The University of Alabama

University Athletic Compliance Oversight Committee Meeting Agenda
Thursday, May 8, 2014

- NCAA Academic Performance Program Data Review Update - Rachel Morton
- FAR Report Update - Kevin Whitaker
- IA Compliance Office Update - Jonathan Bowling
  1. Overview of IA's Drug Testing Program - Jonathan Bowling
- Round Table Information Sharing - All

Next Meeting: Sept 18, 2014, 9:00 AM - 10:30 AM, Room 207m SSC. The entire 2014 - 2015 schedule will be forthcoming in June. Have a wonderful summer.

NOTES:
The May 2014 meeting of the University Athletic Compliance Oversight Committee convened at 9:10 A.M. in Room 207m of the Student Services Center.

Committee members in attendance were:

- Dr. Kevin Whitaker [College of Engineering]
  Faculty Athletics Representative
- Dr. Joe Hornsby [College of Arts and Sciences]
  Past-Faculty Athletics Representative
- Vicki Peeples
  Assistant Dean
  College of Human Environmental Sciences
- Jonathan Bowling
  Associate A.D. for Compliance
  Intercollegiate Athletics, Compliance
- Mary Spiegel
  Associate Provost & Executive Director of Undergraduate Admissions
  Office of Academic Affairs
- Michael George (Chair)
  University Registrar
  Office of Academic Affairs
- Rachel Morton [Guest]
  Assistant University Registrar for Athletic Certification
  University Registrar
  Office of Academic Affairs

Committee members absent were:

- Shane Lyons [ex officio & does not normally attend]
  Deputy Athletic Director
  Intercollegiate Athletics
- Jon Dever
  Associate A.D. for Student Services
  Intercollegiate Athletics, Academics
- Helen Allen
  Director Student Financial Aid
  Office of Academic Affairs

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 A.M. by the Chair.
The meeting then opened with an update by Rachel Morton regarding the NCAA Academic Performance and Graduation Success Rate Program Data [GSR] Review. Since the April 17th meeting, Rachel informed the committee that UA submitted its data to the NCAA on time on April 25th and that it is now being reviewed by Becky Bowman [NCAA]. Rachel further reported that she has been contacted several times by Becky since the review started. More specifically, Becky sought clarity regarding UA's grant-in-aid forms and the numbering protocol. Becky also asked if UA would be submitting a corrections list and would be seeking any point adjustments. UA will be seeking adjustments for the following:

- A student-athlete who transferred to another institution and met the adjustment criteria. [a one point adjustment].
- A student-athlete who transferred to another institution and did not meet the adjustment criteria [a one point adjustment].
- Football student-athletes who have gone professional and met adjustment criteria [a six point adjustment].

Rachel also mentioned that a track athlete may have been reported incorrectly and an adjustment will have to be made.

Over the summer an update on the status of the review will be provided to the UACOC membership by email as the information becomes available.

Kevin Whitaker then talked about the upcoming Spring SEC Meeting in Destin, FL. This meeting includes SEC coaches, athletic directors, FARs and presidents who come together for four days of debates and discussions about the hot topics within the conference and the major sports. Topics for this year's meeting will no doubt include: eight games vs. nine, permanent opponents, SEC network programming, and playoff selection.

Kevin also mentioned that the restructuring of the NCAA is openly being discussed. The focus of this initiative is to review and compare how the larger conferences operate in relation to the smaller/lesser conferences.

Following the presentation of the FAR Report, Jonathan Bowling provided an overview of The University of Alabama Athletic Department Drug and Alcohol Policy which went into effect August 2013. Attached is a comparison of the previous policy and the current policy. Jonathan explained that the focus has changed from being punitive to one in which the emphasis is on treatment, education, and rehabilitation. Student-athletes who now test positive go through a progressive, five-step protocol. For the first positive test a treatment plan is put into place. Subsequent consequences include probation, suspension, and ultimately dismissal from the team.

During the Round Table Information Sharing session Jonathan talked about a push in the SEC amongst the basketball staff to try and allow for the NCAA graduate exception. Upon graduating, a student is immediately eligible to transfer to another institution and play assuming that they have
not used all 5 years of their eligibility at that point. However, the SEC has a rule that states a student has to still have 2 years of eligibility after transferring to another institution in order for the NCAA graduate exception rule to apply.

Being there was no other new business the meeting was adjourned at 9:49 A.M.

The next meeting will be Thursday, September 18, 2014, 9:00 - 10:00/10:30 A.M. in Room 207m of the Student Services Center.

