



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

P.O. Box 6222 • Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222 • Telephone 317/917-6222 • www.ncaa.org

FOR RELEASE:
September 16, 1999
1:00 (Central time)

CONTACT:
Jack Friedenthal, chair
NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions
George Washington University

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY PUBLIC INFRACTIONS REPORT

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA---This report is organized as follows:

- I. Introduction.
- II. Findings of violations of NCAA legislation.
- III. Committee on Infractions penalties.

I. INTRODUCTION

This case was heard by the Division I Committee on Infractions on June 6, 1999. It involved the men's wrestling and women's track and field programs at Michigan State University and concerned violations of NCAA bylaws governing extra benefits, recruiting, coaching limitations, eligibility and ethical conduct. Although the institution was not cited for a lack of institutional control, in this case the committee was concerned that many of the violations found in this case occurred following the institution's appearance before the committee on June 1, 1996 (Case No. M112), which is the effective date for the beginning of the five-year period related to the repeat-violator legislation.

The fact that many of the violations found in this case were secondary and in different sports than the previous case which involved football, combined with the university's actions to institute appropriate corrective measures and to self-impose penalties upon its wrestling and women's track and field programs, led the committee to decide not to impose more serious sanctions on the institution.

A. CASE CHRONOLOGY

On January 17, 1997, the institution submitted a self-report to the enforcement staff in which NCAA rules violations in the women's track and field program were identified. On May 20, 1997 the staff met with institutional officials and hand-delivered to the university president a letter of preliminary inquiry that outlined the scope of the staff's review. During the summer of 1997, while the enforcement staff was reviewing the information submitted by the institution, additional information was reported independently to the staff that indicated potential rules violations in the institution's wrestling program. Subsequently, the staff informed the institution of the new information and a joint inquiry was undertaken.

On June 17, 1998, in a letter to the director of athletics, the enforcement staff informed the institution of the potential rules violations believed by the staff to have occurred in the women's track and field and wrestling programs. On July 9 the institution responded that it was in substantial agreement with the facts and that the facts constituted rules violations as cited in the enforcement staff's June 17 letter.

On June 18 the staff informed the head women's track and field coach and the volunteer assistant women's track and field coach of the status of the staff's review of potential rules violations in the women's track and field program and of the staff's belief that the case could be processed as a secondary infractions case. Both coaches were further informed that they could be charged with ethical-conduct rules violations. Each was requested to report in writing his or her position concerning the unethical-conduct charges. The head coach responded on July 5 disagreeing with the facts and the allegation that she had engaged in unethical conduct. The volunteer assistant coach did not respond.

On July 29 the enforcement staff forwarded the case to a designated member of the Division I Committee on Infractions for review and consideration for processing as a secondary infractions case. The designated member elected to review the report with the entire committee during its September 1998 infractions meeting in Atlanta, Georgia. The committee determined that the acknowledged violations could be major in nature. The case was referred back to the enforcement staff for processing as a major infractions case subject to the provisions of Bylaw 32.5.

Accordingly, on October 13, the enforcement staff issued letters of official inquiry to the institution, the head coach and the volunteer assistant coach. The letters stipulated that the institution and all involved parties submit written responses to

the letters by December 4. On December 4, the staff received the institution's response. On December 18, the enforcement staff and institutional representatives conducted a prehearing conference at the NCAA national office in Overland Park, Kansas.

Because written responses had not been submitted by either of the involved coaches, on December 15 the staff again notified each of them of their opportunity to participate in the enforcement process and requested that they clarify their intentions to participate further.

On December 30 the head coach submitted a written response. On January 5, 1999 she was advised that her response had been received and was informed of her opportunity to participate in a prehearing conference as well as an in-person appearance before the Division I Committee on Infractions. On January 8 the volunteer assistant coach submitted a written response. On January 8 the staff acknowledged receipt of his written response and notified him of his opportunity to participate fully in the enforcement process, to which he did not respond.

On January 13, 1999, a former assistant wrestling coach, who is named in several allegations regarding rule violations in connection with the wrestling program, was advised of his opportunity to participate in the enforcement process, including appearing at the hearing before the Division I Committee on Infractions. He did not respond.

On February 1, 1999, the enforcement staff established a custodial site in East Lansing, Michigan, and filed all relevant interview memorandums, audiotapes and transcripts for the involved parties to review. During the period February 1 to March 31, all additional information developed concerning this infractions case, and particularly the information concerning the head women's track coach, was forwarded to the custodian, and her legal counsel were advised of its availability. On February 3, 1999, the enforcement staff advised the volunteer assistant women's track coach of the establishment of the custodial site in East Lansing and of his further opportunities to participate in the enforcement process. He did not respond.

