



News Release

FOR RELEASE:
May 25, 2006
3 p.m. Eastern time

CONTACT:
Thomas E. Yeager, acting chair
NCAA Division I
Committee on Infractions
Colonial Athletic Association

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA **PUBLIC INFRACTIONS REPORT**

I. INTRODUCTION.

On April 21, 2006, officials from the University of Oklahoma, the former head men's basketball coach (the "former head coach") and three former assistant men's basketball coaches ("assistant coaches A, B and C," respectively) appeared before the Division I Committee on Infractions to address allegations of NCAA rules violations in the institution's athletics program. Officials from the former head coach's and assistant coach B's present institutions also attended the hearing.

The majority of the violations involved the men's basketball program and primarily consisted of 577 impermissible telephone contacts with 17 prospective student-athletes from 2000 to 2004. Over 40 percent of the calls (233) were made by the former head coach, with assistant coaches A and B accounting for 165 and 107 calls, respectively. The remaining calls were either made by other members of the men's basketball staff or were made from a men's basketball phone extension and could not be attributed to a particular member of the staff. Of the 17 prospects who received the calls, five enrolled at the institution and another has signed a National Letter of Intent (NLI) to attend the institution.

The impermissible calls violated NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2. As that bylaw existed in the 2004-05 academic year and previously, it permitted men's basketball coaches at an institution to make the following telephone contacts with a prospect or a prospect's parents or legal guardians:

- One telephone call on or after June 21 following the prospect's junior year of high school [Findings II-A and II-B];
- Three telephone calls during the month of July following the prospect's junior year of high school with no more than one call per week [Finding II-C];

- After July of the prospect's junior year, no more than one phone call per week [Finding II-D].

The specific violations committed by the coaching staff were contrary to every clause of this bylaw. Multiple calls were made to prospects and/or their family members prior to June 21 following the prospects' junior year of high school and during weeks when only one call was allowed. Impermissible and excessive calls were also made during July evaluation periods. One prospect ("prospect 2") and his parents received 154 impermissible phone calls, including 16 during a five-day period in September 2000. Once the violations were discovered, the former head coach characterized the high number of impermissible calls the staff made to prospect 2 as "ridiculous." Another prospect ("prospect 4") and members of his family received 113 impermissible calls during the course of the young man's recruitment. A third prospect ("prospect 8") received 67 impermissible phone calls from the men's basketball coaching staff. The former head coach made 63 of the calls. Prospect 8 went directly from high school to the National Basketball Association (NBA).

This case is a result of the former head coach's complete disregard for Bylaw 13 telephone contact limitations during the four-year timeframe (2000-04). The former head coach created and encouraged an atmosphere among his staff of deliberate non-compliance, rationalizing the violations as being the result of "prioritizing" rules. Though he acknowledged that he knowingly violated NCAA recruiting legislation, he did not take the phone contact violations seriously. He considered them to be unimportant in comparison to, for example, the provision of significant material inducements for prospects, even though the end result could have been the same, securing the commitment of a prospective student-athlete by operating outside recruiting rules. The former head coach preferred to think of what he and his staff were doing as "hard work" rather than cheating.

The committee has consistently heard that the key to successful recruiting is being able to develop relationships with prospects and their families. The obvious purpose of these violations was to be the first institution to make recruiting contact with prospects and then to build on the relationship by having multiple impermissible contacts with the prospects in the very important early stages of their recruitment. These calculated violations created a significant recruiting advantage over institutions abiding by the telephone contact limitations.

The committee is troubled by the fact that, during part of the time span in which the violations were taking place, the former head coach was serving as president of the National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC). He presided over a widely publicized NABC Ethics Summit called by the organization in October 2003. At a time

when the NABC identified impermissible phone contact as a serious issue and the organization was calling on its membership to be accountable, the former head coach and his staff were engaged in a pattern of willful recruiting violations. At the hearing, the former head coach stated that the rules regarding phone calls constitute the biggest ethical dilemma facing the college coaching profession. In addition to making the excessive phone calls, this staff attempted to avoid detection by institutional compliance personnel by failing to record all of their calls on the written logs required by institutional recruiting procedures. At one point during the four year period in which the violations were occurring, the former head coach was approached by a coach from another institution and informed that one of the former head coach's assistants was making calls to high school juniors prior to June 21. The former head coach said that he "talked to" his assistant but did not report the violation or take any action to stop the violations in spite of being aware of the rules.

As a result of the former head coach's deliberate actions over four years, including knowingly making over 230 impermissible phone calls and encouraging and allowing his staff to commit similar violations, the committee finds that he failed to meet his responsibility to monitor his program. The telephone contact violations support an additional finding that the institution failed to monitor calls made by the men's basketball coaching staff.

The committee is further troubled by the former head coach's conscious decision to violate NCAA recruiting legislation in the recruitment of prospective student-athletes, some of whom were among the most prominent in the nation, and the fact that this decision permeated the actions of other members of his staff. However, the enforcement staff did not bring an ethical conduct allegation against the former head coach, explaining that telephone contact violations are not specifically enumerated in Bylaw 10.1 as activities that constitute unethical conduct. Despite this position, the enforcement staff acknowledged that Bylaw 10.1 findings can be based on repeated and knowing violations such as those committed in this case. The committee agrees, and seriously considered giving notice of an ethical conduct allegation to the former head coach and requiring him to respond. Ultimately, the committee decided to forego an ethical conduct proceeding, concluding that the culpability of the former head coach could be adequately dealt with through the show cause provisions of Bylaw 19.5.2.2 (1) based on findings of his personal involvement in the multitude of the violations committed, combined with a finding that he failed to monitor his program. His show cause provision is set forth in Section III of this report (Penalty III-L).

The case also involved self-reported violations in women's gymnastics concerning impermissible countable athletically related activities conducted by the coaching staff. A major violation also occurred in the men's gymnastics program.

The university is a member of the Big 12 Conference and has an enrollment of approximately 25,000 students. The university sponsors nine men's and nine women's intercollegiate sports. This was the university's sixth major infractions case. It previously appeared before the committee in 1988 for a case involving the football program; 1980 for a case involving the football and men's track programs; 1973 for a case involving the men's basketball and football programs; and 1960 and 1956, both times for cases involving the football program.

