Second.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Now, do you all understand what we are doing? We are going to send it back to Lindsay for rewording using the current membership classification terminology for approval.

The Board is in favor of this proposal when rewritten.

MR. CHAMBERS: Would you repeat that?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: For rewording using the current membership classification terminology for approval and the Board is in favor of this proposal when rewritten.

In other words, what he did is he used the 1970 membership classifications and that has been outdated by four years. The last change was in 1974.

MR. LEE: And then, of course, he tacked on a few things.

MR. DAVIS: That was not in 1970.

5
PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, we have a motion and a second.

All in favor?

Is there anybody opposed?

Any abstentions?

It is carried.

Now, we are down to the matter of Ethics.

A short time ago, when I got this thing from Tow Diem, when Otho sent it around to us, I don't know what made me do it but I spent one Sunday reading the Code of Ethics and trying to make some heads and tails out of it and I was not pleased with it because we have nine pages there which we indicate is our Code of Ethics and when I read it, you really cannot find out what the Code of Ethics is, even with the nine pages.

Now, I know that someone worked for a long time and hard at doing this.

Now, one of the things that the doctor from HEW said is this -- that in connection with all of our material and our Code of Ethics, you know, he read through our Code of Ethics and he could not find what was ethical and what was not ethical.

Well, I have tried to condense and condense and condense what is in this nine pages in order to come down to what is a readable and understandable Code of Ethics.

Therefore, I would like to have you all please turn to your old code.

Also, please understand this -- that I did not change any concept and I did not change any word like "seek" to "accept". I did not change any words.

All I did was to condense and take out things.

The Code of Ethics is in your books here. It is a yellow paper.

MR. DAVIS: And right in front of that is the old one -- his worksheet, which was last revised.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: You can go to the yellow one because I have nothing to change in the yellow one other than I would change in the old one, too.

First of all, I don't think there should be anything in the Code of Ethics that we cannot enforce.

For example, he says "one outstanding characteristic of a profession is that its members are dedicated", and then he goes on and on with this type of speech without telling what an athletic trainer should or should not do.

In some instances, for example, he said that we must promote athletics. However, what if we don't promote athletics -- is that against the Code of Ethics?

It says, for example, we must go and introduce ourselves to the visiting coach and the visiting team manager. Is that against the Code of Ethics if we don't do it?

Well, I have tried to leave some of these nice things out of it.

For example, it is nice for me to visit Dick Malacrea but, however, if he doesn't come and visit with me, is that a violation of the Code of Ethics?

I don't know. However, I think we should make it more specific and I think we should make more general statements -- we should take all the flowers out and those types of things.

In relation to the first page, all I retained on that first page was the one sentence from the bottom and that is "all NATA members will understand and apply

7

the principles set forth in this Code." That is all. I did not change any words. I left out all of the other material in front of it because we are going to publish this once a year in the Journal and we are going to ask our members to read it.

For example, if we put this in the Journal, I wonder how many of our members will weed through nine pages to get at what is in the Code? I think we have to condense it. However, that one sentence was all I kept from the first page.

In relation to the second page, I kept nothing because I did not see any need for anything there.

We have to have a section later on in relation to enforcement.

As to the purpose of the Code, you know, I believe we all know what it is for. Also, the objectives are stated in the Constitution and so there is no need to repeat them in our Code of Ethics.

The third page, section 1, I deleted that completely because if an athletic trainer does not do that, is it a violation of the Code? I did not think it was.

Get this -- I am not going to ask you to vote on this or approve it -- all I want to know is your feeling about it so that I can write Mel and ask him his opinions and also ask for the opinions of his Committee and, if they don't like this to at least take out the flowers but really sit down and give us what the Code of Ethics really is.

Now, as I say, I left out item No. 1 because what if I don't do anything to further develop and improve all branches of athletics?

For example, I might never promote a gymnastics meet but is that a violation of the Code of Ethics?

In other words, I have left some of these things out because we cannot enforce them. What if a guy doesn't do it?

With regard to players, all I kept was Section No. 1, which states "each and every member on the team should be treated conscientiously, without discrimination or partiality."

Now, that is all I really thought you needed in relation to that particular section. I don't think you need "the athletic trainer can wield a great amount of influence on members of the squad by proper conduct." I don't think you need those things.

Going to the Section on Physicians and Medical Advisors, I kept those just as they were because I was called upon, as you know, a couple of years ago, to go to the Code about aspirating and suturing and things like that and I used that statement and it worked out well and, therefore, I thought we should keep the whole statement. In relation to Section 3, I left out "parents", because when a kid gets hurt, I am supposed to assure the parents that everything is being done.

Well, there are plenty of times that somebody gets hurt on my level or your level, Otho, and you don't tell the parents as to what is being done.

MR. DAVIS: Or the wife.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, if the kid is hurt really badly, in the hospital, sure the doctor is going to tell the parents and, as a matter of fact, that is policy in our school. I don't call the parents, the doctor does. At any rate, that is our policy. I don't know how it is in your place.

If a kid is hurt bad, we get in touch with the parents but if we put him in a cast overnight, say for a knee and the doctor is going to take it off the next day, a posterior splint, we might not call the parents that night.

It depends, of course, on the kid. If the kid is a freshman and is very upset, that is one thing but, on the other hand, if he is a senior and this is his sixth time being hurt and the kid is going to bite the bullet and play in a week, then this involves a big difference.

At any rate, I left that out because I did not think it was necessary.

As to administrative officials, I also left that out because it says I should get along with my Athletic Director and maintain harmonious relationships.

Now, do you know how many trainers and athletic directors fight like hell every day in the week?

The same thing applies to coaches. I would have to leave that out because I fight with the coaches all the time.

Many, many of these coaches come and talk to me.

MR. DAVIS: You can have a harmonious relationship even though you are fighting.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I am sure of that.

However, I have had some of these coaches say to me, "you know, all you care about is the football players, you don't come down and take care of the cross country team."

Now, maybe I am the only trainer who gets that but I know every head trainer I work with got the same thing and there is only so much of this that can go around. Therefore, I left that out.

In relation to fellow trainers, here I thought the important part was that any trainer who, by his conduct or comments, publicly discredits or lowers the

dignity of the members of this profession, he is guilty of a breach of ethics.

Now, fellows, I am not trying to rush through this but I think you get the idea of what I am trying to do.

Now, do you support it, or on the other hand, do you want to retain everything that was in there? Do you want me to keep reading?

As I said initially, I think someone did a lot of work in coming up with those nine pages and I don't know who it was, whether it was Pinky or somebody else.

MR. MELIN: I guess the original revision was Pinky's. However the revision of this within the past several years has been within the Committee.

MR. LANE: These go back to 1952.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I did not want to hurt the feelings of anyone who had written any of them but there is a lot in here that I could not see myself.

Now, do you want me to keep on going like this?

MR. DAVIS: Let's take the recommendations.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I am going to come to that -- that is in here.

With regard to the new recommendations, I have checked the whole thing -- as to how they should be enforced, for example, that is good.

Basically, he is asking us to change that.

MR. LEE: I don't think there is much we can do in relation to much of this.

MR. DAVIS: Let's vote on the revised January, 1976 Code.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, not to be printed.

MR. DAVIS: No, let's vote on it so that we do have a Code of Ethics. Perhaps you should give what your changes are to Phil and let him come back in June with them so that you are covered with something between now and June.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, do you agree with what I have attempted to do here?

MR. LANE: We do have a Code of Ethics now. It is not a good one but we have survived with it since 1952.

MR. DAVIS: He has some good changes to be made.

MR. LANE: He also has a couple of poor ones, such as on enforcement, on page 2.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Do we all agree up through what my changes were, up to "enforcement"?

For example, let us look at this one -- the harassment of game officials.

"The harassment of game officials is not considered good sportsmanship."

Well, I have yelled more than once at some of these guys. Do you want to leave that in or take it out?

MR. LEE: He seems to feel strongly about that, real strong.

MR. DAVIS: I know he does.

MR. LANE: Well, let me say this to you, Frank.

I think yours is a very modern version and I think it is well put.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, the man from HEW read it and he said he could not find a Code of Ethics on nine pages.

MR. LEE: However, that doesn't mean it is wrong.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: No, it doesn't, but it means that we have a lot of words there that do not mean anything.

For example, what if I don't go to a meeting-- is he going to report me to the Ethics Committee? That is something that is in there and I think we have to get it out.

MR. LEE: You told him to shape it up last year and he did. Well, he did and didn't. He did not shape it up to what you are telling us tonight, now.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is why I would like to send him what we think he should shape up. We asked him to shape it up and he left all of that but, really, we did not tell him to take out all of these other things.

MR. DAVIS: He came in here with recommendations and came back with a better one.

MR. LEE: I believe that Eddie has some points down here.

MR. LANE: On page 2 compared to page 8, on enforcement, on page 2 I have a note which says "see page 8, Section 2, not consistent with Section 1."

In other words, the first paragraph on page 2 under "enforcement" is not consistent with page 8, Section 2.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is right.

MR. LANE: And, also, the second paragraph on page 2 is not consistent with Section 1 and that definitely has to be changed or nobody can live with it the way it is written now.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Okay, we are now on page 8.

MR. LANE: Well, just comparing the two -- the first paragraph on page 2, compare it with Section 2.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I took it out completely.

MR. LANE: And the second paragraph on page 2, compare it with Section 1 on page 8 and you will see that they are not consistent in any shape or form.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is what we should do. Page 2 is wrong, I will say that. That is why I left it out completely.

I kept page 8 in because the first part is correct. If there should be a violation of the Code, it should be reported to Otho and I and we, in turn, turn it over to the Ethics Committee, who investigates it.

Isn't that what it says?

MR. LANE: That is what page 8 says. Page 2 says something different.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, that is wrong.

MR. LANE: It says, "send a written report to both the President of the Association and the Chairman of the Committee on Ethics."

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is wrong.

MR. LANE: Paragraph 1 there on page 2 is also wrong.

MR. LEE: Why is that wrong?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I think we all realize that page 2 is wrong and that is why it was left out.

MR. LANE: It is the duty of the Code of Ethics Committee to collect all the data important to...

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is right. That part of it is right.

MR. LANE: Over here, on page 8, Section 1, the reporting of unethical conduct -- "any member of the Association that becomes aware of conduct that he considers unethical and that he believes warrants investigation should report the incident in writing to the President and the Executive Director of the Association, who will, in turn, initiate investigation to the Ethics Committee."

Now, it doesn't say that on page 2.

MR. MELIN: Page 8 is the original and coincides with subsequent revisions as they were made.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Page 8 cannot be the original. That is the one that was just rewritten.

MR. DAVIS: Page 8 is the new one.

MR. CHAMBERS: That is the one he was working on.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Page 2 is the original.

MR. DAVIS: Yes.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is the one that needs to be left out.

You have "enforcement" there and you don't need it again on page 8. Therefore, there is no sense in arguing over what is right and what is wrong.

MR. MELIN: The question is as to what procedure you desire.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: A letter to Otho and I and we, in turn, turn it over to the committee.

MR. MELIN: That is on page 8.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is what we want.

MR. MELIN: That is the original intent.

MR. DAVIS: The original intent but it is not worded that way.

MR. MELIN: I think there was one copy of this that was that way.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We never had it the way it was originally written.

MR. MELIN: It has been revised since then.

MR. CHAMBERS: This page 8 is what we worked on?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

Now, Eddie, let's go back to page 8. What do you want changed on that page?

MR. LANE: I will go with page 8.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Are there any other changes you think we ought to suggest to Tow?

These come from the Board and not just from me. If you think, for example, this brief form is what we should recommend to Tow?

MR. WHITE: Yes.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Would you like to add or

delete anything else in there?

MR. LEE: You certainly mean, for example, for it to be longer than two pages?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: No, I don't, even shorter if it can be.

MR. MALACREA: I would add page 1 and 2 and the enforcement.

MR. LEWELLYN: I would like to see the "purpose" left in here.

MR. MALACREA: The preamble and purpose.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Page 2, the "purpose"?

MR. LEWELLYN: Yes.

MR. CHAMBERS: At our committee meeting in June, we did not even cut page 2. I do have my worksheet in front of me and we did not cut it there.

MR. LEWELLYN: I would like to get it into one sentence here and have a statement of purpose and then what follows.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Why do we need it?

MR. LEWELLYN: I think it is a little more professional than just having what you have here and getting right into it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, how does anyone else feel about that?

MR. CHAMBERS: I can see eliminating page 2 but I agree, I do think we should have some kind of heading into it instead of just saying "boom", here it is right now.

Granted, I agree with Eddie, that page 2 is

not consistent with page 8 but we have not touched page 2 for as long as I have been on the committee, which is some two or three years. We have not even done any of that and, I agree, leave it out. However, I think you have to have something in here like "rules" -- "you cannot do this, this or this." In other words, you have to have something like that in there.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, that was my original intent. This is what I had reference to in relation to the man from HEW. When he read this, he did not know anything about it. Therefore, it has to be clear and has to hit the individual in the face pretty quickly as to what it is.

I will tell you one I would like to talk about a little more and that is number ten, the matter of harassment of game officials.

For example, does Dick Malacrea report me for yelling at a trainer after a game? Does he report me for yelling at an umpire or an official?

... Cries of "yes" ...

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In other words, you would like to keep that?

MR. FLENTJE: If you are going to observe standard and good sportsmanship, yes.

MR. CHAMBERS: That is fine, but it should stop at the local coaches.

MR. JORDAN: Let me say, to my way of thinking, it is one thing in yelling at an official but if you really belittle everybody, then I think that is wrong.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: For example, when we were playing football, at our last game, the other team was trying to kick a field goal to win the game. However, after it was kicked, our guy blocked it, picked it up and ran some

eighty-five yards for a touchdown. Well, the official blew the whistle because he thought they were trying for the extra point.

Now, do you think that did not provoke me into calling him some names? As you can well imagine, I went crazy and so, you know, I agree it is wrong.

MR. LEWELLYN: However, the purpose is pretty well stated in the replay here but even on page 3 here, on the basic principles, even if you wanted to reword that, I would hate to see the words "integrity" and "loyalty" left out. I would like to have them left in.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, insofar as I was concerned, I thought it sounded too much like a Boy Scout oath. That is why I left them out.

After all, what is loyalty? Do we really know?

Honesty, of course, is not making those fake kicks. Let's face it, we are dishonest when we do that.

MR. DAVIS: And that is even more reason to leave the rule in there.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: No, it is not.

MR. DAVIS: In other words, now you are dishonest and you are admitting it and now you are trying to write the rule to admit your dishonesty.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I don't think we should have anything in there that we cannot confess.

MR. JORDAN: On the matter of probation, do we have any control over that?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I really don't think so.

MR. SMITH: With regard to Section 4, we are

trying to get people and, as you go into the State of Texas and a lot of other places, we have a lot of trainers in the high schools.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is right, we do.

MR. SMITH: Now, in relation to that section and the matter of the parents, if they do not notify the parents, is that a violation of the Code of Ethics?

