

It's all about the Form

By Karen Casilio

Whenever non-runners hear someone say, "Let's go run a 5K!" they tend to start to shake and worry that there is no possible way they could ever finish a 5K. However, what they don't realize is that running a 5K can be fairly easy if you know what you are doing. When running a race, the most important thing you can do is focus on your form. Moving your body in the correct positions will increase your chances in performing to the best of your abilities and allow you to finish the race with success. As long as you can think positively and maintain good form, there should be no problems finishing every race with 100 percent satisfaction.

Running is all about form and technique. The position of your body will help or hinder you. By moving your body with the correct form, you can conserve energy and save it for the end of the race when you probably will need it the most. All parts of your body are extremely important in running because you have to take your entire body through the journey.

Your arms are probably the most important part in keeping your body propelling forward. The arms are what drive your legs forward. Quick arm movements will allow your legs to open their stride and allow for a fast sprint past an opponent. Your arms should be positioned close to the sides of your body, and you should make forward and backward movements with your elbows bent in a 90-degree angle. The primary objective that needs to be accomplished through arm movement is keeping the arms moving in the same direction propelling you forward. The worse thing you can do is move your arms across your body because it not only wastes energy but also creates tension in the shoulders and hinders the leg movement forward. The arms are surprisingly the most difficult aspect of running to conquer. This is mainly because within the first mile of a race you start getting tired and stop thinking about your arm movement. Also,

when fatigue sets in, your arms naturally start twisting across the body. The key is to not let fatigue stop you from having the correct arm movement; otherwise, your arms will grow even more tired because of the extra energy being expended on them from moving in the wrong direction. If worse comes to worse, and you are so tired you can't easily remember how to move your arms, pretend you have a pen in your front pants pocket and you need to put it in your back pants pocket. Just keep repeating that motion and your arms will be in relatively good positioning. Be careful that you don't drop the pen.

When running, keep your upper body relaxed. Tension in the upper body could very well cause the lower body to not perform to the best of its ability. Shoulders and hands are key ways to keep the upper body relaxed and flowing smoothly. Keep your shoulders low and loose. This way they will not tense up and cause your arm swing to change. Also, keeping them level so they do not fall from side to side with each stride is part of maintaining good running posture. However, if your shoulders do start to tense up and there is a downhill coming up, while you are running down the hill, release your arms and shoulders and lightly shake them out. This should release the tension and allow you to go back and focus on your arm movement and the overall race.

The next part of the body that you probably would not think has much effect on the way you run is the hands. Like the shoulders, the hands need to be relaxed to lessen the tension in the upper body, especially the arms, which mimic leg movement. The hands should not be clenched up tight. They should be slightly open with the fingers just barely touching the palm. If you are not sure how close your fingers should actually be to your palm, pretend you are holding a metal baton, which is used for relay races in track. Batons are circular and approximately 1.5 inches in diameter.

Legs are the next important factor to focus on during a race. For long-distance running, which includes the 5K, only a small stride is needed. This is because longer strides are hard to keep up for long periods of time. Therefore, the key is to lift the knee only slightly and focus on a quick leg turnover. By doing this, your feet should land directly beneath you. In order to decrease the impact on the knee when striking the ground and keep up the quick leg turnover, your knee should be slightly bent as your foot comes in contact with the ground.

The only exception to the knee being only slightly bent for distance running is when you have to push yourself up a hill. In that case, you should focus on trying to have enough energy to run up on your toes, keeping your knees up high and quickening the pace of your arm movement. The faster you push yourself up a hill, the faster you get through it and can focus on the rest of the race. Just remember the little slogan that “what goes up, must come down.” At some point in the race you will have the wonderful experience of going down the hill.

The way your feet hit the ground is also extremely important in moving you forward in the most efficient way possible. The heel should be the first part of the foot to hit the ground if you are not sprinting. In sprinting, you should always be running on your toes. After the heel hits the ground, the mid foot should follow and then the toes, making a quick, light landing. The key to the feet is to have your toes spring off the ground in order to propel you forward. Your running should be smooth and quiet. Pounding your feet on the ground will only create tension in the knees, which will cause an extreme loss of energy and will also damage your knees if done excessively.