II. FINDINGS OF VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION.

A. IMPERMISSIBLE PHONE CONTACT PRIOR TO JUNE 21 FOLLOWING THE JUNIOR YEAR OF HIGH SCHOOL. [NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 (2004-05 NCAA Manual) and Bylaw 13.1.3.1.4 (1999-00 NCAA Manual)]

In the month of June in the years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004, members of the men's basketball coaching staff, including the former head men's basketball coach and assistant men's basketball coaches A, B and C, engaged in impermissible telephone contacts prior to June 21 following the junior year of high school with multiple prospective student-athletes or their parents or legal guardians or both. Specifically:

1. Between June 2 and 14, 2000, assistant coach B placed six impermissible telephone calls from his cell phone to the home of prospective student-athlete ("prospect 1") prior to June 21, 2000, (his junior year of high school).
2. Between June 5 and 16, 2000, an assistant coach placed eight impermissible telephone calls from his office or cell phone to the mother's place of employment or the father's cell phone of prospect 2 prior to June 21, 2000, (his junior year of high school).
3. Between September 28, 2000, to June 20, 2001, members of the men's basketball staff placed 25 impermissible telephone calls to a prospective student-athlete ("prospect 3") prior to June 21, 2001, (his junior year of high school).
4. Between December 29, 2000, and June 18, 2001, members of the men's basketball staff placed six impermissible telephone calls to a prospect 4 prior to June 21, 2001 (his junior year of high school).

5. On May 17, 2004, an assistant coach placed one impermissible telephone call from his cell phone to the home of a prospective student-athlete ("prospect 5") prior to June 21 of his junior year in high school.
6. Between April 29 and May 18, 2004, members of the men's basketball staff placed two impermissible telephone calls to a prospective student-athlete ("prospect 6") prior to June 21, 2004, (his junior year of high school).
7. On June 18, 2004, assistant coach C placed an impermissible telephone call from his office telephone to the home of a prospective student-athlete ("prospect 7") prior to June 21, 2004, (his junior year of high school).
8. Between June 23, 2003, and June 19, 2004 members of the men's basketball staff placed 47 impermissible telephone calls to prospect 8 prior to June 21, 2004, (his junior year of high school).
9. Between January 11 and February 18, 2004, two impermissible telephone calls were placed from a telephone extension or calling card assigned to the men's basketball staff to the home of a prospective student-athlete ("prospect 9") prior to June 21, 2004, (his junior year of high school).

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff, the institution, the former head coach and assistant coaches A, B and C were in substantial agreement with the facts of the finding and that violations of NCAA legislation occurred. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

This finding involves 98 impermissible phone calls made by four coaches to nine prospects, three of whom enrolled at the institution. At the time of the hearing, another of the prospects had committed to attend the institution. The former head coach acknowledged being aware that he could not phone prospects prior to June 21 following their junior year of high school.

Forty-seven of the 67 impermissible calls to prospect 8 were made prior to June 21 following his junior year of high school, when all calls are prohibited. The former head coach made 43 of the 47 calls, claiming that they were made in his role of "consultant" to the family and that during many of the calls he did not talk of the young man's college plans. However, the former head coach actively recruited prospect 8 until August 2004 when the young man made it known that he would not be attending the institution

because he intended to bypass college for the NBA. Regarding the calls to prospect 4 listed in this and subsequent findings, the former head coach justified them because he had known the family since the young man was ten years old. Prospect 4 is a current men's basketball student-athlete at the institution.

B. MORE THAN ONE PHONE CALL BETWEEN JUNE 21 AND JUNE 30 FOLLOWING JUNIOR YEAR OF HIGH SCHOOL. [NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 (2004-05 NCAA Manual) and Bylaw 13.1.3.1.4 (1999-00 NCAA Manual)]

Between June 21 and June 30 in the years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004, the former head coach and assistant coaches A and C engaged in impermissible telephone contact by placing more than one telephone call to multiple prospective student-athletes or their parents or legal guardians or both between June 21 and June 30 following the prospects' junior year of high school. Specifically:

1. Members of the men's basketball staff placed 14 impermissible telephone calls to prospect 2 after the one permissible call was made on or after June 21.
2. On June 28 and 29, 2004, the former head coach placed two impermissible calls from his office phone to the home of prospect 6 after the one permissible call was made on or after June 21.
3. Members of the men's basketball staff placed 13 impermissible telephone calls to prospect 7 after the one permissible call was made on or after June 21.
4. On June 23, 2004, the former head coach placed two impermissible calls from his office phone to the cell phone of a prospective student-athlete ("prospect 10") after the one permissible call was made on June 21.
5. From June 23 to June 29, 2004, the former head coach placed five impermissible calls from his office and cell phones to the home of the guardian, a foster parent's cell phone or the home of prospect 8 after the one permissible call was made on or after June 21.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff, the institution, the former head coach and assistant coaches A and C were in substantial agreement with the facts of this finding and that violations of NCAA legislation occurred. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

This finding involved 36 impermissible calls made to five prospects, one of whom enrolled at the institution. The former head coach made 15 of the calls. The former head coach acknowledged that he was knowingly violating NCAA recruiting legislation.

C. IMPERMISSIBLE PHONE CONTACT DURING JULY EVALUATION PERIODS. [NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 (2004-05 NCAA Manual) and Bylaw 13.1.3.1.4 (1999-00 NCAA Manual)]

In July of the years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004, members of the men's basketball coaching staff, including the former head coach and assistant coaches A, B and C engaged in impermissible telephone contact during the July evaluation period with multiple prospective student-athletes or their parents or legal guardians or both. Specifically:

1. Members of the men's basketball staff placed 21 impermissible telephone calls to prospect 1 either after the three permissible calls were made during the July evaluation period or after a permissible call was made during the same week during that period.
2. Members of the men's basketball staff placed 22 impermissible telephone calls to prospect 2 either after the three permissible calls were made during the July evaluation period or after a permissible call was made during the same week during that period.
3. Members of the men's basketball staff placed two impermissible telephone calls to a prospective student-athlete ("prospect 11") either after the three permissible calls were made during the July evaluation period or after a permissible call was made during the same week during that period.
4. Members of the men's basketball staff placed 19 impermissible telephone calls to prospect 4 either after the three permissible calls were made during the July evaluation period or after a permissible call was made during the same week during that period.