That is all I am asking.

Now, it may be wrong that they don't and it may be wrong, when they come visit me, that I do not go down to see them.

After all, you know we go to plenty of places and, really, people do not say hello to us each time. Maybe that is not a responsibility, and, therefore, perhaps you could change that word "responsibility" to provide that this is not mandatory -- that it is just recommended.

Therefore, if a guy does not do it, he is not in violation of the Code.

However, as I read it now, it is the "responsibility" of the trainer.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I can see where we can recommend some policies and procedures but, on the other hand, that should not be anything that someone can say that we broke the Code of Ethics on.

MR. FLENTJE: Why don't we send that back to him and ask it be redone in a form similar to this.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Very good.

MR. LANE: I have another one on ethics -- the procedure for NATA program endorsement. This is something that none of you have. It also concerns the Code of Ethics.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, let's finish the Code of Ethics.

Now, first, do you want us to approve what was done formally now in connection with this meeting.

MR. CHAMBERS: I think you should send it back to the Committee and let them kind of rework it and send it out to all of our group.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In other words, you just want to send it back for their revision.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I see.

Now, with regard to what is on those sheets, do you want to accept that now, not to be printed or anything?

I will make sure he doesn't spend any money printing it but so they have something to go on?

You see, until we print it, there is no sense having anything because the members will say "what are you talking about", and I don't think we should do all of that until we have something.

MR. CHAMBERS: Well, I am sure that this never occurred to any of the Committee members.

As a matter of fact, we did not realize that pages 2 and 8 were so inconsistent because we never really touched this in here.

We have been dealing more with the back of it so to speak and I think if it isn't consistent, we ought to do away with it.

Now, I am speaking strictly as just a Committee member and it is just my opinion but I think it should be pointed out to the rest of the Committee members in order to let them know what we discussed. I have reference to what Eddie brought up here about consistency

and then let us discuss it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, do you feel this should be condensed?

MR. CHAMBERS: Yes and no.

However, I think it should be right there in black and white. Then also I kind of feel like Craig, in other words, you should leave something of what we have had in here because it does look a bit more professional.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, should there be anything in there that cannot be enforced?

MR. CHAMBERS: No.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: For example, when you tell me to promote athletics in all the phases and everything else, to the best of my ability, if I don't do that have I violated the Code?

MR. CHAMBERS: Well, I think that is kind of an ambiguous term.

For example, if you are an athletic trainer, you are certainly going to be promoting athletics.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, I may just be promoting football. However, it says that you must promote athletics in all of its phases, all athletics.

It merely doesn't say one thing and that is why I left it out completely.

For example, the soccer coach gets real mad at me because I don't take care, according to him, of his soccer players, which I should do, and that I just promote football. Now, on that basis, does he report me to the Code of Ethics Committee?

Do you think we should send it back to the

Committee for some reworking?

Do you think it should be condensed?

...Cries of "yes"...

MR. FLENTJE: They may have some better type of statements.

MR. CHAMBERS: Maybe we can condense it down and maybe not. After all, we do have some good folks on this committee and we can certainly take another look at this.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, if there is no objection, we will refer it back to the Committee for rewording and condensing. Do we need a motion for that? Can I have a motion for that?

MR. LANE: I would so move.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: The motion is that the 1976 revisions of the Code of Ethics not be approved and be sent back for further consideration, further revision, to be considered at the June Board meeting.

MR. CHAMBERS: Second the motion.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there any more discussion?

All in favor? Is there anybody opposed?

Any abstentions? Okay, it is carried. Thank you.

MR. LANE: Very briefly, there is one thing that I discovered here quite by accident, again concerning the Code of Ethics.

On the request for NATA program endorsement that I received from Bud Miller, on the second page of it, it says, in talking about program format, "any change in program format after NATA endorsement without NATA approval is subject to review of the NATA Ethics

Committee."

Now, all I wanted to know is this -- what is the history on this?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, that is the first time I have heard that.

MR. LANE: That is also the first time I have heard of it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: It does not say anything in the Code of Ethics on it.

MR. LANE: It says the same thing we have been talking about.

MR. DAVIS: What is this one now?

MR. LANE: That is why I said Dick might be able to give me some history on it.

MR. LEE: We were not given that in our book.

MR. LANE: This involves correspondence from Bud and myself.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: This is what Bud sends whoever applies for an NATA approved workshop.

MR. LEE: What that means is that if I am conducting a program and I set it up and give him all the information he requests there and I have Frank George on the program and he drops dead of a heart attack and I put Otho Davis on in an emergency, am I going to be reviewed by the Ethics Committee?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I will write to Bud and ask him to reword that.

MR. MELHART: These things are done anyway now because we are getting into continuing education and we no longer have these.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Then, don't worry about it because there is no longer any NATA approved workshops. Okay, thank you.

MR. LANE: On the other hand, I don't see how you can say that, especially when I have a letter written on December 18th, 1975 from Bud.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I will write to Bud and get that revised, okay?

Well, we now have something in relation to the banquet at the convention.

MR. DAVIS: Bill mentioned, in a telephone conversation last Friday I guess it was, probably this would go through the Grants and Scholarships, on the banquet for student trainers that we discussed in June.

In other words, I thought Lew Crowl had donated \$200 for this.

MR. CHAMBERS: You know, at the Board meeting last year when we were discussing this he said he would. When I talked to him at the end about it, he said he wanted to do it in the name of Ernie Butts. Also, I think this would be a perpetual type of thing from Lew as long as it was done in the memory of Ernie.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Of course, you can donate money in anybody's name.

Is Dr. Curlan's group going to pay for that?

MR. CHAMBERS: I met with Pinky after everybody had gone. We taped everything, everything is on tape, that we did not have to write notes and this sort of thing, and so I went over everything we had done and talked about and gave him all the information about what was done.

We had several discussions, you know, and to

be quite honest, I forgot what we talked about because it has been that long ago. However, as I say, it was all on tape and I thought, and I do remember that at the time I felt we had some pretty concrete suggestions as to who would get complimentary tickets and I think we decided on a luncheon, if I remember correctly. Curlan was very pleased with the way things went out in our area and if the monorail had not broken down, we would have had more people. However, as it was, we received a lot of good comment back from this.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: So I will contact Pinky and ask him about it.

MR. CHAMBERS: Pinky should have it. We pretty well worked out the thing.

MR. DAVIS: Also, in relation to grants and scholarships, we probably should set a little guideline for the President's Challenge Award. I think, for example, the name should be submitted to the Board of Directors by April 1st, so the Board can consider it.

After all, this is a very prestigious award and a very fine award and I think the Board of Directors should select the individual.

MR. LEE: Instead of the Grants and Scholarships Committee?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: The Grants and Scholarships Committee does it now.

What do you say? How do you feel about it?

Do you think the Grants and Scholarships Committee should do it or do you want to pick the winner of that?

MR. MALACREA: Why do you want to change?

MR. MELHART: I would think it would be their

responsibility, subject to approval.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Grants and Scholarships?

MR. MELHART: If, for example, you don't want to give it to so and so, you can act on that later.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, the point regarding this is that we do not get asked until it is really too late to do anything. By that time, it has been printed, the guy has been notified and everything else.

MR. WHITE: Why would we discuss it?

MR. LEE: That goes out to mail vote, is that right?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think we can discuss it. We would have to do it by the week of the winter Board meeting.

MR. WHITE: However, that is not really realistic.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We already have one picked for next year. He was picked last June.

MR. CHAMBERS: Further, the guy is not going to do something in one year's time that is going to qualify him for the award.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: What can I say?

MR. DAVIS: There are other people who want to submit names.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think that Pinky had two very qualified people that it came down to last year and in his own mind he figured he would give it to one that year and one the next year. I don't know if anything official has been done and if anyone submitted a name more qualified.

MR. MALACREA: Who was it last year?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: He told me Dr. Hanley would be in Boston and he planned it that way -- that would be the place to give it to him. I don't know if he received any other applications. We don't do anything about that committee, really.

MR. WHITE: I know there have been other applications.

MR. DAVIS: I know that, too.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Since June?

MR. WHITE: Yes. One went through my office.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, do you want to make a stipulation that it must be presented to the winter Board Meeting for approval?

MR. MALACREA: I think probably a lot more input has to be given to the selection of the individual, keeping in mind that so few people are going to win this over a time span. There have been a lot of people who have helped support athletic training and I am sure somebody could pick off five very easily. Therefore, it is going to be five years before each one of those is recognized, let alone any new ones coming along.

Therefore, it would be wise possibly to have a pool of people that you could look at and say, "Well, this individual has probably contributed the most out of this group."

PRESIDENT GEORGE: For example, Pinky told me last year, and this doesn't have to be confidential, that the committee had selected Dr. Hanley for the award last year in California and he thought it would be better to put over a year and give it to him in Boston, for sentimental reasons.

MR. MALACREA: That was a good move.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, they gave it to the Doctor from Ohio State last year.

Are there any comments? No?

Well, do you want to let it go the way it is going?

MR. WHITE: To my way of thinking, I don't think that one person should have that power.

MR. LEE: He doesn't now.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: He has a committee.

MR. DAVIS: He has a list of names over here.

MR. LEWELLYN: I think it would be good for the Board to take it over and get a cross-section of individuals and discuss it.

MR. CHAMBERS: I don't think that Pinky should do it himself. If this is what is being done, I don't think it is fair.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Who is to say that?

MR. DAVIS: You are an ex-officio member, what do you say about that? Did you ever get anything from him?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: No.

MR. CHAMBERS: I don't think that is right.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Does an ex-officio member vote?

MR. DAVIS: You can be kept abreast of what is happening on the committee.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, as to how democratic that committee is, I really don't know.

MR. CHAMBERS: There are fourteen people on there. However, I wonder how many of those people have voted on anything.

MR. DAVIS: It is just a list of names.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think you are right. Pinky does all the work.

MR. LEE: They do not send out ballots. Pinky tells them what is going on but he does not solicit work.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, fellows, we have to make a decision.

Do you want to review the selection of the President's Challenge Award nominees?

MR. LANE: Perhaps we can do this -- leave the selection with this committee and ask that a deadline be put on the names that the Board of Directors will be made aware of and give the Board of Directors recommendations back to Pinky to make the final selection.

Would this help?

MR. LEWELLYN: I think it ought to be the reverse. I think the committee ought to give us the names and we review them.

MR. LANE: Well, that is what I meant and maybe I said it the other way.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Okay. We will recommend that this committee recommend to the Board of Directors three suitable names at the Winter Board Meeting for selection for the President's Challenge Award.

MR. WHITE: That is not realistic because

that means that the committee has to have researched those people by January -- a group of people by January.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, what is unreasonable about that?

MR. LEE: If they are selecting them three or four years ahead of time, that ought to be a snap -- just keep sending us a few new names.

MR. LANE: That would let them have the knowledge.

MR. LEE: How did this get screwed up?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Who screwed it up? Who said it was?

MR. LEE: How did you start on this idea?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I didn't.

MR. LEWELLYN: For example, all of a sudden did you give it some thought, did somebody get on you about it?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: No, no.

MR. LEE: You know what he means?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Otho doesn't like the way it is being selected. I don't think he likes to see Pinky have that much power to pick that particular award.

MR. LEE: Does he pick the other ones?

Isn't he in charge of picking all the awards?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In charge of it?

MR. LEE: Well, he does it. He does not send out a copy of the resumes of all those kids that send in the things.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: He doesn't? Well, I don't know.

MR. LEE: At least not from what I have been able to find out.

MR. DAVIS: Here again there should be a date on all of these awards, a cut-off date.

MR. LANE: I think I have expressed myself several times along these lines.

This Grants and Scholarships Committee and the Chairmen of all Committees take too much on themselves. I think this is a good indication, for example, that this can happen and I think we should take steps to correct it and if we put a deadline on this and we are, I believe, doing the right thing.

Now, in a review of these applications, I am not saying we have to select the winner but we need to be more aware of them.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Would it be reasonable to ask for all winners of NATA Scholarships, including the President's Challenge Award and all Honorary and Twenty-Five Year Awards to be presented to the Winter Board Meeting for approval?

MR. DAVIS: It would, for the Winter Board Meeting.

The Honor Awards are received prior to February 1st.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, is it unreasonable to ask, for the Winter Board Meeting, to have these names?

Of course, I know that we can ask for anything we desire but, on the other hand, is it reasonable for us to ask, for the Winter Board Meeting, for a list of the Honor Recipients and the Grants and Scholarship

Recipients?

Is that unreasonable?

MR. MELHART: I don't know that it is unreasonable to ask but maybe Pinky is going to have to give the answer.

Has anybody ever done anything in that respect with him?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: It says "April 1" here. I think by April 1 he has made his selections but then I don't know.

MR. LEWELLYN: In this folder I got tonight, it is April 15th. That was last year's scholarship information.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Therefore, I believe we have to make some revisions there.

For example, how much, in the way of selection of this President's Challenge Award, do you people want to know?

MR. LANE: With regard to the date, all we have to do is change April 1st to be consistent with the Board Meeting held during the winter because we already have authority in the Bylaws, under Grants and Scholarships, to approve or reject.

MR. MELHART: On the other hand, if Pinky says, for example, we either accept or reject, at the same time, we don't know the alternatives as to who might have been considered or whatever.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, if we either accept or reject, then he would have to come back with another name.

MR. CHAMBERS: He could say, for example, "these are the ones we have selected and this other group

are the ones in the running." This could be sent to all of us in one ball of wax.

MR. WHITE: I think, in essence, what we are trying to do here is to indicate, for example, that Pinky should not have the total say.

Now, on the other hand, we would not feel bad about it if this, in reality, were a committee action, the actions of a committee, rather than just the actions of one person. I think this is what we are really trying to fight here -- as to how, for example, we can solve that aspect of it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: You have to get Pinky involved with a more working committee.

You know, we have kind of traditionally left this to the committee chairman, to more or less run this on a committee basis, at least as to how he sees fit.

MR. WHITE: However, is it solely because Pinky created this?

... Cries of "yes" ...

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes, he did create that. We asked him to do so.

MR. WHITE: And he did?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

As I said, we asked him to do so. The Board asked Pinky to make this a functioning committee, to raise money and, of course, he did it. After all, you know Pinky, he will do it.

MR. WHITE: Can't we ask him for evidence of more committee input in relation to his decisions? Would that be an embarrassing thing to do?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think so, yes.

MR. LEE: On the other hand, if you do this in relation to one, then you have to do it in relation to all of the rest.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes, possibly in connection with all of the scholarships.

MR. LEE: You know, it is stupid to call to his attention the fact we want to have more input in relation to the President's Challenge Award.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is why I had reference to all of the scholarship awards.

MR. LEE: In other words, if they do one, they should do them all.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Would you like to talk with Pinky about it at the June Meeting?

MR. LEE: I think it would be a good idea.

MR. CHAMBERS: To my way of thinking, it would be a better way of handling it.

MR. WHITE: I would agree.

In other words, why don't we ask him how he operates -- how this happens.