On March 1, 1999, the head women's track and field coach's legal counsel filed a supplemental response on the head coach's behalf. On March 22, the enforcement staff and the coach's legal counsel conducted a prehearing conference. On March 30, 1999, the head coach's legal counsel filed an additional supplemental written response on the head coach's behalf.

No eligibility issues remain in this case. The involved student-athletes identified in the letter of official inquiry have exhausted their eligibility, left the institution or been declared ineligible and subsequently restored by the NCAA student-athlete reinstatement staff during the investigation.

B. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS OF VIOLATIONS

The violations found by the committee may be summarized as follows:

- The head women's track and field coach violated NCAA standards of ethical conduct.
- A volunteer assistant women's track and field coach involved in this case violated the NCAA standards of ethical conduct.
- Ineligible student-athletes were allowed to practice with the women's track and cross-country team.
- A prospective student-athlete was allowed to reside in the on-campus apartment of a student-athlete at minimal cost for a period of six months.
- There was a secondary violation relating to an excess number of coaches and several secondary violations relating to the provision of extra benefits.
- Prospective wrestling student-athletes were impermissibly employed at the institution's summer wrestling camp.
- Prospective wrestling student-athletes were provided with various improper recruiting inducements.
- There were numerous secondary violations in the wrestling program relating to the provision of extra benefits and minor recruiting inducements.

C. SUMMARY OF THE PENALTIES

In imposing the following penalties, the Committee on Infractions considered the corrective actions taken by the university, as detailed in Parts IV-A and V-A of this report, and the penalties proposed and self-imposed by the university.

The committee adopted as its own the following penalties which were proposed or self-imposed by the institution:

- The women's track and field program was placed on probation for two years, beginning January 1, 1997.
- The head women's track and field coach was released from her position.
- The volunteer assistant women's track and field coach was disassociated from the institution's athletics programs.
- An additional volunteer who assisted in coaching the women's track and field team was disassociated from the institution's athletics programs.
- The university reduced by two the total number of athletics financial aid grants available to the sport of women's track and field for the 1997-98 academic year.
- The university declared several women's track and field student-athletes ineligible for their sport.
- The wrestling program has been placed on probation for two years beginning July 1, 1998.
- The head wrestling coach was suspended from his coaching duties for 60 days without pay. During his suspension, he was not allowed to perform any activities related to the wrestling program and was not permitted to engage in any recruiting activity.
- The head wrestling coach's salary was maintained at the 1997-98 level for the 1998-99 year.
- Letters of reprimand were issued to the head wrestling coach and an assistant wrestling coach.
- A former assistant wrestling coach who was involved in several violations of NCAA legislation was disassociated from the university's athletics programs.
- During the program's two-year probation, the wrestling staff will not be permitted to make housing arrangements or arrange local jobs for

prospective student-athletes who have signed National Letters of Intent with the university.

- No prospective student-athletes will be allowed access to the university's wrestling facilities.
- The head wrestling coach was made responsible for directing and managing all aspects of the Michigan State University summer wrestling camp. In addition, the head wrestling coach was required to work the 1998 summer wrestling camp for a flat salary rather than for a share of the profits from camp operations.
- The wrestling program's athletics grants-in-aid were reduced from the NCAA limit by 1.5 scholarships for the 1999-2000 academic year and by 1.5 scholarships for the 2000-2001 academic year.
- The university declared 11 student-athletes ineligible for their sport

The committee found the penalties imposed by the university meaningful and significant. However because of the individuals involved in the violations and the length of time over which these violations occurred, the committee imposed the following additional penalties:

- Public reprimand and censure.
- Extension of the institution's current probationary period for an additional two years.
- The number of expense-paid visits to the institution's campus in the sport of women's track and field shall be limited to 3 during each of the 1999-00 and 2000-01 academic years.
- A show-cause requirement regarding the head women's track coach shall be in effect from September 1, 1999 until June 30, 2000.
- A show-cause requirement regarding the volunteer assistant track coach shall be in effect from September 1, 1999 until June 30, 2000.
- There will be a reduction of one additional financial aid award in wrestling during the 2001-02 academic year beyond that imposed by the institution, for a total reduction of one award for that year.

- There will be a limit of eight official paid visits in wrestling during the 1999-00 and 2000-01 years.
- Requirement that the institution continue to enhance its educational and compliance program with annual reports to the committee during the period of probation.
- Recertification of current athletics policies and practices.