5. During July 2004, assistant coach C placed three impermissible telephone calls from his office or cell phone to the cell phone of prospect 7 during the July evaluation period after a permissible call was made during the same week.
6. During July 2004, the former head coach placed five impermissible telephone calls from his cell phone to the work phone of the guardian of prospect 8 after a permissible call was made during the same week during the July evaluation period.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff, the institution, the head coach and assistant coaches A, B and C were in substantial agreement with the facts of this finding and that violations of NCAA legislation occurred. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

This finding involved 72 impermissible calls made to six prospects, three of whom attended the institution. The former head coach made 33 of the calls; assistant coach A made 19 of the calls; assistant coach B made 13 calls and assistant coach C made three calls. Four calls were made from a phone in the basketball office. At the hearing, assistant coach B acknowledged that the violations were committed knowingly and that he rationalized the calls as attempts to "out-work" other institutions. He added that the men's basketball staff didn't take telephone contact rules seriously and that he lacked the courage and job security to question the systemic violations occurring in the program. Assistant coach B, in his interview with the enforcement staff, admitted that the staff didn't log all of its calls as required because "we were making too many calls." At the hearing, the former head coach said that he and the staff knew they were only supposed to make one call per week. He was aware it was a violation to make the additional calls.

D. MORE THAN ONE CALL PER WEEK. [NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2, 2004-05 NCAA Manual]

Between August 1, 2000, and September 29, 2004, members of the men's basketball coaching staff, including the former head coach and assistant coaches A, B and C engaged in impermissible telephone contacts by placing more than one call per week to multiple prospective student-athletes and/or their parents or legal guardians. Specifically:

1. Members of the men's basketball staff placed 38 impermissible telephone calls in excess of the one-time-per-week limitation to prospect 1.

2. Members of the men's basketball staff placed 112 impermissible telephone calls in excess of the one-time-per-week limitation to prospect 2.
3. Members of the men's basketball staff placed 10 impermissible telephone calls in excess of the one-time-per-week limitation to prospect 11.
4. Members of the men's basketball staff placed three impermissible telephone calls in excess of the one-time-per-week limitation to prospect 3.
5. On April 24 and 25, 2001, assistant coach A placed 12 impermissible telephone calls in excess of the one-time-per-week limitation from his office or cell phone to a junior college prospective student-athlete.
6. Members of the men's basketball staff placed 101 impermissible telephone calls in excess of the one-time per week limitation to prospect 4.
7. Members of the men's basketball staff placed 12 impermissible telephone calls in excess of the one-time-per-week limitation to a prospective student-athlete ("prospect 12").
8. On October 12 and 13, 2003, the former head coach placed four impermissible telephone calls in excess of the one-time-per-week limitation from his office or cell phone to a prospective student-athlete ("prospect 13").
9. From September 19 to October 16, 2003, the former head coach placed five impermissible telephone calls in excess of the one-time-per-week limitation from his cellular telephone to the cellular telephone of a prospective student-athlete ("prospect 14").
10. From October 25, 2003, to March 19, 2004, the former head coach placed 29 impermissible telephone calls in excess of the one-time-per-week limitation from his cell or office phone to prospect 15.
11. From August 13 to September 11, 2003, assistant coach B placed eight impermissible telephone calls in excess of the one-time-per-week limitation from his office phone to the home of junior college prospective student-athlete ("prospect 16").
12. Members of the men's basketball staff placed two impermissible telephone calls in excess of the one-time-per-week limitation to prospect 5.

13. Members of the men's basketball staff placed 21 telephone calls in excess of the one-time-per-week limitation to prospect 7.
14. From August 13 to September 29, 2004, the former head coach placed 14 impermissible telephone calls from his cell or office phones to prospect 8's home, guardians' cell phones or guardians' work phones.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff, the institution, the former head coach and assistant coaches A, B and C were in substantial agreement with the facts of this finding and that violations of NCAA legislation occurred. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

This finding involves 371 impermissible calls made by the former head coach and assistant coaches A, B and C. The calls went to 14 prospects, five of whom enrolled at the institution. The former head coach, who made 137 of the impermissible calls, admitted that he considered the telephone contact rules to be insignificant and that he didn't consider himself and his staff to be gaining any kind of recruiting advantage by breaking them. The committee strongly disagrees.

E. IMPERMISSIBLE FACE-TO-FACE CONTACTS. [NCAA Bylaws 13.1.1.1 (2000-01 NCAA Manual) and 13.1.8.2-(b) (1999-00 NCAA Manual)]

Members of the men's basketball coaching staff, including the former head coach engaged in impermissible contacts with multiple prospective student-athletes. Specifically:

1. Between April and December 2000, members of the men's basketball coaching staff engaged in impermissible face-to-face contacts with prospective student-athletes during their junior year in high school.
 - a. In April 2000, during a prospective student-athlete's ("prospect 17") junior year, the former head coach engaged in conversation with prospect 17 at his high school after watching him play pick-up basketball.
 - b. In December 2000, during prospect 3's junior year, the former head coach engaged in conversation with prospect 3 at his high school after watching him play pick-up basketball.

2. In July 2000, members of the men's basketball coaching staff engaged in impermissible face-to-face contacts with prospective student-athletes during the day of competition.
 - a. In July 2000, during the Adidas Big Time Tournament held in Las Vegas, Nevada, a member of the men's basketball staff engaged in conversation with a prospective student-athlete ("prospect 18") between games.
 - b. In July 2000, during the Great American Shootout held in Denton, Texas, a member of the men's basketball staff engaged in conversation with prospect 18 and his mother between games. Further, after initiating impermissible face-to-face contact, the men's basketball staff member handed prospect 18 a cell telephone and facilitated impermissible telephone contact between prospect 18 and another member of the men's basketball coaching staff.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff, the institution and the former head coach were in substantial agreement with the facts of this allegation and that violations of NCAA legislation occurred. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

F. IMPERMISSIBLE ATHLETICALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES. [NCAA Bylaws 17.1.5.2-(a) (2004-05 NCAA Manual), 17.1.5.2.2 (2003-04 NCAA Manual) and 17.13.6]

During the 2003-04 and 2004-05 academic years, the women's gymnastics team engaged in impermissible, countable athletically related activities outside of the institution's declared playing season. Specifically:

1. Between August 25 and October 6, 2003, which constituted the preseason for the 2003-04 academic year, the women's gymnastics team participated in mandatory skill instruction when only skill instruction requested by the student-athlete was permissible under NCAA legislation. In addition, as a result of the activities being deemed countable, the women's gymnastics team:
 - a. Exceeded the maximum weekly time limitation of eight hours per week for mandatory activities with not more than two hours per

week spent for individual skill instruction. The mandatory activity limitation was exceeded by approximately 10 hours per week and the individual skill instruction was exceeded by approximately 15 hours per week.