MR. MELHART: Also as to what are his procedures?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes. For example, how are these people picked?

Would that be okay with the Board Members?

MR. DAVIS: Then, do you want to disregard this at this time?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, as has been indicated

here, we are going to endeavor to do it in June.

MR. DAVIS: Why? After all, it is already right here.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: You mean, for example, you want him to send us that name by April 1?

MR. DAVIS: Well, that is in the Bylaws. He has a date of April 15th on the application.

MR. LEWELLYN: There is no date on here as to when he is supposed to receive it.

He says "completed nomination forms are to be submitted to your District Director by May 15th (and this was 1975) and reported to the Selection Committee."

However, he has no date as to that.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Just a moment, what award do you have reference to?

MR. LEWELLYN: That is the Challenge Award.

MR. WHITE: On the other hand, we have to assume that if a name is submitted once that it will stay in submission indefinitely.

MR. DAVIS: However, that we do not know either.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is a committee procedure that we have never questioned.

MR. MALACREA: It is similar to the Helms Award -- once it is submitted, it stays.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: No, it must be resubmitted every year.

MR. MALACREA: However, this does not involve a new form, does it?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: No new form, new pictures, no, but, however, the District must resubmit the name.

Well, okay then, the two are not consistent.

I can, I presume, notify Pinky that, according to the Bylaws, this form is not correct and that we should have the name by April 1st. However, I do not know now, in relation to this year's form, what to say.

MR. SMITH: On the other hand, if he already made a selection for June, then we cannot do anything until we meet with him in June and ask him how these things come about.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, okay, do you all feel that way?

MR. WHITE: You have to give in. He has already done it.

MR. CHAMBERS: Also, I could understand why he would involve Dr. Hanley in connection with the Boston Meeting.

MR. WHITE: So can I.

Now, I don't think it is right it happened that way but if it happened we should meet with him.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think that Pinky's first choice for the award was Cooper. He gave it to him when he did, for example, because he thought that was the best selection and I also think he probably thought his second choice for that award was Dr. Hanley.

MR. DAVIS: I think that the Board approved Cooper. I know the Board approved Dr. Cooper because when we told Pinky, for example, who the recipient would be, the one that the Board had picked, he was concerned because Don is on his committee. He said something to the effect, "Well, I hope this doesn't look bad."

MR. FLENTJE: I submitted his name. Somebody else may have also but I know I did.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, fellows, is there anything you want to do on this?

MR. LEE: During the first year there wasn't an application like there was the second year.

MR. DAVIS: No.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I don't remember one.

Now, again, is there anything you want to do on this now for this meeting before June? We are wasting time -- yes, no?

MR. WHITE: We ought to have a meeting with Pinky in June.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Now, there are two curriculum approvals from the Professional Education Committee.

MR. MELHART: There are two curriculums for approval.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: And they are what?

MR. MELHART: The Graduate Program at the University of Virginia and the Undergraduate Program at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

These were new curriculums, approved this past week at Penn State by the Professional Education Committee.

Again, the University of Virginia is graduate and the University of Nebraska, at Lincoln, is undergraduate.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there any discussion in relation to those?

Will somebody make a motion to approve?

MR. FLENTJE: Is there any information on these programs in here?

MR. MELHART: No, there is not.

MR. LANE: Are these new ones?

MR. MELHART: Yes, these are new ones.

MR. LANE: If that is the case, then what happened to those hanging fire?

MR. MELHART: Those were the ones hanging fire. There was also one that we tabled, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

We felt, for example, there were enough problems there that we were unsure of and so we did not approve it.

MR. WHITE: Are they both male and female?

MR. MELHART: Yes.

MR. LEE: I would make a motion that we approve these two schools.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: There is a motion to approve these two schools. Is there a second?

MR. MALACREA: I will second the motion.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Now then, is there further discussion on it?

MR. FLENTJE: I have a question here.

How many students is each of these programs going to try to run through?

MR. MELHART: Well, first of all, the

guidelines say sixteen per certified trainer in the undergraduate.

Now, Nebraska has three certified trainers.

MR. FLENTJE: Is that sixteen per year or sixteen in total?

MR. MELHART: Sixteen per certified trainer.

MR. FLENTJE: Per year?

MR. MELHART: Total.

MR. FLENTJE: How many sports do they have?

MR. MELHART: I do not know.

All I can tell you, for example, is the University of Nebraska has a full sports program.

MR. LANE: At Lincoln?

MR. MELHART: At Lincoln, yes.

MR. LANE: Excuse me, I am thinking of Omaha.

MR. FLENTJE: So we are talking forty-eight students?

MR. MELHART: Potential.

MR. FLENTJE: How many do you think you are going to have?

MR. MELHART: Well, I don't know that it was stated, other than that they anticipated, to start with a low number.

MR. FLENTJE: How are they going to take care of their practical experience?

Is it all going to be done different than any other curriculum?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: What point are you trying to make, Bill?

MR. FLENTJE: The point I am trying to make is that in relation to some of these curriculums, they are not giving their kids enough clinical experience -- they are coming out a bunch of dummies.

MR. MELHART: They are getting six hundred hours.

MR. FLENTJE: Stuffing envelopes and this type of thing.

This is an extreme example, of course, but the point was made in relation to Mel's thing, that some of their practical experience was stuffing envelopes and, therefore, I am curious as to how they are going to get their clinical experience because, in relation to some forty-eight people, it takes one hell of a program to get that much experience.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Are there any programs that are that large, Dick?

MR. MELHART: No.

Well, I am not sure about Mel's, because he does have a large one. Also, Mankato has a large program.

Virginia, however, is small at this time.

MR. FLENTJE: Unless they have some system of farming these people out into the high schools, which we have already kind of, in the past, indicated that we are opposed to, where are they going to get their experience?

Are they going to send them to another college

under a certified trainer?

MR. MALACREA: They do that at the graduate level.

MR. MELHART: I believe Warren can speak to that, about the experience that the graduate students are getting at your place.

MR. LEE: In the high schools?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Do they have to have six hundred hours before they come in?

MR. LEE: Yes.

MR. LANE: They cannot do that at the undergraduate level -- they cannot farm them out at the undergraduate level, can they?

MR. MELHART: Not unless, of course, they are working under a certified trainer. If the high school has a certified trainer then that is fine.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there a motion?

MR. MELHART: I cannot answer your question specifically about training because I didn't do the evaluation. However, I assume they get their experience like all the rest of them -- that is, being in the various training rooms on the campus.

MR. FLENTJE: Okay, how about the University of Virginia -- the same questions?

MR. MELHART: It is going to be a very small program and only graduate students.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Are they going to be in the high schools or at the university?

MR. MELHART: At the university.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: This is not going to extend out to the high schools?

MR. MELHART: No.

MR. SMITH: What will be the total there, sixteen?

MR. MELHART: Less than that. He was talking about six to start with.

MR. FLENTJE: How many certified trainers are there now?

MR. MELHART: I am not sure -- I don't know.

MR. SMITH: Are they both men and women?

MR. MELHART: Yes.

MR. FLENTJE: You know, somewhere along the line we are going to have to tighten things down.

Now, I realize that we are kind of going in different directions here at the same time. For example, we want more certified trainers and we are also trying to increase our programs but, at the same time, I feel we do not have enough jobs for the ones presently available and, therefore, to me, it seems as if we are just trying to go too fast and get all of these people eligible for certification and then they come out not really knowing anything.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: You know, Bill, that bothered me for a long time and then I listened to the other professions speaking. For example, in relation to the education of the physical therapists. They are not worried about not having enough jobs.

It is just a means of getting a kid an education. He gets educated in physical therapy and so what if there are not any jobs? So what, if the profession is

overloaded? After all, the kid has had his education. He has been educated in whatever he picked to have himself educated in.

MR. MALACREA: Also, the physical therapists have a tremendous attrition rate in the early years of practice. They get married and leave the profession.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, education does not seem to have any qualms about turning out five hundred educators from a big school every year and with no jobs available for them, no jobs at all. They don't seem to mind.

MR. FLENTJE: Well, does that mean we also have to do it?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: No, we don't have to but I don't think we should be bothered by it either.

MR. FLENTJE: It does bother me.

MR. WHITE: As I remember, we have said that no new programs will be approved as of last year except those that were pending.

Now, these two were in process and we are not approving any additional programs -- is this not right?

MR. MELHART: There was a year's moratorium.

MR. WHITE: Correct, a one-year moratorium.

MR. SMITH: Going along somewhat along the lines of what Bill is talking about, some of these people are not getting the practical experience in the training room.

You know, when you get large groups like this you do not tend to get enough of the practical experience.

Also, let me add that I asked Duke about this

a couple of years ago. I asked him what he was doing there at Western Illinois and I was informed that they stay a week here at a particular training room and they go to another one and so on.

Now, what if Joe Blow is in that training room, he gets to treat an individual with a knee torn up, then he moves on and, of course, in so doing, he does not see that athlete for another three or four weeks, to see what the progress was.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, as you know, I did speak to the Education Committee at Penn State and, in relation to everything I said to them, I told them this was the biggest problem.

I told them, for example, I was not worried about the job market because it either will be or won't be and we have given the kid a good education and, further, I don't know how much control we have over that.

I told them that I thought our biggest problem involves the critical experience for the students and that it is by far the biggest problem they have and they have to solve it because they are really not turning out the best athletic trainers, for example, if Gene can take a kid in his program, which is not an approved program and educate that kid by having him a student with him for three years, fall, winter, spring, day in and day out. In other words, if that is the best way to do it, then we are not doing it in the right way.

MR. LEE: That certainly is a good point.

MR. MALACREA: That is evidenced in the fact that most have to retake the oral-practical, which is a practical type of experience thing and not the written part.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We have also talked to Lindsay about this and he says one of the reasons for this is the subjunctionness of the oral-practical exam.

For example, Lindsay is not pleased with the oral-practical part of the examination. He is, however, I think, quite pleased with the written part.

For example, he has seen kids who will give very similar answers and comments and yet these kids will have a very wide variation in their scores. Therefore, he is trying to make it more objective.

MR. JORDAN: This also happened last summer in our area.

MR. LEE: Well, I think much of this has to do with the experience of those testing.

I know, for example, this is the third or fourth year that I have been involved in that now and, as a result, you are getting much more discriminating and much more fair with the people.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, we seem to have deviated here a little bit and so let's get back to this education bit.

As I said, the biggest problem is that of clinical experience and Bill is right -- that, for example, if you have forty-eight kids in your program, and I don't care what program you have, if they are not learning to tape ankles, knees and the like, they are not getting the proper experience.

MR. MELHART: On the other hand, I hope it is obvious that you will not have all of these students taking their practical experience all at the same time. It has to, as a matter of fact, be spread over the last two years.

I have some twenty-two students in Minnesota and working in the training room this particular semester I have five.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: To get back to you, Gene, the kid who has been taking it your way, he is not doing

the best on the examination.

MR. SMITH: Of course, I realize that.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: And, of course, this also applies to the kids who are doing it in other ways. Therefore, you know, as I said, this is the biggest problem -- the clinical experience is the biggest problem we have and I believe we have to solve it.

Now, you know, we have talked here about direct supervision and all of that. Well, I said to them that direct supervision means that the athletic trainer is located in the same facility.

Also, I have indicated to them in the past that I believe that as a kid progresses, he, in turn, needs less and less of this direct supervision type of thing. You can probably send him away with a freshman team or something like that.

Well, okay, we have before us a motion and the second, is there further discussion?

We have before us a motion to approve these two curriculums. Shall we approve them or not approve them?

All in favor of approval of the graduate program at Virginia and the undergraduate program at Nebraska, Lincoln, raise your hands. Is there anybody opposed?

... Mr. Flentje raised his hand in opposition...

Is there anybody abstaining?

Well, the motion is carried by a vote of nine to one.

Now, the second matter is that they had a re-visitation at two schools and, I believe, they want a five-year approval on those.

MR. MELHART: They were reevaluated after five years. The reevaluation was approved by the Professional Education Committee and needs to be approved by the Board of Directors.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Were both of these institutions visited?

MR. MELHART: Yes.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: On the other hand, cannot reevaluation be done without them being visited? You know, we had to put Mankato off for a year because they could not afford it or did not have money for a visitor to come.

MR. JORDAN: I understand that Mankato is one of these institutions. Who is the second one?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: It is Indiana State.

Now, is there a motion to reapprove these two programs?

MR. WHITE: I would so move.

MR. MELHART: Let me say that Indiana State has both a graduate and undergraduate program. We are approving both programs.

MR. SMITH: And Mankato, as I understand it, is just undergraduate?

MR. MELHART: Yes.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We do have before us a motion to approve these two programs? Is there a second?

MR. LANE: Second the motion.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there further discussion?

MR. FLENTJE: Yes.

Here again, Mankato has a lot of people up there. Have they indicated a willingness to get these people some quality supervision or do you feel they are getting the quality that we should expect of them?

MR. MELHART: Gordy did state, for instance, he does not go to football practice; he is not required to go to the field for football practice and so he indicated he spent the majority of his time in the training room in the afternoons supervising the people that he has, although I think I would also venture to say that this is a unique situation.

I don't know about any of you, for example, but there is no way I could be in the training room in the afternoons during football practice.

MR. FLENTJE: How many certified trainers are there?

MR. MELHART: I believe he has two now. He has a graduate student who is certified.

MR. SMITH: He and one other person?

MR. MELHART: Yes.

MR. FLENTJE: How many students does he have?

MR. MELHART: I think he told me that he had forty.

MR. FLENTJE: Are we talking about a ratio of one to sixteen?

MR. MELHART: Well, we are indicating interest. He does not accept them until after their sophomore year.

MR. FLENTJE: On the other hand, who are we doing a disservice to if we don't approve it?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: The biggest people I would say are the students in the program.

MR. FLENTJE: Well, who are we doing a disservice to if we do not approve it?

MR. LEE: I don't know how we cannot approve them.

For example, this fellow has had a program for five years and now are we going to tell him we don't approve his program?

MR. FLENTJE: Exactly.

MR. LEE: If we send the Professional Education Committee out to do a reevaluation and they come back and tell us it is okay and if we vote it down, hell, it doesn't make sense.

They are the ones who are doing the screening and if we are going to be voting it down, then we had better be going to do the evaluation.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: My feeling is that if that committee recommended to us that we approve the curriculum, then we have to approve it.

MR. WHITE: Approve it or get rid of it.

MR. FLENTJE: If they are not following their own guidelines, then I think we ought to have a talk with them.

MR. DAVIS: How about the Iowa program?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: What about it?

MR. DAVIS: How can it be approved and it be changed completely since it was evaluated?

Those people are not working sports, they are working intramurals and all of that business.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think that working intramurals is okay for students.

MR. FLENTJE: Under direct supervision.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

MR. MELHART: I am concerned about what he had to say about his program.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Don't you allow intramurals?

MR. MELHART: First of all, we do not have supervision there.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I mean the committee in general?

