

MANDATORY COACHES COMPLIANCE MEETING

March 11, 2015

- ▶ The NCAA released it's public report of the infractions committed by Syracuse University on March 6th
- ▶ Infractions were mainly in men's basketball and football
- ▶ Infractions occurred over a 10-year period
 - ▶ NCAA statute of limitations applied

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY INFRACTIONS

- ▶ Violations included:
 - ▶ Impermissible Extra Benefits
 - ▶ Unethical Conduct: Academic Fraud
 - ▶ Academic Extra Benefits
 - ▶ Failure to Follow Written Drug Testing Procedures
 - ▶ Impermissible Complimentary Admissions
 - ▶ Failure to Report Outside Income and Supplemental Pay
 - ▶ Impermissible Non-Local Transportation
 - ▶ Failure to Cooperate
 - ▶ Head Coach Responsibility
 - ▶ Lack of Institutional Control

SYRACUSE VIOLATIONS

- ▶ Representative of Athletics Interest Provided over \$8000 to 5 Student-Athletes & Provided Transportation to 4 Student-Athletes
 - ▶ Over 14 months the Representative paid student-athletes for work they did at a local YMCA
 - ▶ The work included mentoring, working at clinics, camps & tournaments and YMCA projects
 - ▶ The work was supposed to be volunteer work per the program the work was being completed through
 - ▶ The Head Men's Basketball Coach and Assistant Coaches knew about the payments but assumed they were permissible and that the Compliance Office knew about them

EXTRA BENEFITS

- ▶ Part-time Tutor and 3 Football Student-Athletes engaged in academic fraud related to hours completed for an internship
 - ▶ The part-time tutor also worked at the YMCA
 - ▶ The student-athletes needed to complete community service work for a course they were enrolled in
 - ▶ The part-time tutor verified their hours and provided an evaluation for the professor, despite not being their direct supervisor at the YMCA and not have direct knowledge of their work
 - ▶ The student-athletes also provided false information in their final report, claiming to have completed projects that they were not involved in
 - ▶ The institution, through its regular academic misconduct process, determined that the student-athletes had committed an academic integrity violation

UNETHICAL CONDUCT-ACADEMIC FRAUD

- ▶ The Director of Basketball Operations and the Basketball Facility Receptionist engaged in academic fraud on behalf of 1 Men's Basketball Student-Athlete
 - ▶ This violation occurred while the Institution was under investigation by the NCAA for other violations, including academic violations
 - ▶ The student-athlete had been declared ineligible at mid-year and a waiver request to the NCAA had been denied
 - ▶ It was determined that the student-athlete could regain his eligibility by completing additional coursework in a previous class to raise his grade


UNETHICAL CONDUCT-ACADEMIC FRAUD

- ▶ The Director of Basketball Operations and the Basketball Facility Receptionist engaged in academic fraud on behalf of 1 Men's Basketball Student-Athlete
 - ▶ The student-athlete met with the professor and the professor was willing to allow the student-athlete to complete an additional paper in order to raise his grade
 - ▶ The Director of Basketball Operations and the Receptionist took a previous one-page statement written by the student-athlete (with assistance) and revised it into a 5-page paper with citations that was provided to the professor
 - ▶ The institution, through its regular academic misconduct process, determined that the student-athlete had received impermissible assistance in completing the assignment and thus committed an academic integrity violation

UNETHICAL CONDUCT-ACADEMIC FRAUD

- ▶ A Mentor and Tutor provided academic extra benefits to 3 Men's Basketball Student-Athletes
 - ▶ Over the course of 2 years, the mentor (who later became the basketball facility receptionist) and tutor impermissibly revised, created and wrote assignments for the student-athletes
 - ▶ The institution reviewed these as possible violations of its academic integrity policy, but a violation was not found
 - ▶ However, because the level of assistance that was provided to the student-athletes went beyond what is normally provided to student-athletes through the Support Services Program, it was deemed a violation of extra benefit bylaws
 - ▶ Director of Student-Athlete Support Services had expressed concern about some practices involving the tutor (including concerns that work was being done for the student-athletes) to his colleagues but did not report it to the provost or compliance office.

ACADEMIC EXTRA BENEFITS

- ▶ The Institution failed to follow the prescribed penalties in its written drug testing policy
 - ▶ The Head Coach did not inform the student-athletes parents when required under the policy
 - ▶ Student-athletes were allowed to return to competition prior to being released by a counselor as required
 - ▶ The AD stated that the institution followed an “unwritten policy” because the written policy was confusing 
 - ▶ Sound clip from COI hearing:
 - ▶ “The suggestion that an ‘unwritten policy’ should supersede a written policy was considered incredible by the panel and contrary to virtually all sense of reason, as the reasons policies are in writing is to ensure that they are clear and followed.”