Running is a full body experience, and the lower body moves in unison with the upper body. By controlling upper body movement, the lower body will flow easily to the finish line. Running is hard to keep up mentally because most people think about giving up. If you keep

focusing on your form, you shouldn't have time to think of not finishing. Just remember,
"Running is real and relatively simple - but it ain't easy." (Mark Will-Weber)

Drug Testing Policy

For or Against?

By Karen Casilio



Dear My Fellow Wine Lover,

I'm starting to chill down now. They always put me on this ice just before I'm about to go out and meet the people. They tend to look down at me first and are mesmerized by my glistening gold label. They're also very happy to see me this year. I've been sitting in the cellar for a couple of years now and I am finally ready to have my cork pop out and impress some people today. Last year, I was brought out to sit in reserve. I sat on the shelf and watched as my brothers were pressed into service (wine humor). I'm getting really excited because I was able to witness one of the servers make everyone's day light up. Fortunately, I got to get a quick glimpse of her name tag as she was hurrying past me to grab some more shrimp to pass to the honored guests. Her name was Karen Casilio. I heard there is a chance she's coming back this year to help run this event if I can provide a full account of why she should be chosen. Well, here it is:

On Friday, September 29, 2006, one of the greatest wine events of the year took place at the New York Wine and Culinary Center in Canandaigua, New York. There, the wines of New York were displayed to perfection with excellent servers bringing out hors d'oeuvres for the lovely guests to sample. Karen Casilio, who passed the shrimp that was wrapped with bacon with a touch of barbecue sauce, was never seen standing still. As soon as her plate ran out, she would bustle back to the kitchen to get more from her primary food giver, Heights Cafe of Ithaca, New York. As the night went on, she was able to convince guests to sample the hors d'oeuvres so fast that when she came back to the kitchen the chefs did not have anything to give her. They were not expecting someone to be able to convince people to try their specialties so fast.

I was out in the tent where Karen did her primary serving. It was very interesting to watch her.

She would seek out a group of people just standing around and hastily walk up to them. I saw her smile, and the faces of the people that she brightened up with every giggle. She was very good at convincing people that whatever she had on her plate was the best thing since sliced bread. She probably could have been able to get those guests to eat anything. Many guests were so impressed that they offered her jobs to come work for them. They must have been just as impressed with her salesmanship as I was, because even Mario's, one of the major restaurants, is still trying to get her to work for them.

As the event was coming to an end, once again, Karen never stopped moving. While many of the other workers were starting to become restless because the event was going on so long, Karen's second wind kicked in as it does for her in her broad assortment of sports. She had as much energy as she did when she started. Maybe even more with all that adrenaline increasing from the excitement of the event.

Oh, if only she could do this event one more time. I really think you should give her a chance. Before this event even she didn't think she could do it, majoring in nutritional management and all. However, now she realizes that this is where she wants to make her career, and I believe, as do others, that she has the skills, experience, and personality necessary to perform an excellent job at next year's Toast of New York.

I've taken much time to search through her references and sift through her resume. I have found many things that would help her be one of the best leaders possible. "I think students and all of us admire her as she can balance her school work with all her many other activities, sports, advanced classes, church activities, our church festival," says Anne Hastee, Director of Faith Formation at St Pius X Church. She is involved in so many activities I am completely positive that she knows how to manage her time extremely well, and I have her guarantee that she will make the Toast of New York one of her top priorities.

Her bubbly personality in itself will show the guests a good time and make everyone want to come back for more for years to come. She'll make going to the event not a task to try all the wines, but to learn to love whatever you decide to try, which includes the delicious appetizers.

It's not an easy decision to pick only two people from a group of very qualified workers. However, I believe Karen has proved herself worthy to help lead the incoming freshmen of next year at the Toast of New York.