MR. MELHART: Yes, if they are supervised and we feel it is important that they be in the inter-collegiate level also.

We have always felt they should have some experience, both women and also the men.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We have two in front of us, Mankato and Indiana. Do you want to discuss these any more?

MR. FLENTJE: I personally would like to have some information on what these people do when they go to them. This is the thing that really bugs me, I guess, is the fact that we sit here and we say, okay, for example, on a ratio of one to sixteen and he has one to twenty.

MR. MELHART: Wait a minute now. They are not accepted into this program as yet. They are accepted after they have completed some of those. I merely said there are some forty people who have indicated an interest in the program.

MR. FLENTJE: How many does he turn down?

MR. MELHART: I don't know.

MR. LEE: He probably turns them down until he gets a ratio of that type or even lower. However, he has a good question there.

When we say one to sixteen and then, Dick, you say one to twenty, then he is wondering and that is the only inference you can draw from that.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Basically what we want to do is to get Bud in here and tell him that the Board feels strongly that they should adhere to the rules they have set up.

MR. FLENTJE: And perhaps even tighten them up.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

In other words, make the requirements even stricter, if that is what you desire. However, I don't think you can say "no" to those two programs.

Well, do you want to discuss this any more?

MR. WHITE: I would call for the question.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: All in favor. Is there anybody opposed? I believe Bill is opposed.

MR. SMITH: I have a question. I had to step out. Last year in June, for example, did the committee not come back and say they were cutting it back down to sixteen at a maximum for certified and here we have forty in the program?

MR. MELHART: They indicated an interest.

MR. CHAMBERS: I also have a question.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Just a minute, did you vote on this last one, Gene?

MR. SMITH: No, I have not as yet.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I have eight "for" one against and one abstaining. Do you want to vote?

MR. SMITH: I will abstain.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Very well, the vote is eight in favor, one against and one abstaining. District 5 is no and District 9 is abstaining.

Now, I think, if you have any questions, when Bud gets in here, you had better let your wishes be known.

In other words, we have to come up with a method of enforcement or we have to find out what is going on.

Do you understand what I mean? We do have to know what is going on in relation to that committee.

If you think, for example, a ratio of one to sixteen is, say, too much, perhaps you should make it smaller -- like one to ten.

Now, Dick, I know you are in this and I think that one to sixteen -- well, I cannot handle sixteen students, could not.

MR. MELHART: I could not either, if they were all turning up at one time. However, we have been spread out over four years or whatever it is.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I guess my concept is different. I was a student trainer -- was a student trainer every day from three in the afternoon to six-thirty -- for three seasons, three years. That is how long I was a student trainer.

MR. MELHART: Well, I think we all were.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Also, I think that is how

it still should be or else, on the other hand, how do you get the hours for them?

MR. MELHART: Right now the guidelines provide for 600 hours spread over a two-year period.

MR. LEE: Still, however, you have a guy going three or four hours a day and it takes a lot of hours in a year. You have to, therefore, spread it out over a longer period of time. You have to work them a week and then let them off a week -- work another week. This is in relation to a lot of programs.

I have checked into some of the programs like that.

MR. FLENTJE: You certainly have a good point.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: It certainly is tough.

MR. FLENTJE: On the other hand, I just do not believe that a one to sixteen ratio is feasible and I don't care what size of a program you have. If you took sixteen students into my place, for example, we would all be falling over one another, even if we just had four in there during the day. There just isn't that much work to do and the state colleges in our state, in relation to them, you just do not have enough sports and enough work for those people to get the experience they require.

MR. MELHART: You are speaking of your own situation?

MR. FLENTJE: I am talking about the situation in general.

For example, if I were going to have a program, I probably would not have over five or six individuals in the whole program and this is talking about a school with a 12,000 enrollment.

MR. WHITE: How many hours a week could a student work in your place?

MR. FLENTJE: What do you mean, could they work?

MR. WHITE: If you had a student trainer, for example, how many hours would he be in your training room per week?

MR. LEE: Going full blast, probably twenty.

MR. FLENTJE: The people I have working now, they are just students and they average around three hours a day, six days a week.

MR. WHITE: Well at twenty hours a week, forty weeks, they can work 800 hours.

MR. FLENTJE: Well, okay.

MR. WHITE: All they have to put in is 600 hours over a period of two years.

MR. LEE: On the other hand, when you have forty kids, you have another problem.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: When you have a clinical affiliation type of thing, it is a big problem.

It just seems to me, for example, one to sixteen, that is a lot of students.

MR. SMITH: Didn't they say they were going to try to keep it down below that?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I thought it was going to be one to twelve.

MR. SMITH: And keep it below. This was one of their new rules, as of last year.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, let's proceed.

I think that Bud should be told -- let him know how you feel about that.

MR. CHAMBERS: Why is Del Forge representing District No. 8 on the Committee when he is in District 7?

MR. MELHART: Because they wanted to have him visit rather than pay for Lee to come and visit.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: From the Education Committee.

One more thing. We have been asked to accept the resignation of Roy Mullens.

MR. LEE: How come he has quit?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: How do I know.

MR. MELHART: His athletic director would not let him come to the meetings and that is the answer.

Have they appointed anybody yet or do you do that at your meeting?

MR. MELHART: We considered some people and we are going to contact others.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, is there a motion to accept this resignation?

MR. CHAMBERS: I would move that this resignation be accepted.

MR. MALACREA: I would second the motion.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: You have before you the motion and the second. Are there further comments in relation to that?

All those in favor. Is there anybody opposed? It is carried.

Now, we have another one -- the National Athletic Trainers Honor Society. Did you all read that?

I have some basic comments.

For example, I did not like the dues. I thought they were much too high.

Also, I did not like the idea of calling the members "Brothers". This is a fraternity designation.

Likewise, I did not like the idea of blackballing. I think, for example, if someone is eligible for an honor society, then it should be on academic achievement only and they should not be blackballed out if they do qualify academically.

Those are three things, at least just off of the top of my head, that I have thought about.

Are there any other comments?

MR. FLENTJE: Who is going to run this thing anyway?

MR. LANE: Under the Membership Section, it cuts out many NATA members and students in other programs. It discriminates.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Will you clarify that Eddie?

MR. LANE: Well, in Section 2, under their Constitution, it cuts out NATA members and students in other programs.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, that is what they wanted to do.

MR. LANE: Well, I personally do not like that.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, okay, that is another

thing someone doesn't like.

Is there anything about this that anybody likes?

MR. MALACREA: I would like to know what the purpose is?

To me, it seems to be very complicated. Perhaps it may be a worthwhile document, but why is it so complicated?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I believe that Bud had somebody at Penn State write this and the guy writing that probably copied most of this from some social fraternity constitution.

MR. LANE: On the other hand, I think if we are going to have things like this, we had better put a brass instrument course in some of our curriculums so that people can blow their horns a little better.

MR. MELHART: We thought probably most people would be eliminated from the grade point average required -- 3.5.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: On the other hand, if a guy does have a 3.5, he should be allowed to be in it. I don't think, on that basis, he should be able to be blackballed.

MR. MALACREA: The way it reads, for example, at least it is my interpretation that these are going to be little chapters in each school. Each school will be a chapter. However, they want a national organization over and above all of this.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is what I was very confused about.

MR. FLENTJE: Who is going to administer the thing anyway?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I am not sure they want the

national organization because I asked about that.

MR. FLENTJE: Also, look how high the dues are. The dues are higher, for example, than for an NATA Certified Member and that, to me, is kind of ridiculous.

MR. WHITE: How come we are discussing this -- did someone propose it?

MR. MELHART: The Education Committee sent it back to them.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: You did?

MR. MELHART: Yes.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Then you are not proposing this?

MR. MELHART: We sent it back with some suggestions.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Has this come back to you?

MR. MELHART: No, because we just sent it back the day before yesterday.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, gentlemen, what do you want to do about this?

For example, might we not table the request until we get the proper revisions?

MR. FLENTJE: Yes, the proper revisions.

I also think they should be instructed to contact the student organization in District No. 6 regarding their ideas on it. There is, for example, a young man in St. Louis that has some ideas in relation to a student organization affiliated with NATA and I think he should be contacted. His name is Dick MacFadden. He is at the University of Missouri, St. Louis.

Contrary to what this group wants to do, I think the idea of any other student organization is to help the student trainers in some of their activities and this sort of thing rather than just kind of a name society.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Did your committee rule out the blackball procedure?

MR. MELHART: Yes, absolutely.

MR. MALACREA: You know, I get concerned about splinter groups. I don't think we are big and strong enough.

Now, when you are like APTA, you are some 150,000, then you can do this type of thing -- they can come in with subcommittees and specialties. However, to my way of thinking, we are not there as yet.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Then that is what I am going to do -- I am going to write them to resubmit it with proper revisions.

MR. MALACREA: With regard to the American Academy of Pediatrics, item 17 on their agenda, they are going to have a meeting somewhere and, also, I don't know exactly what time.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, that can be ascertained later.

However, let us now go to the Division for Girls and Women's Sports.

I know you all have the report and I think it is too late for us to try to read it and accept it now. It is going to take me ten minutes to read that thing, the report you just received.

Now, is there any need for us to do anything on it before June? Is she asking for anything?

MR. DAVIS: I don't think so.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I would like more of an opportunity to read that.

MR. CHAMBERS: Do you want to table that until June?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes, until June.

MR. DAVIS: It is merely a report and that is all it is. She is not requesting anything.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Have you read it?

MR. DAVIS: All it is -- it is a report.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there any motion to accept this report?

Do you want to make a motion before you read it?

MR. CHAMBERS: I don't think so.

MR. LEE: What are we under?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Item 24, Division for Girls and Women's Sports.

MR. MALACREA: This is an association meant to be all to itself?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: It is a part of AHPER.

Well, if we don't need any action, we will simply hold it until June because, at least by that time, we should all have had a better opportunity to peruse it.

Now, let us go to item No. 31, having to do with my letter to the Board.

Now, I assume you all received this letter and, further, I hope you read the articles and I hope you realize what is involved here.

You know, there are more and more cases of legislation being called against people everywhere -- Orthopedic Surgeons, high school teachers, just about everybody, including trainers.

Now, I sent you the letters I wrote to the attorneys. You should have a copy of them and also the Athletic Training Act.

Now, over the years, many questions have been brought up about this subject and I think one lawyer said, you know, we have been performing like ostriches, in other words, putting our head in the sand and thinking this would go away.

Some of these questions, as a matter of fact, were even asked back in 1967 in Massachusetts -- current athletic training and things like that -- and the answers were ambiguous.

Now, there are several questions asked here.

In relation to Question No. 1, it seems that as long as your doctor tells you to use a whirlpool, it is okay to do it.

In Section 6 it states that no matter what your doctors tell you, you must have the supervision of the physical therapist to turn the whirlpool on.

In New York State, for example, it provides that unless you are a Certified Physical Therapist, you cannot turn on a whirlpool, even if the doctor tells you to do so. As a matter of fact, the doctor is breaking the law if he tells you to do so and he knows you are not a therapist and, therefore, you, in turn, can break the law by doing it.

To say the least, it is very, very confusing.

I think the first article came out in Scholastic Coach and he made some good points.

He said, for example, schools are using more qualified individuals. He said this, in turn, has upgraded the profession. Well, I liked that about it.

He also said that the term "Athletic Trainer" was used very loosely -- that, as a matter of fact, anybody can call themselves an Athletic Trainer.

I think that Wes or somebody brought that up earlier today.

There are also some bad points made in that article.

For example, he states that treatment is not the domain of the trainer -- it is strictly a medical responsibility.

You know, I disagree with that.

I think, with a prescription, a trainer should be allowed to treat an injured athlete because if we are not allowed to do that then we have cut our professional responsibility about in half.

Do you agree with that?

If you have a doctor's prescription, if your team doctor comes in and says, tomorrow, for example, put him into a cold whirlpool, then, to me, that is treatment. As I say, if you are not permitted to do that, then your responsibilities and services are really about cut in half.

Now, the writer also goes on to say that a trainer without physical therapist certification has no legal right to administer the whirlpool treatment diathermy or anything else. Well, I think he is wrong there.

I think that just about everyplace we do it,

we are against the law, at least in all but twelve states, because in relation to those twelve states, we can do it as long as we do not call ourselves a physical therapist. However, in all of the other states, unless you have physical therapy supervision, you should not be doing those things.

Now, I know that we can discuss the various aspects of this article for many, many hours and argue and fight about it and, if you want to, we will.

However, the solution to the problems that are brought up in that article is to have an Athletic Training law in each state. If there is an athletic training law, then, in turn, the trainer will be protected.

The next article I would like to talk about is the one written in Arizona by Baker and Roe.

Both of the lawyers who read this thought it was a well written article.

Both were very upset at the authors for doing exactly what the authors are telling us what not to do.

They are telling us not to practice physical therapy without a license and yet they are giving us legal advice and they are not lawyers. You know, everybody likes to do it but don't you do it.

The solution in relation to the problems brought up in that article again seem to be the same thing -- get a law in each state.

Therefore, what have we done thus far?

Well, we have written and discussed over the telephone with our lawyer from Iowa, the gentleman who spoke to us in California at the Board Meeting. I have also written and discussed this with a lawyer by the name of Lawrence Graham, who is in the area from where Rod is from, and he is very knowledgeable about this

subject and very willing to help.

Both of them did a good deal of research.

They have, as a matter of fact, each had two or three research assistants working two or three days on it and they did not send a bill for anything along this line.

Also, Mr. Graham did a good deal of work personally on this and we also have not received a bill from him.

They are interested people, both of those individuals.

Now, I sent all that information to the Board and I have asked you to study it and make suggestions.

MR. LEE: How come we did not get a letter from Hayes?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, all of his involved telephone comments. I think there was a letter to him -- at any rate, my letter to him is in there.

However, I guess his replies and comments all involve telephone conversations back to me.

His comments were essentially the same -- we should make trainers aware of the civil and criminal liability they may incur in each state. However, we should let them know, in a very quiet way. Do you understand what I am saying?

You know, you just cannot publish in the Journal, for example, that possibly some trainers may be breaking the law but, on the other hand, you can make them, through other means, aware of the civil and criminal laws involved and I believe you should do that.

If you disagree with me, please tell me.

Another thing is says to do is to encourage a trainer-physician relationship.

In other words, if you have a doctor that you can say told you to do that, then you are, I think, on pretty good ground. You may be breaking the law but you are at least better off than if you do not have a doctor who told you to do that.

The thing they said was to draft a uniform licensing act. In other words, write a model piece of legislation -- try to get that passed in each state.

Another thing they would like us to do is to push for the various state legislatures to enact laws to have a high school with trainers. Well, we are not going to tackle that right now.

I think that right now what I would like to ask you to do is give us permission to form a Legislative Committee.

We would like approval for this Committee to meet in March.

We would include one or both of the lawyers at this meeting.

Of course, it will cost money but the most important thing I want from this Board right now, if you say we can have that Committee, are some guidelines for the Committee to follow.