- b. Exceeded the maximum number of four student-athletes allowed to be involved in skill-related instruction with their coaches at any one time in any facility.
2. Between August 23 and October 25, 2004, which constituted the preseason for the 2004-05 academic year, the women's gymnastics team participated in mandatory skill instruction, which:
- a. Exceeded the maximum weekly time limitation of eight hours per week for mandatory activities with not more than two hours per week spent for individual skill instruction.
 - b. Exceeded the maximum number of four student-athletes allowed to be involved in skill-related instruction with their coaches at any one time in any facility.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff and institution were in substantial agreement with the facts of this finding and that violations of NCAA legislation occurred. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

These violations, which were discovered by the institution and self-reported, involved mandatory weight training and individual workouts by members of the women's gymnastics team. The coaches claimed that the "safety exception" of Bylaw 17.13.7 applied; however, attendance at the workouts by the student-athletes was mandatory and the workouts were conducted by the coaches. Additionally, student-athletes who didn't attend the workouts were disciplined by the coaches. The coaches acted in more than a "safety" capacity.

G. FAILURE TO RECORD COUNTABLE HOURS. [NCAA Bylaw 17.1.5.3.4]

During the 2004-05 and 2003-04 academic years, the men's and women's gymnastic coaching staffs failed to record countable hours on a daily basis for each student-athlete who engaged in athletically related activity. Specifically, the

men's and women's gymnastic coaching staffs failed to maintain records of countable athletically related activity during the preseason of each academic year until requested to do so by the institution's compliance staff in late September 2004.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff and the institution were in substantial agreement with the facts of this finding and that violations of NCAA legislation occurred. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

H. FAILURE TO MONITOR. [NCAA Constitution 2.8.1]

The scope and nature of the violations detailed in Finding II-A through II-D demonstrated that over a four-year period and through several staff changes the former head coach failed to monitor his and his staff's activities in the area of telephone contacts with prospective student-athletes in order to ensure compliance with NCAA telephone contact legislation, and thus also failed to maintain an atmosphere of compliance among his staff in that area. Specifically, between June 2000 and September 2004:

1. The former head coach and some members of his staff committed numerous violations relating to telephone contacts with multiple prospective student-athletes, including many impermissible early telephone contacts with junior prospects.
2. The former head coach had reason to know that violations relating to telephone contacts were occurring, but he failed to report the impermissible telephone contacts or take appropriate corrective measures to prevent them from continuing.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff, the institution and the former head coach were in substantial agreement with the facts of this finding and that violations of NCAA legislation occurred. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

As stated in the Section I of this report, the Introduction, the former head coach created an environment in which telephone contact rules were consciously ignored and

repeatedly broken over a four-year period. Even when specifically told by an opposing coach that one of his assistants was violating telephone contact rules, the former head coach did nothing to change the pattern of behavior; to the contrary, he encouraged the behavior in the name of "hard work." He failed to ensure that his staff was recording all calls as required, he took no action to correct the violations and he never reported the violations.

I. FAILURE TO MONITOR. [NCAA Constitution 2.8.1]

The scope and nature of Findings II-A through II-D demonstrated a failure by the institution to monitor telephone contacts with prospective student-athletes by the institution's men's basketball program between June 2000 and September 2004, contributing to over 550 impermissible telephone contacts by four men's basketball coaching staff members with 17 prospective student-athletes going undetected over a four year period. Specifically, the institution failed to do the following:

1. Implement adequate systems to ensure that the men's basketball coaching staff was in compliance with NCAA rules relating to telephone contacts with prospective student-athletes. The institutional system in place for ensuring compliance relating to telephone calls to prospects included the following:
 - a. Regular rules education, including a written recruiting manual containing a sample telephone call log sheet.
 - b. The documentation of the telephone contacts with prospects, which was done on a form different than that supplied to coaches by the institution, was maintained only in the men's basketball office.
 - c. Infrequent spot checks by compliance personnel and institutional auditors to determine whether the coaches were in compliance with NCAA legislation.
 - (1) From June 2000 to spring 2003, institutional auditors and the compliance staff conducted infrequent spot checks of the telephone call logs prepared by the men's basketball staff to determine whether the logs were being maintained and whether the coaches recorded more than one call per week to prospective student-athletes.

- (2) From spring 2003 to September 2004, the compliance staff conducted infrequent spot checks of telephone numbers that appeared on the men's basketball staff's cellular telephone billing records to determine whether more than one call per week was made to a number that appeared on the cellular bill.
2. The institutional systems in place to track and monitor the telephone contacts made by members of the men's basketball coaching staff with prospective student-athletes were deficient in that the institution failed to do the following:
 - a. Provide a standardized system to the men's basketball staff for the tracking or monitoring of telephone calls made to prospects.
 - b. Conduct spot checks comparing actual telephone billing records to the telephone logs sheets completed by the men's basketball coaching staff.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff took the position that the facts of this finding demonstrated a lack of institutional control. The institution asserted that the facts of this finding demonstrated a failure to monitor the telephone contacts with prospective student-athletes. The committee finds that the facts establish a failure to monitor by the institution.

As shown by over 500 impermissible calls made over four years going undetected, the system in place to monitor phone calls made by the men's basketball coaching staff was wholly inadequate. The coaching staff got together on Sunday nights, reviewed the calls they had made and recorded a countable call on forms different than those supplied by the compliance office. The completed forms weren't turned in to the compliance office but were instead stored in a filing cabinet in the basketball office.