I wish you luck in your decision, and I hope you take my suggestion to heart.

Yours truly,

Chardonnay

Chardonnay



P.S. "Not only did she demonstrate a great work ethic, but she also brought her enthusiasm and cheerful personality to the team as well and that was significant to the success of the summer activities," said Lon Smith Jr., assistant scientist, Digital Imaging and Remote Sensing Laboratory, who was Karen's advisor during her summer internship at the Rochester Institute of Technology.

Table of Contents

Page 1

Introduction

For Random Drug Testing

Role-Models

President Simone's View

Health Effects

Page 2

Privacy Different for Athletes

Voluntary Participation

Against Random Drug Testing

Reverse Effect

Page 3

Why Just Athletes?

Alternative

Not Same as Physical Exams/ Vaccinations

Page 4

Invades Fourth Amendment

Conclusion

The Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) has recently put into effect an athletic drug testing policy. From the beginning, and throughout its proposing stages, many athletes strongly voiced their opinions against the random testing. In June of 1995, the Supreme Court made it legal to perform suspicionless drug tests on student athletes in the case *Vernonia Sch. Dist. 47J v. Acton*.

(<http://www.cato.org/pubs/journal/cj16n3-5.html>) Even though the president of RIT says he had compelling reasons why the testing should be administered, many still believe that random drug testing is an invasion of privacy and their constitutional rights. This essay will explore the reasons for and against random drug testing. However, in the end, no matter who has a stronger case, it has been ruled by the Supreme Court for schools to be allowed to perform random drug tests on their student athletes.

Student athletes are put to a higher standard than non-athletes. They are required to sign an insurance waiver upon participation, maintain a minimum grade point average, and subscribe to the athletic code of conduct, as well as all other school rules. This is one of many reasons why random drug testing is seen as just and fair in order to try and stop drug use. Student-athletes are admired in school and are at many times viewed as role models. Being role models is what started much of the drug use problem in Vernonia County schools (Vernonia, Oregon). Athletes would boast that there was nothing the school could do about their drug use and the athletes became the leaders of the drug culture. Random drug testing of athletes will hopefully have a trickle-down effect. If the tests cause students to stop their drug use, maybe those who idol the athletes also will stop abusing drugs.

(<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

President Albert Simone of RIT favors the new drug testing policy because it is geared toward the health and welfare of the students. "Drugs undermine athletic performance, and we wish to counter this effect," says Simone. (<http://cfapps.rit.edu/askthepresident/question.cfm?id=1063>) The health of the students in general is a compelling reason why the government has interests in lowering drug use by having a drug testing policy. Drugs increase the risks of sports-related injuries by impairing coordination and judgment, lessening perception of pain, and slowing down reaction time. The younger

a person is when using drugs, the faster a chemical dependency grows and with much weaker recovery. Drugs in sports form an immediate risk to the user and all others playing around the user. Besides drugs affecting the athletes on the field, their effects also cause disruptions in the classroom.

(<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

The reason why the Supreme Court did not find random drug testing as unconstitutional Fourth Amendment was that it is based on "special needs." The Fourth Amendment covers the right to privacy. Having a warrant and probable cause would be impractical for the fact that it would interfere with swift, informal discipline and would undercut the need for the administration to maintain order. Schools have special guardian-like privileges that go beyond the Constitution. Physical examinations and vaccinations are already administered without opposition. The school environment has less privacy than the general population. Athletes' privacy is even smaller because their usual site of activity is in public places. For example, most locker rooms do not have shower or bathroom stalls. Therefore, athletes have a reduced expectation of privacy. (<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

Even if one was to argue that privacy is completely invaded, that would not be entirely true. The ways the samples are taken have almost the same conditions as if one was in a public restroom. The tests are looking for certain drugs only and nothing else. Also, the tests take place at random, so there is little need to worry about whom school officials pick. The broad-based nature of these tests dilutes accusatory nature. (<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

Being an athlete is voluntary. Therefore, athletes should expect intrusions on normal rights. They are looked up to and are held to a higher standard than non-athletic students. This in itself is a reason why drug testing policy on athletes is seen as constitutional. The Fourth Amendment right is no more violated than other rights can be in a school setting. Being an athlete is a privilege and therefore athletes can be randomly drug tested in order to maintain order.