Now, perhaps we should first determine whether or not to establish that type of committee and then, following that, I will comment a little bit as to the guidelines I think we would like.

First of all, for example, do you agree that it seems necessary that we have an athletic trainer's license or law in each state?

Do you agree that this seems to be the solution to the problem?

MR. JORDAN: How does this affect the high schools?

How does this, for example, affect every high school in the State of Maine.

You know, many of them are in rural areas where there are no hospital or staff doctors around; many of which already have whirlpools, in most cases run by the coach.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: How would it affect them?

I would not say it would affect them. They would not break any more laws than they are breaking right now by using it but the law that we write, for example, will not be a restrictive law. We will not say in our law, for example, that a physical therapist may not treat athletic injuries.

We will not say in our law that a coach will not treat athletic injuries.

We will not say in our law that a Chiropractor, Masseuse or anybody else may not treat athletic injuries.

All we will say is that the Athletic Trainer may do this, do this, do this.

We will say that no-one who does not have a license may call himself an Athletic Trainer.

Therefore, how will it affect the coach who turns the whirlpool on?

Well, he is breaking the law right now in the State of Maine and he will continue to break the law.

MR. SMITH: Is there something in relation to the Texas law that protects the coach?

MR. LANE: No.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That was the interpretation

by the Texas Attorney General. His interpretation, for example, was that if a coach needs to turn a whirlpool on to protect his livelihood, that he may do it.

MR. CHAMBERS: As long as he doesn't call himself a trainer.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes, as long as he doesn't call himself a trainer.

MR. FLENTJE: What about the Grandfather Clause -- are we going to get into a can of worms with them coming in and say, "okay, I am a licensed trainer in the State of Oklahoma" and then come back for certification and all this type of thing?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I would think that anybody who is serving as an athletic trainer -- well, first of all, let's not get into that until we get to the piece of legislation.

First of all I want to know if we are of the opinion, because we don't want to waste any time if not, but are we of the opinion that we need legislation in each state to protect the Athletic Trainer who is not a Physical Therapist?

I think it is proper and I believe both lawyers thought it was and also the people in Texas, mainly with regard to being protected.

You know, on that basis, it is beautiful, they are protected, they are not breaking a law by doing what they are doing. However, in relation to every other state in the Union, the trainer is probably breaking a law by doing what he is presently doing.

MR. SMITH: I have one question.

In some states, for example, something like this should probably go through fairly easy.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, don't assume that.

MR. FLENTJE: Not for a minute.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: For example, some people who were at this meeting said, if we proceed on this, we are probably going to have the naturalists fighting against us. As you know, these are the people who treat with nature.

Likewise, we are going to be fought by the masseuses and the maseurs, the chiropractors, the physical therapists, the electro therapists, the hydrotherapists.

As a matter of fact, we will be fought by almost everybody.

Also, please do not expect this to go through on the first try. They say that will never happen.

MR. SMITH: Also, in relation to some states, it is going to turn up a can of worms.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes -- New York and California, as well as Pennsylvania. It will be murder in relation to those three states.

MR. CHAMBERS: Well, in relation to California, let me say that I don't like the idea, for example, that you are breaking the law to begin with. However, I don't think that in California we have, in the eyes of the California Medical Association, any difficulty because there, in their eyes, the NATA is looked upon with a lot of favor and, therefore, I don't think you will be receiving much trouble from California.

Of course, I am saying something here which is probably dangerous to say because, first of all, the doctors there do not have time to treat all the people and, as a result, the physical therapists are going to have the time and there is no way in the world a state agency can enforce this, especially not with the number of schools, people and whirlpools there are out there.

There is not enough money to have people

running around jerking out whirlpools and this sort of thing.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, the law that we are going to endeavor to ask you to get guidelines for tonight is not a restrictive law. We are not, for example, trying to rip out whirlpools or stop anybody from doing what they are doing. We are merely endeavoring to make it legal in relation to what they are doing.

For example, do you know why the malpractice insurance that we were talking about tonight is so high?

Well, I don't know what particular state an individual is in but if he has broken the law, then that malpractice insurance does not cover him. Do you understand what I mean? Right in there, for example, it says that if whatever you are doing violates a state law, then they will not cover that individual for breaking the law -- he will be covered in relation to malpractice but not for breaking the law.

Therefore, first of all, I would like to know from you whether we are of the assumption that we should proceed with this and try to propound some guidelines for a law to be passed in each state.

Again, as I said before, I think that if you try to ignore this, you are still continuing to put your head in the sand. To my way of thinking, the time has come for us to take action.

MR. SMITH: I have another facet that I would like to throw out real quickly and this is from my Athletic Director.

He would like to know, for example, if we as a group are having problems, why do they not know about this?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Who are "they"?

MR. SMITH: The Athletic Directors.

You know, they are supposedly our bosses all over the country.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, to give you a partial answer, if somebody were to get sued, it probably is not your Athletic Director who is going to be sued.

That is one thing.

MR. SMITH: However, the point is this -- should they not be involved with us insofar as helping is concerned.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, in relation to helping, everybody should be involved, sure.

MR. DAVIS: You certainly have to have help from everybody.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes, you are going to need help from everybody.

MR. SMITH: However, as they indicate, they need to know something about the problems facing trainers all over the country.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I will go to my Athletic Director, when it comes time to get the law passed. As a matter of fact, I will go to everybody. However, in the final analysis, this cannot be done at the Federal level -- it has to be worked on in every single state and it is a fight in every state.

Illinois, for example, was very well prepared with a very mild law, very mild and yet it went down the pike.

MR. MALACREA: However, wasn't Illinois very much like Texas?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Not when you read it closely.

MR. MALACREA: Well, I thought I had read

it closely.

MR. MELHART: One opinion, for example, was to the effect that the Texas law is very weak.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: When you say "very weak", why weak?

For example, it is weak in that it allows the coaches to still use whirlpools -- very weak, but that is not what we are looking for now. We are not trying to knock coaches or anybody else out of this. All we are trying to do is to protect ourselves. Forget about anybody else in relation to this.

MR. FLENTJE: What we are looking for is permission to use modalities.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I don't care who else they let use it. Maybe if we get strong enough, on the other hand, then we can state they are not qualified to do this. However, right now we are trying to get some action merely to protect ourselves.

MR. LANE: In relation to this case in Texas, it is written so that we can enforce it against violators.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: But you are protected if that therapist comes to you.

MR. DAVIS: But that is all you care about.

MR. LANE: I made a note here on Frank's original letter -- a change in the direction of the law from authorization to protection. Basically, as a matter of fact, this is what we are talking about. We want to, for example, protect the Athletic Trainer and we want to have a guideline to protect the Athletic Trainer within each individual state.

MR. JORDAN: Another point made, and I may be out of order by bringing it up now, is the fact that it was indicated trainers are practicing medicine without

a license and, in essence, perhaps we are.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I have, on occasion, carried prescription drugs. For example, I might be away on a baseball trip for two weeks and the doctor might give me certain medications to take with me. This comes under the same heading, does it not?

MR. DAVIS: Well, for example, if you give out aspirin, you are practicing medicine.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, the aspirin is different because it is over-the-counter. It is not a prescription drug.

When I say "medicine", for example, I mean an antibiotic.

MR. JORDAN: Such things as pencillin.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: You know what Jim Hayes said to us -- forget it -- don't ever give penicillin without a doctor's order -- don't ever give an antibiotic without a doctor's order.

MR. MALACREA: Also, in many states, it is even illegal to give these substances with a doctor's order.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is it, at least in most states, but there are many places where that is not even close.

MR. MALACREA: However, if they want to stick you with it, they can.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In other words, the doctor himself is not supposed to hand that patient penicillin or anything else. This is in relation, for example, to these samples and things like that. At least that is what I have been told -- that it really all had to go through a pharmacist.

However, we are getting a little bit away from what I would like to have us consider.

First of all, let me ask you this. Do you want to write a piece of legislation, yes or no?

MR. LANE: You mean the Board of Directors?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, do you want to present guidelines to a Committee to do it?

MR. LANE: Well, speaking for myself now, I want to have a Committee appointed to establish guidelines, write the guidelines, because I don't think any of us have experience in this field.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, to clarify, we want the Committee to write a piece of legislation, Eddie, but, on the other hand, we are going to have to give them some guidelines to follow.

There are some very, very important things involved here that the Board is going to have to decide on before we turn this over to a Committee. There are some very important things that differ between Texas and Illinois.

MR. FLENTJE: Is this Committee to be from the Board of Directors, of the Board membership, or in consultation with?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I thought, for example, that Otho and I should be on it; Logan Wood from Texas should be on it, mainly because he probably knows more about legislation than just about anybody.

I also thought that Bob Behnke should be on it because he did so much with the Illinois law and I thought that Bud or someone from the Education Committee should be on it because, basically, any law that they write, we want to make sure we are able to substantiate that we are in fact educating our people to be allowed to

use a whirlpool; to be allowed to use ultrasound, etc.

I also thought probably, and I have not talked to him that Phil Donnelly, who was very instrumental in writing the West Virginia Physical Therapy law and who probably does not want to get involved with this at all, but I think we could get him to attend a one-day meeting on this particular thing.

MR. DAVIS: Also, we should have somebody from Certification.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I did ask Lindsay and he said it was too much for him. However, basically, I thought that would be the basis of it and then we would have to write, and I will go through some very important questions I have for you as to what you want in that law, but we do here, at this Board, have to write some guidelines for them to follow.

Well, on that basis, are there any comments?

Do you want a Committee formed, for example?

MR. WHITE: I would move we form the Committee here.

MR. LEE: Second the motion.

MR. MELIN: You probably should specify this should be an Ad Hoc Committee, unless you want to add it to the Bylaws -- specify it as an Ad Hoc Committee just for a special purpose.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That may come to be a regular committee. However, it can be specified as an Ad Hoc Committee.

MR. WHITE: Yes, that is to be an Ad Hoc Legislative Committee.

MR. FLENTJE: Second the motion.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there further discussion on this? All in favor? Is there anybody opposed? It is carried.

Now, the next item I would like to ask you is if we may have the money to meet in March for one or one and a-half days and, in order to do so, we need money to do it with.

MR. FLENTJE: Let me ask you, where and how much is it going to cost?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I wish I had more information for you. What does this Board Meeting cost?

MR. DAVIS: Approximately a thousand dollars.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Does it really?

Would two thousand dollars do it?

MR. DAVIS: I would hope so.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, on that basis, I would like to ask you for approximately two thousand dollars in order to meet the expenses of this contemplated meeting, as well as the attorney expenses.

Would anybody care to make that in the form of a motion?

MR. WHITE: Again, I would so move, that we approve an expenditure of two thousand dollars as suggested for his proposed meeting.

MR. FLENTJE: Second the motion.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there further discussion?

If not, all in favor? Is there any opposition? Carried.

Now we come to the hard part, the guidelines

to be presented to this committee to follow.

MR. FLENTJE: Are we going to first set the guidelines and then appoint the committee, or what are we going to do?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, as I understand it, you have already given me permission to form the committee. Now, I have to call and ask them if they will be willing to serve and that sort of thing.

MR. LANE: I wonder if you would run those names by again?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I have not yet asked them as yet.

It is Logan Wood, Bob Behnke.

MR. FLENTJE: I have a question to ask at this point. For example is Behnke for or against us because, in relation to a lot of the correspondence that came through here a year or so ago on this act, there was some question in my mind as to whether he was fighting for us or fighting against us or, as a matter of fact, try to sneak around us.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: He is strongly for us. I also thought I would ask Dick Malacrea and Donley and someone from Education and someone from Certification. I would probably ask Behnke to be the Chairman.

MR. WHITE: And the two of you would also be members?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes, both Otho and I.

MR. LANE: As I understand it, you are basically talking about a ten-member committee?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Also a lawyer.

MR. LANE: One or two lawyers?

3

PRESIDENT GEORGE: WE have not even discussed that. Let us say "legal advice."

Now, gentlemen, as I say, now comes the hard part. What we have just gone through is the easy part. That is, we have to give this committee some guidelines.

For example, in relation to these two acts, I have read them over and there are differences in them.

Now, some of the differences are very minor; in other words, who appoints the Board of Trainers? Does the Governor do it or does the Director of the Department of Registration and Education do it or, on the other hand, does the Director of Medicine do it? In other words, who appoints the Board because it is different in every state.

For example, in relation to the State of Texas, it was the Governor but now, I believe, Eddie, it is someone different, is it not?

MR. LANE: Basically, it is the State Board of Health.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In Rhode Island it is the Governor; in Massachusetts it is the Medical Director. However, those are minor things.

There are two really big things we have to consider here and one, for example, is a definition as to what an athletic trainer may do. This, gentlemen, is very different in relation to the two laws.

Now, we look at these two laws and say they are the same. Well, the first four items, as I read them, they were the same. But that is not necessarily true in relation to everything.

Now, likewise, we have to concern ourselves with the qualifications as to who is going to be allowed to be a trainer. Otherwise, of course, the penalties are going to depend on the state you are in. If you

4
break any of those medical acts, then whatever the penalties are for the particular state, that is going to be it.

The prohibited acts are the same. No person may hold himself out as an athletic trainer without obtaining a license. As I say, this is going to be the same.

The functions of the Board are similar. The Board that I am talking about is this Athletic Training Board.

In both states, for example, it involves two trainers and a physician.

Likewise, the function of the Boards seem to be the same. For example, they keep records, collect dues and that sort of thing. By "dues", I mean licensing.

The big things we have to concern ourselves with now are, first of all, the definition of what a trainer should do, be allowed to do in a state and, secondly, the matter of qualifications. Therefore, let's get into what the trainer should do and this comes into, really, what we as an association, what our concept of an athletic trainer is.

Listen, in Texas, it means a person with specific qualifications who, upon the advice and consent of his team physician carries out physical rehabilitation on injuries incurred by athletes.

Now, that is good and I believe that is involved in both of these acts -- to carry out these functions.

Now, also, to carry out these functions the athletic trainer is authorized to use -- and this is where it differs, and this is what we have to decide -- what can that athletic trainer use -- physical modalities such as heat, light, sound, cold, electricity or mechanical devices in relation to rehabilitation and treatment?

5

Now, on this basis, at least in Texas, that means you can do or use just about anything you desire. That is beautiful.

Of course, the easier we make the law, the less things we allow the athletic trainer to do, probably the easier it will be to pass the law. For example, look how easy they made it in Illinois and yet it did not pass.

"An athletic trainer in Illinois, may, upon the advice and consent of his team physician, carry out prevention and care of injuries incurred by athletes by means of exercise or heat or cold related to rehabilitation and treatment."

Now, this, in turn, does not say anything about electrotherapy. It does not say anything about ultrasound. It does not say anything about the apparatus. In other words, it very much limits the modalities to be used.

Now, I say that because that is what I would like some direction from this Board on -- as to what to tell this legislative committee -- what do we want. In other words, do we want to include everything that was in the Texas law or do we want to cut it back to what was in the Illinois law or, on the other hand, do we want to change it?