However, review of the records by compliance personnel was sporadic at best, occurring approximately once per year. It wasn't possible to say with certainty when the reviews took place, as no records were maintained by the institution. Compounding the problem was that the reviews were conducted by interns rather than by trained and experienced compliance personnel. But perhaps the most glaring deficiency was that the logs produced by the basketball staff (which were incomplete since the coaches failed to record all calls made) were never cross-checked against institutional phone records; the coaches were taken at their word when even a cursory review of men's basketball office,

cell phone and calling card bills would have revealed the myriad of impermissible calls being made by multiple coaches over a period of years.

Though seriously flawed, a system for monitoring the phone calls did exist. The coaches were regularly educated regarding phone contact rules, written policies were in place and forms to record the activities were supplied to the coaching staff. It was the monitoring of the calls that contributed to the problems; the phone logs compiled by the coaches were not checked on a regular basis and the reviews that took place did not involve cross-checking the logs with available institutional records. Finally, the violations involved only one aspect of one sport. For these reasons, the committee finds that the facts establish a failure to monitor the men's basketball program by the institution rather than a lack of institutional control.

SECONDARY VIOLATIONS:

A listing of 13 secondary violations is attached as Appendix 1 to this report.

III. PENALTIES.

For the reasons set forth in Parts I and II of this report, the Committee on Infractions finds that this case involved major violations of NCAA legislation. The violations occurred primarily in the sport of men's basketball and were caused by the former head coach's decision to consciously ignore certain recruiting rules which he "prioritized" as insignificant in the recruiting process. He also allowed his staff to violate the same rules and like him they knowingly did so.

The former head coach, who made 233 impermissible phone contacts with prospects over four years, fostered the environment of noncompliance. His assistants knowingly joined in, with assistant coaches A and B making 165 and 107 impermissible calls, respectively, over the same time frame. Assistant coach C did not join the staff until 2004 and made only 28 of the impermissible calls. These intentional violations of unambiguous rules conferred a significant recruiting advantage upon the institution.

The institution, which cooperated fully in the investigation, acknowledged its responsibility for the personal actions of its athletic department employees and self-imposed a number of meaningful institutional and individual penalties. Some of the penalties were imposed individually on the former head coach, who has since left the institution. However, the former head coach's present institution indicated in writing that

it will impose some of the same penalties upon the former head coach for the same period of time. A full listing of all the institutional and individual penalties, including those imposed by the committee and those self-imposed by the institution and adopted by the committee, follow: Additional corrective actions developed by the institution are set forth in Appendix Three:

- A. Public reprimand and censure.
- B. The institution shall be placed on two years probation from May 25, 2006, through May 24, 2008.
- C. The number of men's basketball financial aid awards shall be reduced from 13 to 11 for the 2005-06 academic year and from 13 to 12 for the 2006-07 academic year. (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee as its own.)
- D. During July 2005, the institution reduced the number of permissible calls to prospects in July subsequent to the junior year in high school from three to one. (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee as its own.)
- E. The number of permissible calls to prospects on or after June 15 of the prospects' sophomore year in high school through July 31 of the prospects' junior year in high school shall be reduced from one call per month to one call every other month for a period of two years commencing August 1, 2005, and concluding July 31, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Calls Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment). This penalty will result in a minimum reduction of 240 calls over a two-year period of implementing the reduction and was imposed to directly address any recruiting advantage gained by the impermissible telephone calls. (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee as its own.)
- F. The institution shall reduce the number of permissible calls to prospects on or after August 1 of their senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week for a period of two years commencing August 1, 2005, and concluding July 31, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Calls Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment). This penalty will result in a reduction of from at least 780 calls up to possibly more than 1,600 calls over a period of two years. These numbers are based on a calling period from August to April, which is about 40

weeks, and recruiting 20 prospective student-athletes per year. (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee as its own.)

- G. The institution prohibited the former head coach from engaging in any off-campus recruiting activities during July 2005. In addition, the institution reduced the permissible number of recruiters at any one time from three to two during July 2005. (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee as its own.)
- H. The institution reduced the number of official paid visits in men's basketball from 12 to nine for the 2005-06 academic year. (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee as its own.)
- I. The institution shall reduce the number of permissible recruiting days from 130 to 98 for the 2005-06 and 2006-07 academic years. (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee as its own.)
- J. The former head coach was restricted to engaging in off-campus recruiting activities for a maximum of 19 days during a period commencing August 1, 2005, and concluding June 30, 2006. Further, this prohibition applies to all off-campus appearances at which prospects may be in attendance including exceptions provided in Bylaw 13.1.9. (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee as its own.)
- K. The institution retroactively implemented a ban on the former head coach's eligibility for bonus compensation due under the former head coach's contract for the two year period of March 2, 2005, through March 1, 2007. During the same two year period, the former head coach's employment contract shall not be renegotiated, amended or extended and he shall not be eligible for any compensation increase. According to financial figures supplied by the institution, the cost to the former head coach over the two year period will be approximately \$180,000. (Self-imposed by the university.)
- L. The former head coach's present institution adopted and transferred penalties E, F, J and K above. It noted that the former head coach had already used 15 of the 19 permissible off-campus recruiting days at Oklahoma and would therefore only be able to be off-campus four days from the date of his hiring through June 30, 2006. The present institution has also required weekly meetings between compliance personnel and the director of basketball operations to monitor men's basketball recruiting activities. While the committee recognizes the significance of the transferred penalties it determined that, because of the number and nature of the violations committed by the former head coach as well as the atmosphere of noncompliance he fostered and encouraged among his assistant coaches, further recruiting restrictions are warranted. Therefore, his current employing institution

shall, pursuant to the provisions of NCAA Bylaw 19.5.2.2 (l), show cause why it should not be penalized if it does not prohibit the former head coach, for a period of one year from the date of the release of this report (May 25, 2006 through May 24, 2007), from 1) making any phone calls that relate in any way to recruiting or being present when members of his staff make such calls; and 2) engaging in any off-campus recruiting activities. The prohibition on off-campus recruiting activities shall apply to all off-campus appearances at which prospects may be in attendance including banquets, booster functions and exceptions provided by Bylaw 13.1.9. The present institution shall submit a report to the committee by August 1, 2006, in which it details the institution's monitoring of, and rules education sessions for, the former head coach and his staff. The report should also include documentation of the institution's compliance with all other penalties adopted and transferred to the present institution.