The contrary view, against the drug testing policy, is as strong as being for the tests. Some believe that instead of stopping drug use, it will in effect increase drug use. Inframarginal athletes will

stop using drugs, but marginal athletes will probably end up quitting the team, thereby increasing drug use because they have no reason not to. This will, in turn, increase non-athletic drug use.

(<http://www.cato.org/pubs/journal/cj16n3-5.html>)

The problem is that athletes are not strictly the ones having the problems with drugs. Table 1 shows that non-athletes tend to abuse drugs more than athletes.

(<http://www.cato.org/pubs/journal/cj16n3-5.html>) The real question is why are athletes the only ones being targeted? Athletes were probably chosen because it was easier to pass drug testing through the constitution if a person is participating in something voluntary. I, personally, find this to be discriminatory on athletes who already give up so much to balance school and athletics. The price athletes pay is already high. For example, leisure time is extremely diminished because that time is spent trying to benefit the team by going to practices and participating in games. By administering drug tests to athletes alone, one is creating more costs for athletes to participate and more reasons for an athlete to quit. Besides, disruptions in class caused by drug use are not solely athlete related.

(<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

The alternative to random drug testing is already in place. It is suspicion based in which one tests only those who appear to be on drugs. This way does not discriminate against athletes. It is also cost effective because one is testing a few rather than many. Suspicion-based testing gives potential targets control over whether they will be searched by avoiding acting suspiciously. The way to avoid acting suspiciously is to not do drugs. This alternative is also less intrusive on privacy because it is based on reasonable suspicion. The evidence that made drug testing constitutional to begin with was given to people who would have been considered suspicious under the T.L.O. decision anyway. The T.L.O. decision was a Supreme Court case that legalized searches to be conducted in schools if school officials had probable cause. (<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

Also, the argument for drug testing that says drug testing is considered on the same basis as physical exams and vaccinations is misleading. Vaccinations are not looking for anything, so they can

a person is when using drugs, the faster a chemical dependency grows and with much weaker recovery. Drugs in sports form an immediate risk to the user and all others playing around the user. Besides drugs affecting the athletes on the field, their effects also cause disruptions in the classroom.

(<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

The reason why the Supreme Court did not find random drug testing as unconstitutional Fourth Amendment was that it is based on “special needs.” The Fourth Amendment covers the right to privacy. Having a warrant and probable cause would be impractical for the fact that it would interfere with swift, informal discipline and would undercut the need for the administration to maintain order. Schools have special guardian-like privileges that go beyond the Constitution. Physical examinations and vaccinations are already administered without opposition. The school environment has less privacy than the general population. Athletes' privacy is even smaller because their usual site of activity is in public places. For example, most locker rooms do not have shower or bathroom stalls. Therefore, athletes have a reduced expectation of privacy. (<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

Even if one was to argue that privacy is completely invaded, that would not be entirely true. The ways the samples are taken have almost the same conditions as if one was in a public restroom. The tests are looking for certain drugs only and nothing else. Also, the tests take place at random, so there is little need to worry about whom school officials pick. The broad-based nature of these tests dilutes accusatory nature. (<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

Being an athlete is voluntary. Therefore, athletes should expect intrusions on normal rights. They are looked up to and are held to a higher standard than non-athletic students. This in itself is a reason why drug testing policy on athletes is seen as constitutional. The Fourth Amendment right is no more violated than other rights can be in a school setting. Being an athlete is a privilege and therefore athletes can be randomly drug tested in order to maintain order.

The contrary view, against the drug testing policy, is as strong as being for the tests. Some believe that instead of stopping drug use, it will in effect increase drug use. Inframarginal athletes will

stop using drugs, but marginal athletes will probably end up quitting the team, thereby increasing drug use because they have no reason not to. This will, in turn, increase non-athletic drug use.