Do you understand what we are getting at?

MR. LEWELLYN: For example, I think the Illinois law was turned down because it did not spell out enough.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think it was turned down because it did not have cooperation of all the trainers in the state. However, that is a personal feeling and as to how accurate it is, I do not know. On the other hand, it did not, as I say, have the cooperation of some people it should have had the cooperation of and, if it had, I am sure it might have passed.

5
MR. FLENTJE: A question on the Oklahoma Bill in here, for example. It reads basically the same as Texas, is that correct?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Almost word for word. Both Oklahoma and Texas are word for word, I believe.

MR. FLENTJE: What is the status of the bill in Oklahoma now?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, it was written and not a word has been heard from it since.

MR. DAVIS: It has been in the works three years now.

Now, do you get the point I am trying to ask of you? In other words, what should an athletic trainer be allowed to do? Should he be allowed, for example, to use ultrasound? If not, you tell us, from an education point of view. Do you teach them in your courses to use ultrasound?

MR. MELHART: Correct.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: How about diathermy?

MR. MELHART: Yes.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Physical rehabilitation insofar as exercise goes?

MR. MELHART: Yes.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: How about infrared?

MR. MELHART: Some do and some don't.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Electrostimulation?

MR. MELHART: Yes.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Now, in relation to these

7
things mentioned and possibly others, is there anybody who feels that an athletic trainer should not become involved in that?

Can we, as a part of the essential training of an athletic trainer, say that these are parts of our basic essentials?

In other words, what do you expect students to learn?

For example, Gene, how do you feel in relation to your place? What should an athletic trainer do. Should you use ultrasound?

MR. SMITH: I think so, under supervision.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: How about electrical stimulation?

MR. SMITH: Under supervision, with the doctor's permission.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there anybody who feels that we should not include that within the law?

MR. FLENTJE: Include what?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Ultrasound, diathermy, electrical stimulation, therapeutic exercise? In other words, what should be included and what should not be included?

MR. LANE: To my way of thinking, I think as many of the modalities as we can put into it need to be in it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: On the other hand, do you realize that the more we put into the act, the harder it will be to pass it?

MR. LANE: Correct.

8

MR. CHAMBERS: I think I agree with you insofar as trying to keep it very basic is concerned. However, I don't see any reason why we should not be able to use sound, heat or cold, electricity and things like that.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Of course, this is all understood that it would be with a doctor's prescription.

MR. CHAMBERS: Correct.

MR. MALACREA: You know, turning machines on and off is one thing but I think it is extremely important, in our programs, that our kids know why, when, where and that type of thing -- the complications, precautions, side effects.

MR. MELHART: I would sure hope that, in relation to a certification examination, that knowledge will be tested.

I don't know, however, because I never received a certification examination and I don't think any of us have.

MR. JORDAN: Let me ask a question here. Can a man not certified get a state license?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Definitely.

MR. JORDAN: Well, at least on that basis then, certification is not really that important, is it?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: It is now because there essentially is nothing else. When all of the fifty states have this, however, and when we get to the examination, we hope they will use our national NATA certification examination. We are hoping for that.

MR. CHAMBERS: What about the people certified now?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, we are hoping for a Grandfather Clause. That is kind of implied in relation to every piece of legislation being written.

That is why in your states, everybody who calls themselves an athletic trainer now and who has been practicing it for five years will probably be licensed as an Athletic Trainer and there is no way you can keep them out.

You cannot even keep the guy out that started yesterday.

MR. LANE: Sure you can because, in Texas, they had to be practicing it for five years.

MR. FLENTJE: The Grandfather Clause does limit that.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: The Grandfather Clause, insofar as the physical therapy goes, says you had to be practicing for five years. In relation to one of them, at any rate, it states five years.

Well, again, gentlemen, I don't think we have finished this matter of definition. What do we want to include?

MR. CHAMBERS: I have a question, Frank.

How many trainers are now using ultraviolet heat or infrared?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, in relation to my area, as to infrared, yes, some still are. As to the ultraviolet light, I do not know.

MR. CHAMBERS: The only reason I raised that question was because you said the fewer things we have in here, the better opportunity we have of getting this passed. Therefore, I wondered about striking it. It might be a minor point.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, as I say, light was one of them. However, perhaps we should try to get a few of these in at any rate.

MR. DAVIS: Perhaps, for example, you can cut it down to heat and cold.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Otho, for those of you who did not hear, mentioned only heat and cold. He said heat means everything, ultrasound, etc. Now, that is how I interpreted it but I don't know if ultrasound is really now considered a form of heat.

MR. DAVIS: It is heat, cold, stimulation and exercise.

MR. FLENTJE: What about taping?

MR. WHITE: I am sure you have no problem as long as you are taping for prevention. However, if they have an injury and you are taping that, then that is something else.

MR. DAVIS: On the other hand, what about casting?

MR. FLENTJE: Also splinting.

MR. DAVIS: Taping falls into that same category.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think that comes under our first aid, I believe, insofar as splinting and things like that go.

MR. LANE: Hayes told us about that at Anaheim.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: He said that casting was out.

MR. LANE: Yes, he said it was out because I asked him the question.

MR. DAVIS: It is a medical area, especially if you are taping after injury.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: If you are taping after injury, you had better have a doctor's orders to do that in order to prevent injury.

Well, anybody else want to say anything else as to what a trainer should do?

Should we include everything in there or make it very simple?

MR. CHAMBERS:: Are you talking about the Texas law?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

MR. CHAMBERS: Let's strike light.

MR. LANE: Really, you can strike sound. You can strike the ultrasound because it is a heat modality, really.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, there are published articles that claim that ultrasound is not heat -- that it will not produce an increase in temperature.

This is sound bouncing off the bone and it will not increase temperature. This was a recent report.

MR. MALACREA: You will get an increase in temperature with ultrasound.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, there are people who think that is not heat.

MR. FLENTJE: On the other hand, there are people who think it is.

MR. DAVIS: What about a core temperature?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Core temperature, well,

there is no change at all with ultrasound.

MR. LANE: However, it is a commonly accepted theory that ultrasound is a form of heat. That is the thing that is common.

MR. MALACREA: It is mechanical energy that produces heat and other effects.

MR. SMITH: Of course, with the lawyers getting involved in this, this might also throw it a lot of other ways.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I would feel better with it in but I realize that with it in it may be harder to get the law passed.

MR. FLENTJE: On the other hand, what are the people who are fighting this going to say?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Are there further comments?

You must remember, in considering these things that we are attempting to write something that is going to be accepted by every state in the Union.

MR. JORDAN: Are we not going to have to do this on a state basis?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We are going to make a model piece of legislation. In relation to each state, of course, you are going to have money and, further, bend some of these issues in order to get them passed.

In the final analysis, what you really want is a piece of legislation to protect yourself.

MR. JORDAN: However, as I understand it, you are really trying to write a model for the entire country.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, we are just trying

to write a model piece of legislation.

MR. FLENTJE: A model for each state to use.

MR. LEE: You must remember that one state might put everything in and get it passed and one state may only put in one thing and have a terrible time getting it passed.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I am sure you can see the problems involved here.

Well, again, what should we tell the Committee?

What should they include?

MR. WHITE: Well, I think they ought to get together, talk about it and then establish something and give it back to us. I think they should be given or try to establish something.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Of course, they will take a whole day to discuss some of these things.

On the other hand, there are some things you have to make a decision on, such as what will be your philosophy, what should an Athletic Trainer be allowed to do?

This is what I want to know from you.

For example, again, should he be allowed to use ultrasound?

MR. MALACREA: He can use sound, for example, in New Jersey but not in Rhode Island.

MR. FLENTJE: Also, this brings out another point. Are we going to have to be licensed in every state we are going to work in?

MR. MALACREA: Of course, that would be great.

That would involve reciprocity.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We are going to try for it.

MR. FLENTJE: Well, it is going to cost you a fortune to get all your licenses.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: For example, everytime the team physician, when he goes with the team, he is responsible for the license, rules and regulations of Rhode Island and even though we are in Princeton, New Jersey, he may do whatever his license says he may do.

You know, another factor is that doctors, especially Orthopedic doctors, they are becoming very, very much aware of the legal implications, especially those in Orthopedics. On the other hand, I still have some other doctors who are not very much worried about it but the Orthopedic people are because their rates have risen more than those of anybody else.

Now, one of the reasons I bring this up is that in the last three or four years, in connection with road trips, I know that my doctor has actually gone with an injured athlete to the hospital and on two occasions the team physician from the other team went with him to make it an easier transition.

MR. DAVIS: When was Michigan last in the Rose Bowl -- three years ago, six years ago? Well, anyway, the quarterback or one of the ballplayers had an injury soon after they arrived in California and had to have surgery. Dr. O'Connor could not do the surgery because they were in California.

MR. MALACREA: However, as I understand it, he could stand beside the table and assist.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

That could be as far as the hospital would allow him to go. However, in reality, that involves

hospital procedure.

For example, the Rhode Island Hospitals will not let anybody from the outside operate without specific permission.

MR. MELIN: A hospital cannot let a physician who is unlicensed in that state operate.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: On the other hand, we all know that there are people that come into these states from out of state who demonstrate surgery and things like that.

Okay, gentlemen, I am looking for a concept from you.

Again, should an Athletic Trainer be allowed to use ultrasound?

...Cries of "yes"...

MR. LEE: Everything listed there.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes, okay.

MR. MALACREA: I think with the onus we now are faced with in relation to professional education, we have to spell it all out.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In other words, we have to be able to substantiate the claims we make, that we are teaching these things. Okay.

Now, the next thing I want to know about is as to the qualifications of the trainer and this is on page 3 of the Illinois law and on page 5 of the other law.

I would ask you to open these up because they are quite different from one another and this is also where we need some guidance from you.

Now, if you were to ask me as to what the qualifications of an athletic trainer should be, I would say that they should stick as closely to our procedures for certification as possible.

Did you all hear that?

Now, when you are writing in relation to a state law, I wonder if you can say or stick to that too closely?

I think, in connection with Illinois, for example, they sort of copped out on it.

They said, "have met the athletic training curriculum requirements of a college or university approved by the Department."

Also, it is the understanding that the approved curriculums are those NATA curriculums. However, it doesn't have to be because you cannot say that in a state law. However, that would be, we hope the understanding of the Board.

MR. WHITE: On the other hand, why couldn't you say that in relation to a state law?

MR. DAVIS: You cannot write a law for an organization.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: You cannot do that at all.

The way they covered themselves later was that they used the words "Certified Athletic Trainer", and we are really the only certifying group.

At any rate, both Texas and Illinois agree, for example, that you have to be a graduate of an approved curricula.

Now, the second way they differ quite a bit, is, if you will go to page 3 of the Illinois law, you will see they wrote something very similar to Texas,

very similar to our own apprenticeship and athletic training for certification but their cop-out was they said "shall prove acceptable to the Board of Education experience of equal caliber to that of number one."

Do you see how they got around that? In other words, they did not say that you need a physical education degree or a health education degree or that you didn't need a valid teaching certificate and you did not have to spend two years working under direct supervision of a licensed Athletic Trainer. What they said, however, was that you should show proof acceptable to the Board of Education and experience of equal caliber to that in District No. 1.

Now, how would you like our model to be written?

MR. LANE: Again, perhaps we should do it on the basis of how it will be easier to pass. As you indicated, the more you put in there, the less likely you are to get passed.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Again, do you understand what they did and did not do?

For example, they did not include the apprenticeship of the way we have it written in our procedure for certification.

MR. JORDAN: Well, if you write a tough format and submit it and it is turned down, can you then resubmit?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

Again, we have been told that we should not expect this to pass the first time.

MR. JORDAN: Then maybe we should start off by writing a very strict thing, should we not?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Something as close to our procedure for certification as possible?

MR. JORDAN: Yes, I think so.

Perhaps you should begin by shooting for the top and then back away as we have to.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Are there further comments?

How do others of you feel about the qualifications that a trainer needs and should have?

To my way of thinking, I would like to see that be exactly the way our procedures for certification are.

You know, we on this Board have changed our procedures for certification at almost every Board meeting since 1969 but once this goes into a state law, forget it, that is it.

That is why they said "shall prove acceptable to the Board of Education and experience of equal caliber to that in number 1."

In other words, if you are very specific there, you just cannot change it the way we change things here. You just cannot do that with a law, with a state law.

It has to go back to the legislature. In some years they do not even look at these laws. Sometimes they review some of these things, possibly once in every eight years.

MR. JORDAN: This hasn't effected Texas, has it?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I understand some of the people there are very displeased with certain aspects of this part of the law -- very displeased --

and they cannot change it now.

For example, Eddie, in Texas, I understand you can be a supervising trainer, is that right?

MR. LANE: No.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I don't like that at all, do you?

MR. LANE: No.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Does "no" mean "yes" to the first question -- you cannot be a supervising trainer?

MR. LANE: No.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, Jim Dodson is very upset about that -- that they are certified trainers and yet they cannot be supervising trainers and yet that is again what we are saying in relation to our education programs.

I think, Bill, you are talking about clinical supervision.

I think the best way to do it is for someone in an approved curriculum to teach ten, twenty, thirty, fifty students and then each one of these students goes out with a Certified Trainer and works with them from a month to three months, every day for three hours.

Now, what if you do get, let us say, two kids from one school and two from another school and one from a third school. I think that is how it should be done. One guy can supervise 20 people and yet Eddie and Jim Dodson cannot be the supervising trainers because of the way the Texas law is written and the way it is interpreted.

MR. JORDAN: On the other hand, how does this effect you with students working under you?

MR. LANE: I am not working with anybody except secondary school students.

MR. JORDAN: But is it strictly legal for you to take students within your system and student trainers?

MR. LANE: At the secondary level.

MR. JORDAN: It would be perfectly legal for me, if this were applicable in the State of Maine, if my supervision over them were acceptable under the licensing law.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: No, no. It is not considered at this time in relation to apprentices.

MR. JORDAN: I am legally okay to supervise their activities.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes, but when they go to you for a license, they can put you as a supervising trainer because you do not have a professional curriculum.

MR. LANE: In relation to the State of Texas, everybody is a licensed athletic trainer. Granted, they are also certified athletic trainers and this is where we always get into a big hassle in Texas and where we can have a very difficult time keeping certification and licensing separated.

Frank is well aware of this because he sat in at one of our meetings and we have had this going back and forth.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, it is something we have to avoid.

MR. LANE: For example, in the state of Texas, a licensed athletic trainer in a four-year institution is the only one that can fulfill these requirements of two years, or four years beyond the

secondary level.

MR. FLENTJE: On the other hand, what happens if they make you a clinical instructor at that institution?

MR. LANE: Well, we have talked about this -- about becoming a dollar a year man. Bobby Lane and I talked about this.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Eddie has the ideal training ground. What do you have, eighty games a year in football?

I believe he has three or four students besides himself taping and working the games.