- M. Assistant coach A, who made 165 impermissible calls while at the institution, is presently under a three-year show cause order stemming from his involvement in similar violations while he served as the head men's basketball coach at California State University-Fresno (see Case No. M238). The violations committed by assistant coach A in this case also warrant a show cause order. The show cause order in this case shall be identical to that in Case No. M238 and will run concurrently and independently, expiring on March 16, 2008. Assistant coach A is not presently employed at an NCAA member institution.

Therefore, assistant coach A will be informed in writing by the NCAA that, due to his involvement in the violations of NCAA legislation found in this case, if he seeks employment or affiliation in an athletically related position at an NCAA member institution during a three-year period (March 17, 2005, through March 16, 2008), he and the involved institution shall be requested to appear before the Committee on Infractions to consider whether the member institution should be subject to the show cause provisions of Bylaw 19.5.2.2(l), which could limit his athletically related duties at the new institution for a designated period.

- N. Assistant coach B made 107 impermissible calls during his tenure at the institution. He is presently employed at another NCAA member institution which has informed the committee that it has imposed the following sanctions on assistant coach B: 1) no recruiting activities (other than on-campus contacts) for the month of September 2005; 2) a letter of admonishment; 3) a ban on all phone contact by him and the entire institutional men's basketball staff from June 21-30, 2005; and 4) official paid visits in the sport of men's basketball reduced from 12 to 11 for 2005-06. Additionally, the men's basketball program was required to develop a new communication system and to undergo audits of its phone records.

At the hearing, assistant coach B stated that when he arrived at the institution he went along with the rest of the staff in the violations because he was a new, young coach without job security or the courage to challenge the way things were done. He pointed out that the majority of his impermissible calls were made early in his four-year tenure at the institution and that after he became an established member of the staff he tried to adhere to the rules. Records show that of his 107 impermissible calls, 91 were made during his first two years on staff and only 16 in his final two years. Noting that he will have a record in the office of the Committee on Infractions for committing major violations, the committee declines to impose further sanctions upon assistant coach B.

- O. Assistant coach C made 28 impermissible calls, beginning when he joined the staff in 2004. The bulk of his calls were to the family of a prospect whose father he had known for a number of years and at least some of his violations seem to have been truly inadvertent. Because of his minimal involvement in the violations and his small number of impermissible calls, assistant coach C will not have an individual record of his violations maintained in the office of the Committee on Infractions.
- P. Regarding the women's gymnastics program, the institution reduced practice activities by 192 hours over the 2004-05 and 2005-06 academic years. Specifically, the coaching staff reduced practice activities by one hour per day for the 2004-05 declared playing season equaling 144 hours. In addition, the coaching staff will be required to reduce practice hours during the 2005-06 playing season by one hour per day to satisfy the remaining 48 hours per the penalty schedule. Finally, the institution determined that the coaching staff will only be allowed to provide individual skill instruction every other week during the fall of 2005 out-of-season practice activities. (Self-imposed and adopted by the committee as its own.)
- Q. The institution issued a public letter of reprimand dated December 13, 2004, to the head women's gymnastics coach. The assistant coaches were also issued letters of reprimand. (University imposed and acknowledged by the committee.)
- R. The institution required the head women's gymnastics coach and the assistant coaches to serve a one-week suspension from practice and team-related activities. The head women's gymnastics coach was also required to attend a 2005 NCAA Regional Rules Seminar at his expense. (University imposed and acknowledged by the committee.)
- S. The institution imposed a one-year salary freeze on the head women's gymnastics coach's base salary. Moreover, the head coach did not have the opportunity to

receive any bonuses contained in his contract for the 2004-05 season. (University imposed and acknowledged by the committee.)

- T. The institution reduced practice activities for the men's gymnastics team by 108 hours over the 2005-06 academic year. Practice activities were reduced by one hour per day for the 2005-06 declared playing season, equaling 108 hours. (Self-imposed by the university.)
 - U. The institution only allowed the men's gymnastics coaching staff to provide individual skill instruction every other week during the fall of 2005 out-of-season practice activities. (Self-imposed by the university.)
 - V. During this period of probation, the institution shall:
 - 1. Continue to develop and implement a comprehensive system to effectively monitor the recruiting process for prospective student-athletes in all sports, particularly men's basketball and for tracking countable athletically related activities. In addition, the institution will continue to develop and implement a comprehensive NCAA rules-education program to educate all coaches, athletics department staff members and all university staff members with responsibility in the area of recruiting.
 - 2. Submit a preliminary report to the office of the NCAA Committees on Infractions by July 30 2006, setting forth a schedule for the continued development and implementation of this comprehensive system of monitoring recruiting.
 - 3. File with the office of the Committee on Infractions annual compliance reports indicating the progress made with this program by April 15 of each year during the probationary period. Particular emphasis should be placed on adherence to recruiting legislation, particularly telephone calls, contacts and evaluations and the monitoring of athletically related activities. The reports must also include documentation of the university's compliance with the penalties adopted and imposed by the committee.
 - W. At the conclusion of the probationary period, the institution's chancellor shall recertify in a letter to the committee that all of the university's current athletics policies and practices conform to all requirements of NCAA regulations.
-

As required by NCAA legislation for any institution involved in a major infractions case, the University of Oklahoma shall be subject to the provisions of NCAA Bylaw 19.5.2.3, concerning repeat violators, for a five-year period beginning on the effective date of the penalties in this case, May 25, 2006.

Should the University of Oklahoma or any involved individual appeal either the findings of violations or penalties in this case to the NCAA Infractions Appeals Committee, the Committee on Infractions will submit a response to the members of the appeals committee.

The Committee on Infractions wishes to advise the institution that it should take every precaution to ensure that the terms of the penalties are observed. The committee will monitor the penalties during their effective periods, and any action contrary to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations shall be considered grounds for extending the institution's probationary period, as well as imposing more severe sanctions in this case.

Should any portion of any of the penalties in this case be set aside for any reason other than by appropriate action of the Association, the penalties shall be reconsidered by the Committee on Infractions. Should any actions by NCAA legislative bodies directly or indirectly modify any provision of these penalties or the effect of the penalties, the committee reserves the right to review and reconsider the penalties.