(<http://www.cato.org/pubs/journal/cj16n3-5.html>)

The problem is that athletes are not strictly the ones having the problems with drugs. Table 1 shows that non-athletes tend to abuse drugs more than athletes.

(<http://www.cato.org/pubs/journal/cj16n3-5.html>) The real question is why are athletes the only ones being targeted? Athletes were probably chosen because it was easier to pass drug testing through the constitution if a person is participating in something voluntary. I, personally, find this to be discriminatory on athletes who already give up so much to balance school and athletics. The price athletes pay is already high. For example, leisure time is extremely diminished because that time is spent trying to benefit the team by going to practices and participating in games. By administering drug tests to athletes alone, one is creating more costs for athletes to participate and more reasons for an athlete to quit. Besides, disruptions in class caused by drug use are not solely athlete related.

(<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

The alternative to random drug testing is already in place. It is suspicion based in which one tests only those who appear to be on drugs. This way does not discriminate against athletes. It is also cost effective because one is testing a few rather than many. Suspicion-based testing gives potential targets control over whether they will be searched by avoiding acting suspiciously. The way to avoid acting suspiciously is to not do drugs. This alternative is also less intrusive on privacy because it is based on reasonable suspicion. The evidence that made drug testing constitutional to begin with was given to people who would have been considered suspicious under the T.L.O. decision anyway. The T.L.O. decision was a Supreme Court case that legalized searches to be conducted in schools if school officials had probable cause. (<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

Also, the argument for drug testing that says drug testing is considered on the same basis as physical exams and vaccinations is misleading. Vaccinations are not looking for anything, so they can

not look for suspicious behavior, and they tend to be beneficial to the person receiving them. Physical exams cannot be based on suspicion because physical defects are not as obvious as the effects of drug use. Neither of these tests is searching for wrongdoing. Therefore, they are unrelated to drug testing. If a person tests positive for a drug test, disciplinary action is taken. Performing badly on a physical exam is not seen as “a mark of shame.” (<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

The Fourth Amendment is based on the right of the people to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures without a warrant or probable cause. Those against the policy strongly maintain the view that random drug testing invades on the Fourth Amendment. By undergoing random drug testing, all student athletes are denied this right. Out of the four categories this amendment protects, two have already been forfeited in schools by other cases. With these testings, the other two, which are the individual suspicion requirement and the part against blanket searches of mostly innocent people, would be violated, as well. Many proclaim that “students do not shed their constitutional rights... at the school house gates.” However, with random drug testing, the students' Fourth Amendment rights are shattered. It is not part of the traditional school function to perform random tests, and many prefer, especially parents, to trust unless given reason to do so otherwise. It sends a message of having to prove innocence by administering blanket testings. Also, why is it legal for schools to perform random drug tests when police officers cannot go into a drug-ridden neighborhood and test everyone without a compelling reason? Protection comes with a price. More people may be caught by having these tests in place, but the real question is, is it worth the costs of freedom?

(<http://galenet.galegroup.com/servlet/OVRC>)

At present, the *Vernonia Sch. Dist. 47J v. Acton* case has been upheld, constitutionalizing random drug testing of student athletes. I believe that this case will stay upheld for many years to come because the benefits of having random drug testing outweigh the consequences of losing some inalienable rights in a school environment. RIT, in common with many other universities, will uphold athletic drug testing. The NCAA already requires Division I and II schools to perform drug testing.

Within the next couple of years, Division III will have to meet these requirements, as well. RIT is starting its own program now in order to be a guinea pig for the NCAA and to be ready for when these controls do come in complete effect by NCAA standards. Drug testing is necessary to try and keep athletes away from substances that destroy their bodies. Drugs not only inhibit top performance by athletes but also have extremely long-term negative effects on the health and wellness of athletes. For health reasons alone, drug testing should be seen as necessary.