MR. LANE: Let me say that right now I am probably giving my student trainers at the secondary level better clinical experience than anyone else. Now, I do not want to knock any programs but one of my kids, for example, who has been working for me for two years, he says he has learned at a much faster rate under me than he is learning right now this year in an approved curriculum, an NATA approved curriculum.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I think it is because of the amount of exposure and the amount of time.

On the other hand, the point I am making is -- what do we want to do in relation to the qualifications?

What qualifications should there be for a Certified Athletic Trainer.

Well, first of all, as I understand it, you feel that he should be a graduate of an approved school?

Do you all agree with that one?

...Cries of "yes"...

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Now, should we spell it

out like Texas or Illinois did?

MR. MALACREA: In other words, are you saying that only graduate and approved programs can be licensed?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Under Section 1, yes.

Under Section 2, if that Board says that your education has been of equal caliber and you have the experience, then you may be licensed.

MR. LEE: Well, that is going two ways -- curriculum or apprenticeship?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Right.

MR. LANE: I personally think, from the experience of the Texas law, it ought to be like the Illinois law because we are writing guidelines for 49 states.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, okay, keep it as general as possible -- leave it in there.

MR. FLENTJE: I think that if you keep it as general as possible and the individual states will buy that, the key then becomes who is on the Board to say "okay, this is equal and this isn't".

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think everybody in Texas is a Certified Trainer on your Board, is that true?

MR. LANE: Yes.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: If you can submit to the Board that you are a graduate from an approved school or have the experience you are certified, then you would be allowed to come into Illinois as a licensed trainer -- to go into Texas as a licensed trainer and I also would have to work there for two years as an assistant, is that right?

MR. LANE: No, no, not in our case. In Texas you come in and pass the test and you are licensed in the State of Texas.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, what we are going to hope for is that we can set up some form of reciprocity. In other words, if I pass the test in Rhode Island and I move to Illinois, then they will accept my test score, if it is high enough. We are hoping, of course, they will use the certification examination.

In other words, I would like to think that anybody who is certified could get a license.

At any rate, while I think I have your ideas, will you please tell me what you would like us to consider in relation to this?

Okay, shall we then be general like Illinois was?

Do you think so, Eddie?

MR. LANE: Yes.

MR. FLENTJE: You know, in relation to the model, there are going to be so many differences in each state that it will be unbelievable.

MR. MELHART: Does that leave it up to interpretation?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In each state it will be interpreted differently, just as the physical therapy laws are, I am sure.

All we are really looking for is that first paragraph and the qualifications. When this goes in, of course, we realize we are going to get everybody in but once that grandfather stops, then we can control who gets a license and who doesn't. However, we are going to be very disappointed as to who gets trainers

licenses. You know, you get everybody and that is why I have to keep it quiet, too. Now, I am not saying, for example, you should sneak it in but then you have to be discreet.

For example, you don't want to let that assistant trainer or that trainer down there in some little college know about it. Just don't say anything to him about being grandfathered. Wait until the law passes. He will find out, I am sure.

Now, in regard to the physical therapy laws, there were some who did not. Therefore, there will also be people missing out on this.

MR. MALACREA: There were a lot of people who missed out on certification who are going to come in under the grandfathering clause.

MR. LANE: You are going to get some bad apples. I think we had some in Texas but I don't think they have hurt us during the five year period since it has been in effect and, further, we do have control.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: One thing about the "actively engaged", and we are not even concerned with that, is that Illinois included those who are teaching and on research whereas the Texas law did not. However, I think that was because we have included that as a Board change before Texas did.

Also, the penalties are a little bit different.

For example, in Texas it is a misdemeanor and in Illinois it is a petty offense. I will leave that to the lawyers -- just leave the terminology to the lawyers.

Okay, what suggestions do you have for the group? Is there any more that you have not given me?

MR. LANE: I doubt if we would have an easy time passing the law now. We were successful in getting

the law passed in Texas the first time we submitted it.

MR. LEE: Why was that?

MR. LANE: It is because the bill was sponsored by a representative who had a very active interest in athletic trainers -- co-sponsored again by a former football player and, therefore, I think you have to be very selective in getting your people to sponsor these and then, very simply, I talked to the man who co-sponsored it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In the final analysis, you have to go to your friends, guys coming to you for tickets and things like that. This is also the time to go to them.

MR. JORDAN: Perhaps I have a foolish question here but I would like to ask it.

This, I gather, must involve some expense, does it not?

MR. LANE: Well, not a whole lot.

MR. JORDAN: For ground work, legal work and all of that?

MR. LANE: Not a whole lot as an organization.

MR. JORDAN: Did the district pay for this in your case, Eddie?

MR. LANE: No.

MR. JORDAN: How was it handled?

MR. LANE: By the individual.

For example, any travel expenses that were handled were handled by the individual himself. For example, when the bill was presented on the floor in Austin, several of us went down there, appeared on the

floor at our own expense.

MR. MELHART: Is there any lobbying expense?

MR. LANE: No.

MR. MALACREA: Well, it is the kind of thing then you do very quietly or personally so that it is kind of a method of lining up all of your forces beforehand rather than making a showing in open debate.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I believe they stuck it through in Texas.

MR. DAVIS: It went through the first time.

Now, on the subcommittee, there was opposition from the TMA. I was down there and we went into a little room and that man went with the group and he discussed his opposition and the Chairman of the Committee instructed both sides to get together and work out the differences and bring it back, which they did. The next time, then, it went through with no problem at all.

Also, don't ask for funds, no money.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In other words, it has to be all on your own, every state.

MR. CHAMBERS: In relation to the licenses that Texas collects, where do they go?

MR. LANE: Well, I cannot think of the exact name of it but I believe it is the Texas State Board of Health.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: It is the Board of Registration and Medicine at my place.

Well, it is going to be hard, gentlemen and anyone who says it isn't, is a bit crazy. You will get into some fights but now is the time to go to your

friends.

I think we all have some. Anyplace you have friends, you should talk to them now. Use them, all the way up to the governor.

Our governor never asks us for favors but now is the time and in Rhode Island this will be sponsored by a brother of one of my assistants, who is a state senator and as soon as we get the model together he is going to take it from there.

MR. CHAMBERS: Are you going to send a model out to the trainers in each state?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think, to each district Director and then let it be disseminated through that fashion.

We will make copies enough for all of you and of course, we will be making copies of everything.

MR. LEE: You can send them to the key people you know who are going to do the job.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Right.

MR. CHAMBERS: Maybe we can specify the number of copies we will require.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I would think so.

Again, this has to be done quietly and you have to use a poor boy approach.

MR. FLENTJE: Let's assume we get about half these things through sometime in the ~~future~~ -- what is this going to do to our certification examination, if we use the same examination?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: It will probably, as it did in connection with the physical therapy, wipe out the national association being the certifying body. We hope it won't, however, Bill. However, it did in

connection with physical therapy.

It used to be the Registry of Physical Therapy and it just wiped that out.

We hope everybody will have a license and, of course, the idea of the licensing is, as I said, not to do anybody out of anything. We are not trying to do anybody out of anything -- we are trying to protect the athletic trainer.

MR. JORDAN: What happens if after the states accept it and others do not adopt it -- how much of a problem do we then run into?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: That is how it was with the physical therapy. It started with five states, ten states and it grew to the point where, at the present moment, every state has something.

MR. JORDAN: What is the percentage of trainers now who are physical therapists?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think the figure is around 20 percent -- it could be 18 percent.

MR. MALACREA: Trainers?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: 18 to 20 percent. I think that was Phil's last survey.

Well, do we have anything more to add on this?

If not, I think we have enough to give the Committee, when it meets, some guidelines.

Now, if there is nothing further, we will go to item No. 38, which is Eddie Lane's proposal for a spearing signal.

MR. LANE: This is a thought that came to me this fall from two different sources, really, but both in relation to my own experience.

One was from an observation in working football games and the second was in the nature of some injuries that I was treating in my training room.

The nature of those injuries was the bruised back or the fractured rib -- mainly in my training room, treating of just the bruised backs, the mild bruised back and how it was caused.

Now, in most cases, it was caused by the football player being hit with a helmet.

The other is that in working the ball games, I have seen many, many time, particularly defensively, the ball carrier, nine-tenths of the way down, this guy coming in and sticking that hat into him. There are other times when an offensive player used the helmet in connection with everything that we said that we did not want in the regulations -- for example, using it as an initial point of contact and blocking.

Now, I asked several officials who worked ball games in Dallas if they felt that if they had a definite signal to denote spearing or illegal use of the helmet or head, if it would be easier for them to call it. I did not have a single one say "no".

They felt like they could. Now, how I explained this was in this way -- I said, "if you had a definite signal to denote spearing after a call of unsportsmanlike conduct, would you be in favor of it?"

Now, the signal might be to denote that by the use of a closed fist on top of the helmet or something of this nature. Well, they thought my idea was a good idea.

I also talked to the Commissioners of the Southwest Conference and they likewise feel as though it is a fairly good suggestion and worthy of discussion at the Rules Committee level.

Also, in a conversation with an individual

last week, something else was injected and that was the possibility of making the rules on blocking to permit the football player to do something he is already doing but it is a violation of the rules, that is, to let him get his hands out and make it legal for him to get his hands out and use his hands.

Now, it is the feeling that between having a definite signal for spearing and having this rule changed in the wording in relation to the blocking rule, that very possibly we might be able to reduce the use of the helmet.

I think if we let the press box know and the fans know in the stands that a kid was spearing then, frankly, it might slow the coaches down in teaching this technique.

All I wanted was a feeling from the Board as to whether it was worthy to send this on to our Representatives on the Rules Committee.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, what do you think, men?

Are there any comments?

MR. MALACREA: I have one comment.

I have never seen spearing called.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I have seen it a couple of times.

MR. MELHART: They do not call it spearing. I think they call it a personal foul.

MR. MALACREA: Well, I have never recalled seeing it called because of that.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I personally have seen two spearing calls made.

One of these was in relation to the Professionals this year on television.

MR. LANE: I have seen two in 82 ball games this fall and it was not signaled as this, it was signaled as a personal foul.

However, it happened in front of me and I know this is why the official threw the flag.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Also, if they have a signal, they will possibly tend to call it moreso than in the past.

MR. LANE: This is also my feeling.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Maybe they will be more aware of it themselves.

Do you have anything to say on it, Wes?

MR. JORDAN: Well, I think I am in agreement with Eddie.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Are you looking for us to make this a recommendation to the NCAA Rules Committee?

MR. LANE: Yes. I think we have to go through channels in order to get it started.

I did talk to Warren on this while he was in Dallas for the Cotton Bowl Game and he feels like it is something that is worthwhile doing.

MR. LEWELLYN: I think it is worthwhile.

MR. WHITE: I would think it would be a good idea.

MR. CHAMBERS: I also agree.

MR. LEE: Agreed.

MR. SMITH: I would also agree -- at least

to let them look at it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I don't want to get you guys in trouble with your respective districts.

MR. SMITH: I am already in trouble.

MR. MELHART: We have already had a couple of bad injuries due to spearing -- guys laying on the mask.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Eddie, do you want to make a motion?

MR. LANE: I make a motion that we submit to the NCAA Rules Committee Representative to NATA that he introduce to the NCAA Rules Committee the possibility of implementing a definite spearing signal into the rules.

MR. LEE: Use of a definite signal.

MR. MELHART: That would be to have an additional rule then.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: The rule is there -- it would be just a signal.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: What would you like it to be -- classified on top of the helmet?

MR. LANE: A closed fist on top of the helmet.

MR. LEWELLYN: Can we also maybe recommend that the person be expelled from the game, especially where you have someone spearing thus making the player a little bit more aware?

MR. LANE: It is in the Federation Rules.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I would first like to get one rule at a time.

Now, Eddie, am I right -- if a player is in

violation of spearing, he is subject to disqualification at the federation level?

MR. LANE: Fifteen yards.

MR. JORDAN: It isn't like the Federation only -- it is just generally automatic.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, we have Eddie's motion before us. Is there a second?

MR. FLENTJE: Second the motion.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there any further discussion in relation to this?

All in favor? Is there anybody opposed? The motion is carried.

Now, Craig, do you want to add something to that?

Do you want to add a rules change?

MR. LEWELLYN: I would just like to make a recommendation to Warren and his Committee that they look into the feasibility of possibly adding a rule to permanently disqualify for spearing.

MR. JORDAN: I think it is a good idea.

However, I don't think you will find any official with guts enough to call it.

MR. CHAMBERS: In my school, a football official ran four kids off. He kicked four kids out of four different ball games for spearing at the high school level.

MR. LANE: Of course, my main concern is also at the high school level but from the way I understand it, the only way to get it is through the National organization, through the NCAA. We don't have anything

to do, really, with rule changes in the Federation.

We don't have anybody there like we do nationally.

Therefore, this is the only vehicle we have.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Does anybody else want to talk about Craig's proposal?

Do you think it is a good one?

MR. LANE: Let me say Craig, I am with you.

Please don't misunderstand me, I think you are right but then let's not create a bad thing.

MR. FLENTJE: I think before proceeding with this, we ought to see how we get along on the other one and then if we make hay on that, then we can hit them again.

MR. LANE: I would agree.

I think we have a chance in relation to what I have proposed and so, Craig, if we hit them again with yours at the same time, they may not be as sympathetic.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there anything further on Craig's proposal. Do you wish to take any definite action?

If not, we will proceed.

The next item on the agenda has to do with special cases.

Now, it was decided previously that we would allow special cases to take the certification examination.

To give you a little history, these, in the main, are people who will really never qualify to take

the certification examination because they do not have a college degree or perhaps will never get a college degree.

Also, they are people who have been members of the Association for quite a while.

They are people who have been trainers and probably will continue to be trainers.

All we are doing at this point is presenting it to the Board by way of review.

For example, Wes has one case and, further, it is not for us to say "yes" or "no" on it but for us to decide on the merits of presenting it to you at the June Board meeting because that is the last time this particular individual will be eligible.

Further, there has been nobody else apply and that is all I can say.

In connection with all the people who have hassled and fought and indicated they wanted a try, we have written to them all more than once and this happens to be the only one who has seen fit to follow it up.

Now, Wes, can you give us some background with regard to this individual?

MR. JORDAN: Well, this individual is a kind of special case because in addition to not having the college degree, he does not meet the ten-year requirement, if you don't count student trainer service.

...At this point, Mr. Jordan presented the history of this particular individual...

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, fellows, as you can see, this does involve some special factors

I might also add that at one time we certified

this man, the Association did. This man joined in 1969. Jack Rockwell was the Executive Director then and we went to him with the case and asked him what we should do about it.

The man was there -- the head trainer was there -- I was there -- Jack was there and Wes was there and Jack Rockwell said, "certify him".

Well, we did. Now, when Otho came along, he reviewed the records of people who had been recently certified and found that this case did not qualify him for certification -- he had not been a member of the Association long enough -- and so his certification was taken away and, of course, rightfully so.

That is what should have been done.

This individual has been a trainer for seven years at Dartmouth and I have been told by Fred, for example, that he thinks this individual will be a trainer forever -- that is his profession, he likes it and he has been a Code II Member, pays dues every year.