NCAA COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS

Jack H. Friedenthal
Edward (Ted) Leland
Andrea Myers
James Park Jr.
Thomas E. Yeager, acting chair

APPENDIX ONE

SECONDARY VIOLATIONS:

1. In August 2005, the former head coach made an impermissible telephone call to a prospective student-athlete after a permissible call had already been placed for the month. The former head coach received a number of calls on his cell phone from a number he did not recognize. He returned the call, and after realizing the number belonged to the prospect, he immediately ended the call knowing that the staff had already placed the one permissible call for the month. The violation was immediately reported by the basketball staff to the compliance staff. [NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1]
2. In July 2005, the men's basketball staff sent recruiting correspondence to approximately five prospective student-athletes who were participating in a summer certified event (July). The e-mail was sent to a total of 25 men's basketball prospective student-athletes from the recruiting software, and the staff member sending the e-mail inadvertently forgot to delete the prospects participating in the summer certified event. Upon discovery, the violation was immediately reported to compliance by the coaching staff. [NCAA Bylaw 13.1.7.2.2]
3. In July 2005, a men's basketball student-athlete participated in a summer certified league prior to receiving approval from the institution's athletics director. The student-athlete was scheduled to compete in a summer foreign tour with an approved outside team; however, the dates of competition crossed into the institution's start of the academic year. When the student-athlete was told he could not participate in the summer foreign tour and subsequently joined a summer certified league without the knowledge of the coaching staff or the compliance office. [NCAA Bylaw 14.7.3.2]
4. In July 2005, a junior college men's basketball prospective student-athlete was provided an unofficial visit during the month of July. The former head coach contacted the compliance staff on a Sunday morning in July to inquire about the permissibility of an unofficial visit that afternoon with the involved prospective student-athlete. The compliance staff mistakenly allowed the former head coach to proceed with the visit, forgetting the restriction on unofficial visits for the sport of men's basketball in the month of July. [NCAA Bylaw 13.7.1.1]
5. During the men's basketball camps conducted in the summers of 2001 to 2005, an educational session detailing initial-eligibility standards and regulations related to gambling, agents and drug use had never been provided to all camp and/or clinic participants. The coaching staff was unaware of the requirement. [NCAA Bylaw 13.12.1.6]

6. In September 2004, the "godfather" of a men's basketball prospective student-athlete was provided meals during an official visit. The violation occurred because of the unique family relationship between the prospect, the prospect's mother and the mother's significant other (godfather). [NCAA Bylaw 13.6.6.7]
7. Between December 2004 and February 2005, a former student-athlete, who had exhausted his eligibility in the sport of men's basketball, used departmental phones to call long distance without the knowledge or permission of the coaching and/or support staff. The calls were discovered and reported by the coaching staff. [NCAA Bylaws 16.02.3 and 16.11.2.1]
8. In November 2004, a men's basketball student-athlete received an extra benefit (\$105) when he was arrested following a game in Alaska, and an assistant coach paid part of his bail money to allow the student-athlete to be released in time to make the early morning flight back to campus. In addition, the coach thought he would (and subsequently did) receive his portion of the money back after the charges against the student-athlete were dropped. The student-athlete repaid the benefit. [NCAA Bylaws 16.02.03 and 16.11.2.1]
9. In December 2004, the men's gymnastics team participated in countable athletically related activities outside of the playing season during an institutional vacation period. [NCAA Bylaw 17.1.5.2.1.1]
10. In April 2004, the softball team was required to practice immediately following an away-from-home competition. [NCAA Bylaw 17.1.5.3.2.1]
11. During the 2003-04 and 2004-05 academic years, the men's gymnastics team engaged in impermissible countable athletically related activities outside of the institution's declared playing season. [NCAA Bylaws 17.1.5.2-(a) (2004-05 NCAA Manual) and 17.1.5.2.2 (2003-04 NCAA Manual)]
12. During the nonchampionship segment of the 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06 academic years, the softball team engaged in countable athletically related activities that exceeded permissible time limitations of eight hours per week during the preseason and 20 hours per week during the season by an average of 37 hours each year. [NCAA Bylaws 17.1.5.1 and 17.1.5.2]
13. On two separate occasions, once in October 2000 and once in October 2001, the former head coach provided T-shirts to a prospective student-athlete and/or a family member of the prospect. [NCAA Bylaw 13.2.2]

APPENDIX TWO

CASE CHRONOLOGY.

2001

February 19 – The enforcement staff received information from an anonymous source that the men's basketball staff violated NCAA telephone and in-person contact rules.

2002

March 14 – The enforcement staff received additional information from a confidential source indicating that the men's basketball staff violated NCAA telephone and in-person contact rules.

April and May – The enforcement staff conducted interviews of numerous prospective student-athletes.

2003

January 9 – The enforcement staff received additional information from a confidential source indicating that the men's basketball staff violated NCAA telephone and in-person contact rules.

February and October – The enforcement staff conducted interviews of men's basketball prospective student-athletes.

December 18 – The basketball certification staff in enforcement services sent a request for information to the institution, including a request for all telephone records for the men's basketball staff from June 2000 to March 2001.

2004

May 28 – The enforcement staff issued a notice of inquiry to the institution.

December 21 – The secondary enforcement staff received a self-report from the institution indicating that the women's gymnastics team engaged in impermissible out-of-season activities, and exceeded permissible daily and weekly time limitations.

2005

April 4 – After reviewing telephone records and other information obtained through an open records request, the Daily Oklahoman published a story about the NCAA investigation and

identified similar potential violations that occurred after those violations identified through the original NCAA inquiry.

September 27 – Submission of the summary disposition report by the parties.

November 29 – The NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions rejected the findings in the summary disposition report and directed that the case be set for hearing in April 2006.

December 15 – The enforcement staff issued a notice of allegations to the institution, the former head coach and assistant coach's A, B and C.

2006

March 2 – Deadline for filing of responses by the institution, the former head coach and assistant coaches A, B and C.

April 21 – The university appeared before the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions.

May 25 – Infractions Report No. 250 was released.

APPENDIX THREE

CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AS REPORTED BY THE INSTITUTION ON MARCH 2, 2006.

Structural changes.

Oklahoma has taken steps to provide greater human resources and detailed reporting lines to the compliance department. Oklahoma acknowledges that this is a work in process, but believes that the changes that have taken place in the last 12 months demonstrate the institution's commitment to rules compliance. The institution has increased its compliance staff from three full-time members during the 2003-04 academic year to six as it begins the 2005-06 academic year.