FAILURE TO FOLLOW DRUG TESTING POLICY

- ▶ Men's Basketball Staff provided impermissible complimentary admissions to an individual associated with a prospective student-athlete
 - ▶ The previously mentioned booster was considered an individual associated with prospects due to his involvement with the YMCA youth sports program and an AAU program
 - ▶ He was not a coach for any team but was involved with the programs
 - ▶ The men's basketball staff knew of his involvement in these programs but never asked for clarification from the Compliance Office affected their ability to provide complimentary admissions

IMPERMISSIBLE COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS

- ▶ Three Athletic Department Staff members received outside income and one received supplemental pay that was not reported as outside income
 - ▶ The previously mentioned booster made payments to athletic staff members (an assistant athletic trainer, GA athletic trainer and an assistant men's basketball coach)
 - ▶ The payments were permissible and were for working with basketball clinics
 - ▶ The violation occurred when none of the individuals reported the payments as outside income per NCAA bylaws

FAILURE TO REPORT OUTSIDE INCOME

- ▶ Institutional Employees provided 2 Student-Athletes with automobile transportation that was beyond local transportation
 - ▶ Two employees (men's basketball assistant coach and football academic support staff) provided the impermissible transportation one 5 separate occasions
 - ▶ The transportation totaled over 170 miles

IMPERMISSIBLE TRANSPORTATION

- ▶ An Academic Coordinator failed to cooperate with the Enforcement Staff's investigation
 - ▶ The enforcement staff determined that the academic coordinator potentially had knowledge of the student-athlete support that was provided to men's basketball
 - ▶ The academic coordinator no longer worked at the institution but was working for another member institution
 - ▶ The academic coordinator repeatedly declined the requests of the enforcement staff for interviews
 - ▶ After 7 months she finally agreed to be interviewed

FAILURE TO COOPERATE

- ▶ The Head Men's Basketball Coach failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance and monitor the activities of his staff
 - ▶ Academics
 - ▶ Head Coach hired the Director of Operations specifically to handle academics (stated that 90% of the DOBO's job was academics)
 - ▶ Head Coach could not identify any steps he took to monitor the activities of the DOBO
 - ▶ Did not ask questions when issues/concerns arose
 - ▶ Assumed that the DOBO knew the rules and was following them
 - ▶ Head Coach stated that his staff, including DOBO, attended rules education and that they talked frequently

HEAD COACH RESPONSIBILITY

- ▶ The Head Men's Basketball Coach failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance and monitor the activities of his staff
 - ▶ Representative of Athletics Interests
 - ▶ Head Coach was aware of the Representative and his relationship with student-athletes and staff but never asked any questions
 - ▶ Did not ensure that the Compliance Office knew of the activities (i.e. payments, transportation) of the Representative
 - ▶ Knew the Representative was receiving complimentary admissions and that he was connected with YMCA youth sports and an AAU program but did not inquire further

HEAD COACH RESPONSIBILITY

- ▶ Public Reprimand and Censure
- ▶ 5 years of probation
- ▶ Vacate wins in which ineligible student-athletes participated
 - ▶ Men's basketball includes years 2004-2007 and 2010-2012
 - ▶ Football includes years 2004-2007
- ▶ Fine of \$500 per contest played by ineligible student-athletes
- ▶ Return of all monies received for appearance in 2011, 2012 and 2013 NCAA Men's Basketball Tournament

PENALTIES

BASED ON OLD PENALTY STRUCTURE

- ▶ Reduction in men's basketball scholarships by 3 (from 13 to 10) for 4 years
- ▶ Reduction in the number of permissible off-campus recruiters from 4 to 2 for 2 years
- ▶ Men's basketball Head Coach suspended from coaching duties for the first 9 conference games in 2015-2016
 - ▶ Includes all coaching activity from 12:01am day of the 1st conference game until 11:59pm the day of the 9th conference game
 - ▶ Coaching activity includes: team travel, practice, video study and team meetings
- ▶ One year post-season ban for men's basketball (institution self-imposed)

PENALTIES

BASED ON OLD PENALTY STRUCTURE

- ▶ 2-4 year Postseason Ban
- ▶ \$5000 + 3-5% of sport budget
- ▶ 25-50% Scholarship Reduction
- ▶ 5-10 year Show-Cause Order
- ▶ 50-100% season Head Coach Suspension
- ▶ 14-26 week ban on unofficial visits
- ▶ 25-50% cut in official visits (based on average during previous 4 years)
- ▶ 6-10 years Probation

NEW PENALTY STRUCTURE

WHAT THE PENALTIES COULD HAVE BEEN

- ▶ Head Coaches must be aware of what is going on in their program and follow-up when questions/concerns arise
 - ▶ Rules Education is not enough, also need to monitor
- ▶ All staff need to report potential violations or concerns to the Compliance Office
- ▶ When in doubt, ask the Compliance Office
- ▶ A lack of academic misconduct does not mean a violation did not occur
- ▶ Failing to cooperate with an investigation is a violation

WHAT CAN WE LEARN?