Respectfully submitted 5/16/2014

W. Michael George
Chair

Attachments [1]
1. The University of Alabama Athletic Department Drug and Alcohol Policy Review
University of Alabama Athletic Department
Drug and Alcohol Policy Review:

A Comparison of the Previous Policy and the Current Policy
Introduction

In an effort to deal with the national problem associated with drug use in the college aged population, the athletic department recognized the need to evaluate the drug testing policy and the overall philosophy toward substance abuse among student-athletes. The desire of the department staff members and consultants who evaluated the current policy and created the proposed policy was to develop a program that would treat substance abuse as what it truly is in many cases, a medical issue derived from multiple causes. The trend with some policies is to treat substance abuse as a “moral” issue. While an argument can be made for that thought process, the question arises as to whether the best approach in regards to the treatment of substance abuse is through suspension or dismissal of the student-athlete? Should you have a program that automatically punishes a student-athlete for a positive drug test or even permanently dismisses them? Or, should you have a program that attempts, through aggressive testing and treatment (which may include restrictions from playing), to identify and help student-athletes who have a chronic disease process that in most cases began before they came to college?

As the discussions on the proposed policy progressed, the philosophy became that rather than simply suspending or dismissing student athletes with substance abuse issues; we should strive to utilize every resource at our disposal to help them. These “help” methods include frequent and effective drug testing, student-athlete evaluations by trained substance abuse professionals and out-patient and in-patient substance abuse education and treatment.

It became clear from discussions with substance abuse experts that the biggest factor in helping student-athletes with substance abuse issues is patience. Designing a program that provided enough of a deterrent factor to prevent substance use, while at the same time having enough patience to treat what is a chronic medical condition, was and continues to be the challenge.

The current and popular trend is for athletic departments to have a “tough” drug testing program which is equated with suspension and dismissal. The issue with that philosophy is that many programs, with what is considered a “tough” policy in the eyes of the public and the media, fail in the area of testing frequency and treatment methods. While a policy may call for a student-athlete to be dismissed after three positive drug tests and appear to be “tough” on drug use, many times student-athletes are tested on a very infrequent basis, once a year or once a semester at best. Also, many drug testing policies do not have the intense treatment programs necessary for effective recovery in severe substance abuse cases.

Conversations with our consultants had two recurring themes; first, frequent testing as a way to identify and deter substance abuse was a primary importance. Second, it was agreed that to overcome and properly manage an addiction issue, intense substance abuse treatment programs are necessary.

When reviewing the proposed policy and the differences from the current one, it is important to remember that the proposed policy is based on a philosophy of treating substance abuse as a medical condition which does not occur in a vacuum and utilizing every available resource to help the student-athlete recover and move beyond what can be a life altering and devastating problem. Evidence supports the belief that substance abuse has multiple etiologies including social, cultural and psychological factors to name a few. All of these must be addressed and simply suspending or expelling a student-athlete does not accomplish this.
Policy Differences

Listed below are the major differences between the current drug-testing policy and the proposed drug-testing policy that is under review.

1. ABILITY TO TEST FOR ALL ILLEGAL SUBSTANCES

The proposed policy states that the athletic department has the right to test for any substance that is deemed illegal by the federal government or state of Alabama.

2. ATHLETIC DIRECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN NOTIFICATION AND ENFORCEMENT

The proposed policy calls for the medical director to notify the athletic director and director of sports medicine of all positive drug tests. The athletic director then has the discretion to notify other members of the athletic department and university as "deemed necessary".

In the proposed policy, the director of athletics is “responsible for ensuring enforcement of the specific sanctions” for a positive test.

3. 90 DAY PERIOD AFTER EACH POSITIVE TEST

The proposed policy has a 90 day period after every positive test for a student-athlete to return to a negative test level. This allows for the student-athlete to receive the necessary treatment for their substance abuse issue and also accounts for the metabolism of the drug which could result in subsequent positives. If there is a confirmed positive test in the 90 day period, the student-athlete will receive a probationary violation. A second probationary violation in the 90 day period will result in the student athlete being assessed another positive.

4. ABSTINENCE RETRACTION CLAUSE

The proposed policy has an abstinence retraction clause. A positive test will be retracted from the student-athlete’s record should they maintain negative drug test results for a period of one year after a positive test.
# COMPARISON OF SANCTIONS FOR POSITIVE DRUG TESTS

## FIRST POSITIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVIOUS POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Substance Abuse Evaluation  
- Follow Treatment Plan | - Substance Abuse Evaluation  
- Follow Treatment Plan |

## SECOND POSITIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVIOUS POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Substance Abuse Evaluation  
- Follow Treatment Plan  
- 5 day immediate suspension  
- Suspension of 15% of countable contests or 30 day suspension | - Substance Abuse Evaluation  
- Follow Treatment Plan  
- 7 day immediate suspension  
- Possible inpatient treatment program  
- Coach appeal for increased sanctions |

## THIRD POSITIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVIOUS POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Substance Abuse Evaluation  
- Follow Treatment Plan  
- One year suspension | - Substance Abuse Evaluation  
- Follow Treatment Plan  
- One month immediate suspension  
- Mandatory inpatient treatment program  
- Coach appeal for increased sanctions |

## FOURTH POSITIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVIOUS POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - No clause for 4th positive | - Substance Abuse Evaluation  
- Follow Treatment Plan  
- Six month immediate suspension  
- Possible inpatient treatment program  
- Coach appeal for increased sanctions |

## FIFTH POSITIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREVIOUS POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No clause for 5th positive</td>
<td>- Permanent dismissal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>