He would like for us to give him permission to take the examination.

On this basis, I thought it warranted discussion by the Board.

Why don't you therefore, Wes, lead off with the discussion?

MR. JORDAN: Well, I have been encouraging him through correspondence. However, I don't think I have that here with me. I have encouraged him to pursue this. As a matter of fact, I wrote him initially right after our Board meeting last year and heard nothing from him. I then wrote him again this fall, in October, and asked him if he still was interested in pursuing this avenue towards certification. I got a letter back from him. He was upset and said that after reading his letter, he was still very confused.

Well, where we stand at present, at least as far as I am concerned, I think we are right back to the beginning -- nowhere.

He says, in his correspondence, "I am not mad at anybody, just puzzled and confused."

Well, I again wrote him back and said that I would like to encourage him to still seek certification under these special case provisions; that I would make every attempt to see that his case was given special consideration.

Then, in turn, he wrote me back and told me how thankful he was that I would take the time to make this appeal for him.

I have a letter here from his doctor, his team physician, Dr. Ramsey, concerning him.

There is no letter from his head trainer but he did call up on the telephone and strongly recommend this man be allowed to take the examination.

That, in essence, is the background involved here.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there any discussion?

We will start with you, Dick.

MR. MELHART: Well, I really don't know. I believe I would have mixed emotions about all of this.

I think, and this is not speaking for the Education Committee but just for myself, if I were to make a decision right now, I would say to let him take the examination.

MR. SMITH: Also, since he had been previously certified, how much could he actually lag of being grandfathered in?

MR. LEE: He joined in 1969 and 1970 was the deadline.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, you had to have so many years of experience prior to 1970. I forget what it was but maybe, Bruce, you can help us.

MR. MELIN: Two or five.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Would that have included student trainers work?

MR. MELIN: No.

When you were grandfathered, you had to be an active member and to be active you had to be a member for a couple of years.

MR. LANE: Let me ask a question. Is he working presently to get a degree at any level?

MR. JORDAN: Well, I cannot answer that -- I really don't know.

He has had some proctored courses. You don't get them, however for credit.

MR. WHITE: I would think that if this is the last opportunity for this to happen, it is the only person we have making the appeal and if the people who are associated with him directly want him to have it done, yes, we cannot burn ourselves very badly if we make a mistake and, therefore, why not give him a break?

After all, we are not making him a certified member -- we are just giving him an opportunity to become a certified member.

MR. CHAMBERS: We are not establishing a precedent here.

MR. LANE: Further, this becomes an

impossibility in June.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Correct, and he gets one shot at it.

If the Board decides to do it again, that is your decision. You can make that decision if you so desire. However, the way it is now, it will be over.

MR. LANE: I believe this was an action we took either in Anaheim or Chicago last March.

MR. DAVIS: They could appeal at Anaheim and Boston, 1976 was the cut-off.

MR. WHITE: I would like to make a motion we give this fellow an opportunity to take the test.

MR. CHAMBERS: I am in favor of giving the guy an opportunity.

MR. FLENTJE: It is not to take the examination but to present his case.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: If you want to tell him "yes", he will do it.

MR. JORDAN: I indicated to him that he must submit a written application to the District Director at least ninety days prior to the scheduled April 1st meeting.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: As I understand this, we are just looking for an indication to waive the ten years.

He cannot appear before the Board of Directors and take the certification examination.

MR. LEE: He can take it at the winter meeting next year.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Probably at the January

meeting or the meeting in January.

MR. LANE: There is no way that he can be prepared for both -- to come before us in June and also to take the examination at the same time.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: He has to have the material in by May to Lindsay and all of that.

MR. LANE: If we give him permission to come by, I don't see how the fellow can mentally prepare himself to do both.

MR. MALACREA: On the other hand, does this say that he has to take his test in June?

All it provides for is a cut-off in connection with an appeal, does it not?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: However, we on the Board have the understanding among ourselves they would have to take it one year after the last day.

He would have to, for example, make an appeal by June of 1976 and if the Board approved, he must take the test by June of 1977.

MR. WHITE: Whatever needs to be done, I would suggest we do it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think it is okay for him to make an appeal to the Board.

MR. CHAMBERS: I would agree.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: How about the rest of you, do you think it is okay for him to make an appeal to the Board?

...Cries of "yes"...

MR. JORDAN: I think he is going to be very pleased because he was a very frustrated young man

because of the technicalities involved, the indecision or whatever the case may be.

Now, let me ask you to give me some guidelines because I do have to write to him.

What is the procedure from this point?

For example, he has submitted all the data to me, such as his school grades, high school graduation and that type of thing, and I would presume he does not have to do any more of that?

MR. SMITH: Well, he has to have a written presentation of his case to the District Director and so he needs the high school transcript, high school proof of graduation, the letter of recommendation from his supervising trainer and his college transcript, if any.

Also, proof of first aid.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes, he has to take first aid and CPR.

MR. JORDAN: He indicated to me he has one of these and was taking the other one this Spring.

MR. FLENTJE: Also, membership records, if available.

MR. JORDAN: We would have to get these from the District Secretary, would we not?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

MR. DAVIS: I would like to get your opinion on an NCAA request for reducing required practice days from twelve to nine for the NCAA established games.

Does anybody have any opinion on that?

In other words, reducing the practice days

from twelve to nine?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: When in the year are these?

MR. DAVIS: These are all high school games and basketball stars and the like.

MR. WHITE: Can we have a "for instance" in relation to this?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, I know that in Pennsylvania they have what they call the Big Thirty-Three Game and they get all the high school stars together and they play the summer before they go away to college. Half of them seem to get hurt and go to their respective colleges with injuries.

MR. DAVIS: Now, I have talked to Casey Clark about this and they do not feel, for example, that reducing it to nine days is going to cause any problems. This is the NCAA and his committee and some of the people he talked with at Penn State as well as other places.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, how do you judge something like this?

MR. DAVIS: Well, I don't think it is in practice where these kids get hurt -- it is in the game.

MR. MALACREA: Can you tell us why they want to reduce it?

MR. DAVIS: I guess in relation to the expense factor.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Also, could they play a game in nine days?

Really, we could not.

MR. WHITE: We could not in twelve either and so what is the difference? Perhaps you are right --

it is better in twelve than in nine.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, all I have to go on is my experience and, in that connection, nine days, in no way are you going to be ready for a full game.

MR. DAVIS: You are not restricted with certain rules either, Frank, such as set offense, set defense and so on. They are restricted in some of these all-star games.

MR. MELHART: Does this require Board action?

MR. DAVIS: He asked for comments and I wanted to throw it out to see if I could get your thoughts.

MR. LANE: The all-star game in Texas is sponsored by the coaching association and goes for four days. They come in on a Saturday, work out on Sunday and play the following Thursday.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: When in the season is it?

MR. LANE: Prior to the beginning of the regular football season.

It is four days the first of August, the hottest time of the year.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, how does everybody feel about this? What should we recommend to the NCAA?

MR. LEE: I would suggest you leave it the way it is.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In other words, at twelve days -- not cut it down to nine days?

MR. LANE: Increase it to three weeks.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I have no hard facts to give them other than to say that I think most injuries occur during those first two weeks of practice and that

is for sure.

Is there anybody else who wants to comment?

Again, Gene, what should we tell them?

MR. SMITH: In relation to these all-star games, they don't do any hitting until game time, is that correct?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Well, that depends.

MR. LANE: Well, I went through five of them in Texas and there was a lot of hitting.

MR. DAVIS: By reducing it, you are reducing two days of expenses and yet you are reducing that by possibly three more days of injuries.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Are they kept in pads for three days?

MR. CHAMBERS: That is just what I was going to ask.

MR. DAVIS: They do in Pennsylvania.

MR. CHAMBERS: From the first three days or the whole time?

MR. DAVIS: The whole time.

When I was up there, they were always short.

MR. LANE: They are still having that big game, are they not?

MR. DAVIS: Yes.

MR. FLENTJE: Perhaps you should write them and tell them we don't feel qualified to answer that question at this time.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: In other words, we have

no scientific basis on which to base an answer and anything we give is strictly subjective.

Also, what is our relationship with them anyway?

MR. DAVIS: I would like to give an answer you know, from this Committee.

I was going to send a mailogram or something down to their convention there.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: What is our relationship to them? I don't think, for example, it is antagonistic any more, is it?

I think with most of the association things have gently smoothed over. Further, the further away we get from Dellums, the smoother things seem to be. I think if it is ever brought up again, it would be the same thing all over again.

Well, fellows, okay, shall we tell them anything?

What do you think?

MR. MELHART: I would leave it sit.

MR. SMITH: So would I.

MR. CHAMBERS: Leave it like it is.

MR. WHITE: Yes.

MR. DAVIS: Well, we will then leave that one.

Now, on the next page, under "Criteria For the All-Star High School Football and Basketball Games" down in No. 11, since we do have a copy of this criteria, do you want to make any suggestions for a change on there, adding a certified athletic trainer as part of the medical staff?

MR. JORDAN: Well, the only thing we can do is to recommend that because that is a part of their Constitution.

MR. DAVIS: Yes.

MR. JORDAN: Well, they are asking us for a favor and so why can we not ask a favor of them.

MR. FLENTJE: They are asking for our opinion.

MR. JORDAN: Which we gave them.

MR. DAVIS: Well, would you like to suggest that they have a trainer on their staff?

MR. JORDAN: I would like to make a motion that we contact them and request the presence of a certified athletic trainer when they are playing a game.

MR. SMITH: Just a moment, I have a question before you go too far.

Is it the college trainer who cannot participate, right?

MR. DAVIS: I think this has been discussed also, Gene, and in talking with Cassidy on Thursday, they have made a little change in there.

They are sort of over-looking that.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I believe that was discussed at the meeting of the Joint Commission and what the rules state, is that it cannot be the trainer.

MR. SMITH: At the high school level?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, and the reason for this is possible influence on the athlete for recruiting purposes.

On the other hand, if the kid hasn't made up his mind by the time of the all-star game coming up as to where he is going to go to school then I would not want him anyway. Therefore, the influence that the doctor or the trainer is going to have during, in this case, this twelve or thirteen-day period, is nil.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there further discussion?

Now, as I understand it, we have a motion before us to the effect that we contact these people and request the presence of a certified athletic trainer when they are playing a game.

Was there a second to that motion?

MR. FLENTJE: I will second it.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there further discussion? If not, all in favor? Are there any opposed?

The motion is carried.

MR. JORDAN: Is that In Memoriam Resolution that I mentioned to you presented now or at the Business Meeting?

I believe I sent that to you, did I not?

I merely wanted to make sure.

MR. DAVIS: We have it. Is there anything else? Does anybody have anything else we are missing or anything?

MR. JORDAN: Let me ask you this. When is it possible to have a copy of the Journal sent to the widow in this case?

Is this ever done?

MR. DAVIS: It can be.

MR. JORDAN: I kind of replied to her in my letter that it would be in the Journal and so it might help to send her a copy of the Journal also.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I think if you write to Roy, he can take care of that. Just give him the address and tell him what for.

If he cannot finance it, the District will pay for it.

MR. FLENTJE: Should these be sent to you or how should those be handled?

MR. DAVIS: They should be presented at the business meeting of the convention.

Now, another thing for thought here, especially as we had this conflict here today of the Certification and Professional Education Committee's conflict -- about one submitting items for discussion or Board action without the other one knowing about it.

Now, the policy provides that all inter-committee requests presented to the Board of Directors for Board action must first have the signatures of the Committee Chairperson involved.

Now, this does not necessarily mean that all of the Chairpersons involved are in favor of it but, on the other hand, it indicates they are aware of the requested action and should state their opinions.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Just a moment, did you all understand that?

MR. WHITE: In other words, they should be aware of what is happening here and they should likewise state their opinion, especially if they differ from the Committee submitting the report?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Yes.

MR. DAVIS: If they have a difference of opinion, they should so state it so that you as a Board would know.

Then, of course, you in turn can decide on which of the opinions to accept.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Do you need a motion on that or anything?

MR. DAVIS: I would like to have this as a motion relative to a statement of policy.

MR. FLENTJE: I would so move.

MR. WHITE: Second the motion.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there further discussion?

All in favor? Is there any opposition?

It is carried.

Now, gentlemen, do you have anything else?

MR. WHITE: With regard to the convention for 1977, can we assume that the Saturday start and the Sunday start as we had in Disneyland?

MR. CHAMBERS: What did Fred say about the St. Louis Hotel, or do you want to talk about that now?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: He told me he was getting the run-around by Stouffers -- that we probably would not be having it in that hotel and that he was looking at another hotel in St. Louis, and he did give me the name of another big hotel, the Chase Plaza.

MR. DAVIS: In this respect, let me say that the man who made all of the promises to Fred in relation

to Stouffers is no longer there. They booted him out the door.

Now, he thought we might be able to get either half or three-quarters of the space that we needed in Stouffers.

He went to the Chase Plaza. The Football Coaches Association is very happy there and he was also very pleased with what he saw and he is going to go through it again and also Stouffers, and see if he cannot persuade them to give us the necessary space.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Are there any other questions?

MR. LANE: Do we need to take some action on these?

PRESIDENT GEORGE: I don't think so, do we?

MR. DAVIS: It is presently again being reinvestigated.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Now, gentlemen, you have a list of names in front of you. Have you all gone through it, looked at the people involved with your respective districts to see if you, for any reason know why any of them should not take the examination?

The first page is composed of those who are going to take it at Evanston, Illinois; the second page is Portland, Oregon and the next is New York. Then we have Redwood City, California, and Ft. Worth, Texas and then, lastly, we have Nashville, Tennessee.

The Roman Numeral next to it is the procedure of certification that the member is applying to take the examination under -- No. 1 being the approved schools, No. 2 being apprenticeship, No. 3 being actively engaged.

Now, does anybody know of anybody on those

lists that should not be taking the examination?

I will go around the table.

How about District No. 4?

MR. MELHART: I know only of a few and, insofar as I know, they are all okay.

...At this point, the various District Representatives indicated they saw no difficulty...

PRESIDENT GEORGE: On that basis, may I have a motion that we accept these lists of candidates for examination?

MR. LANE: I would make a motion that we accept the candidates as listed.

MR. FLENTJE: I will second the motion.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: Is there further discussion?

If not, all in favor?

Is there any opposition?

It is carried.

Now, gentlemen, is there anything further?

MR. LANE: I would like to ask as to what the schedule for Boston is?

MR. DAVIS: Boston is set for June 12 to 16th.

PRESIDENT GEORGE: We will meet on Friday night and Saturday during the day and also on Tuesday morning. Then, of course, as needed. It will probably be at six o'clock on Friday night.

There will be no Sunday or Monday meetings.

Does that answer the questions?

Now, is there anything further?

If not, I guess we have completed our agenda and a motion to adjourn is in order.

...Whereupon, in accordance with regular motion, the meeting was adjourned at two o'clock a.m., January 12, 1976...
