

TABLE OF CONTENTS

April 2, 1986

Dear Readers:

Welcome to the new *Academic Athletic Journal*. I have assembled an editorial board which consists of distinguished and knowledgeable representatives within and outside our profession. Their competencies range from practitioners of athletic academic counseling, to professors of higher education and counseling, and athletic administrators. Their contributions have brought you a refereed journal, and the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics greatly appreciates their contributions. It is our hope you find the articles stimulating and thoughtful.

Sincerely,
 Gerald Gurney
 Editor

Editorial	
From Theory to Practice in Programming for Student-AthletesTanya R. Foster	1
Paths Between The Locker Room and The Library: An Analysis of Role Conflict Among Student AthletesHenry J. Camp and Jim Epps	10
Contingency Management in an Athletic Study HallSigrid S. Glenn, Guy Bruce, Janet Ellis, and Linda Rollins	19
The Role of a Code of Ethics in Athletic Academic CounselingAnn M. Mayo	27
The Academic GameDr. Janice Roberts Wilbur and Dr. Michael Wilbur	31
Advising the Student-AthleteGerald S. Gurney and Sally P. Johnston	35
NCAA Drug Testing: Finding a Constitutional BalanceWilliam J. Judge	39

EDITORIAL

The voting among NCAA member institutions last January reaffirmed a genuine commitment to Bylaw 5-1-j and increased minimum freshman eligibility standards for student-athletes. As practitioners in athletic academic counseling, we are often charged with the responsibility for implementing new academic legislation.

Now that the legislation has taken effect, I am concerned that interpretations have watered it down in several areas. For example, prospective student-athletes may be eligible for competition with having passed less than 11 core units, so long as 11 are attempted with a 2.0 GPA. Further, student-athletes with less than a 2.0 cumulative point average could now qualify for competition and financial aid. Previously, he or she would be a non-qualifier. Has the NCAA truly increased standards for freshmen eligibility or breached the spirit of proposition #48? The academic courses which qualify for core units have also been interpreted with greater flexibility than the original intention of the voting membership. For example, college preparatory high school math courses have been interpreted as courses containing any elements of algebra, trigonometry, geometry, or statistics. I do not believe spending one day covering a principle of algebra constitutes a college preparatory course.

Research indicates better college academic performances among students who attempt greater numbers of college preparatory units while in high school. The legislation of 5-1-j represents a genuine commitment by chief executive officers to increase the admission standards for student-athletes. The core unit section of the legislation should reflect this spirit. Many athletic academic counseling professionals are looking forward to better prepared student-athletes. I hope intercollegiate athletics will maintain a strict commitment to the concept of the amateur scholar-athlete.