Compliance staff

A former NCAA director of membership services staff and assistant athletics director at another NCAA Division I institution was hired to oversee Oklahoma's athletics compliance program in August 2004. At the time of his hire, the compliance staff consisted of another assistant athletics director and monitoring coordinator. Previously, the executive associate athletics director, provided oversight for the compliance program.

In August 2004, the monitoring coordinator was promoted to a director. In March 2005, the director assumed day-to-day oversight of the compliance operations. The assistant director of compliance was initially hired as the compliance director and was promoted to assistant director in March of 2005. The compliance coordinator was hired in April 2005. She previously worked for two years in the compliance department at another NCAA Division I institution. A compliance graduate assistant was retained in May 2005, she began her duties August 15, 2005. An administrative assistant became a full-time administrative assistant for the compliance program in August 2004.

Reporting changes and individual responsibilities.

In February 2005, the director of compliance became the sole compliance staff member to report to the associate athletics director/administration. The assistant director of compliance and the compliance coordinator began to report directly to the director of compliance.

In March 2005, the compliance office added a reporting relationship between the director of compliance and the financial aid and initial-eligibility coordinators. These additional communication lines have enhanced the coordination of duties among the groups with compliance responsibility and served to more fully integrate these important areas into the overall compliance structure.

In July 2005, the compliance office finalized the individual compliance-related assignments. Each compliance staff member began an extensive review and revision process of all the procedures related to the various components of rules compliance.

Rules education.

In January 2004, the compliance staff added to its education program small educational meetings with individual coaching staffs at least two times a semester. These informal meetings are conducted by the director of compliance. The agenda usually includes a review of hot topics, other items of a timely nature, monitoring requirements, and a question and answer session.

Beginning October 2004, the compliance staff expanded the rules education during the monthly "Coaches Roundtable." These meetings are mandatory for all head and assistant coaches and athletic administrators with oversight of a sport. Previously, assistant coaches were not required to attend these meetings. A compliance-rules quiz is used during these meetings to teach the proper application of NCAA rules. After each meeting, an outline of the rules-education section is provided to the coaches.

In August 2005, individual meetings with each head coach to review playing and practice season legislation (which included the declaration of each sport's official practice and playing season dates) was implemented.

Once a week the director of compliance e-mails timely educational items to the athletics department staff, coaching staff and/or relevant individuals outside the athletics department (e.g., certifying officer, faculty athletics representative).

In October 2004, the compliance staff developed a monthly recruiting calendar that is circulated to the coaching staff, administrators of each sport and other key staff members involved in the recruiting process. The calendar may also have educational items from the director of compliance, financial aid coordinator, and the initial-eligibility coordinator.

The compliance staff will develop and distribute a compliance newsletter to all staff members at least once a semester. It will cover new legislation, important e-mail education, and timely issues. A major focus will be to present the information in an easy-to-read format.

Beginning in the fall of the 2005-06 academic year, the compliance staff will broaden the scope of the rules education of its student-athletes by conducting meetings during the fall and spring semesters. Heavier emphasis will be placed on the playing and practice season legislation, and the rules governing voluntary practice activities, summer employment and workouts, booster education, and other relevant legislation.

Recruiting.

In August 2004, the compliance staff revised and updated the existing manual. These revisions included the creation of new forms, updating existing forms, incorporating amendments to the rules section to reflect recent changes to existing rules and inclusion of newly enacted legislation. The recruiting manual and newly proposed recruiting policy was reviewed and approved by three other on-campus groups or offices with athletics oversight responsibility: the Compliance Review Committee, the athletics department executive staff and the president. Revisions are made to the manual as needed on an annual basis prior to the beginning of the ensuing academic year.

During the fall semester of 2004, the compliance staff began impromptu spot checks of each sport's recruiting files to ensure proper and contemporaneous record keeping was maintained for each recruited prospect. The staff also provides guidance to the coaches regarding recruiting legislation and sends a follow-up e-mail where issues or areas of improvement were noted.

In October 2004, the compliance office began to distribute a monthly recruiting calendar for use by the coaches in each sport. It provides a quick reference as to what phase of the recruiting cycle is in effect. Educational items issued by the NCAA, Big 12 Conference, or on-campus source (initial eligibility coordinator) re also included on the calendar.

During the spring semester of 2005, the compliance staff continued the practice of visiting each sport's office to spot check recruiting files and provide guidance to the coaching staff regarding recruiting legislation. Some sports were visited twice during the semester while others other sports with less active spring recruiting activities were visited once.

In May of 2005, and in conjunction with the spot checks, the compliance staff developed a monitoring notebook that will be used as a tool to assist in the spot-checking process. It is an index of all the contemporaneous information that a sport must be tracking and have on hand for compliance purposes. The list of required information set forth in the notebook will facilitate the systematic review of telephone records by the compliance staff later in the year.

Beginning in the fall of 2005, the compliance staff will review each sport's telephone records two times a semester. All calls placed from either a land line or a cell phone will be tracked electronically and merged together in a master spreadsheet. The data from the spreadsheet will be cross-referenced with prospect telephone information (e.g., home or cell telephone numbers) recorded in the monitoring notebook and the telephone logs being maintained by each coach to verify that all calls are permissible, properly logged, and that each coach is properly recording his/her recruiting calls.

Beginning in the fall of 2005, the compliance staff will implement a new system requiring pre-approval for all coaches' recruiting travel. The system is designed to help ensure coaches are only recruiting off-campus during the appropriate periods and that they are not exceeding the applicable number of contacts or evaluations for any one prospect.

Playing and practice seasons.

New policies and procedures were implemented.

Miscellaneous items.

In January 2005, the compliance staff created a written interpretation log that documents all interpretive questions received and answered by a member of the compliance staff. The interpretation log ensures better tracking of in-house questions and answers of rule interpretations.

The compliance staff recently enhanced the compliance annual report that is provided to the Athletics Council and president. The report details all aspects of the compliance operations to ensure full disclosure and opportunity for review by the institution's governing bodies. This report is exemplary of the compliance culture and philosophy of involving individuals outside the compliance office in the review of compliance systems and operations.

In addition, as part of the ongoing efforts to communicate rules information, the compliance manual was updated in 2004 and is currently being reviewed again by the new compliance staff to identify areas for improvement, system overhauls and appropriate policy revisions.