II. FINDINGS OF VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION

A. IMPERMISSIBLE PRACTICE BY PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES [NCAA BYLAWS 14.3.1, 14.3.5.1.1 AND 14.5.4.1.2]

During the 1995-96 academic year, two women's track and field student-athletes were permitted to practice with the women's track and field program when they were not eligible to do so. Specifically:

1. One of the student-athletes was a recruited nonqualifier who transferred to the university from a two-year college for the 1995-96 academic year. She was not eligible to participate with the women's track and field team because her eligibility was not cleared by October 4, 1995, which marked the end of the two-week period of practice permissible per Bylaw 14.5.4.4.6.1. However, the women's track and field coaching staff allowed her to continue to practice on the track after the two-week period at the same time that women's track and field student-athletes were engaged in organized practice.
2. On September 25, 1995, the NCAA Clearinghouse declared another student-athlete a partial qualifier. The director of the student-athlete support services offices at the university notified the women's track and field coaching staff that the student-athlete was not eligible to participate with the women's track and field team after the initial two-week period of practice permissible per Bylaw 14.3.5.1.1. Despite such notification, the women's track and field coaching staff allowed the student-athlete to continue to practice on the university's track for the majority of the fall 1995 semester at the same time that women's track and field student-athletes were engaged in organized practice.

B. IMPROPER RECRUITING [NCAA BYLAW 13.2.2(h)]

During the period July through December 1996, a prospective student-athlete enrolled at an area junior college who was being recruited for the institution's women's track and field team, resided with a student-athlete in the latter's on-campus apartment. During this period the prospective student-athlete made only one rental payment in the amount of \$100. The rent for the on-campus apartment at that time was \$400 per month.

Specifically, a student-athlete with whom the prospective student-athlete had been living demanded that the latter leave and took the prospect's clothing to the office of the head coach of the women's track and field team. The prospect's living arrangements for the period in question were made in the presence of the head coach, the prospective student-athlete, and the student athletes with whom the prospect had been and would be living. The prospective student-athlete never enrolled at Michigan State nor participated as a member of the institution's women's track and field program.

C. EMPLOYMENT OF PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES – SUMMER SPORTS CAMPS [NCAA BYLAW 13.13.1.5.1]

During the summer of 1993 through the summer of 1996, 11 prospective wrestling student-athletes were employed at the head wrestling coach's Michigan State University Wrestling Camp, earning a combined total of approximately \$1885, even though NCAA legislation prohibits employment of prospective student-athletes. All but one of the prospects subsequently enrolled at the institution the following fall. Specifically:

1. In summer 1993 a prospective student-athlete earned \$150 while employed at the wrestling camp.
2. In summer 1994 two prospective student-athletes earned \$125 and \$325, respectively, while employed at the wrestling camp.
3. In summer 1995 four prospective student-athletes earned \$200, \$220, \$100 and \$265, respectively, while employed at the wrestling camp.
4. In summer 1996 four prospective student-athletes each earned approximately \$125 while employed at the wrestling camp.

D. IMPROPER RECRUITING INDUCEMENTS PROVIDED TO PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES [NCAA BYLAWS 13.2.1, 13.6.2.1, 13.6.2.2 AND 13.7.5.5-(a)]

During the period November 1995 through March 1997, during the recruitment of five wrestling prospective student-athletes the young men were provided with various recruiting inducements, including excessive reimbursement for official paid visit transportation, clothing, lodging and automobile transportation. Specifically:

1. In November 1995 an assistant wrestling coach provided a prospective student-athlete with excessive reimbursement in the amount of \$154.50 for transportation during the young man's official paid visit. Specifically, the prospective student-athlete paid the cost of his airline ticket (\$247.50) but the assistant coach reimbursed the prospective student-athlete \$402 for round-trip automobile mileage. Further, the prospective student-athlete did not use a direct route to travel from his hometown to the Michigan State campus in that he first flew from his hometown to Detroit, Michigan, where the assistant coach transported him by automobile to Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti, Michigan, to observe the Michigan state wrestling team competing in a tournament. The assistant coach then transported the prospective student-athlete and a wrestling student-athlete by automobile from Ypsilanti to East Lansing. [Bylaws 13.6.2.1 and 13.6.2.2]
2. In November 1995 while a prospective student-athlete was attending the Michigan Open wrestling tournament held on the Michigan State campus, the assistant coach provided the prospective student-athlete with a Michigan State sweat suit valued at \$75. [Bylaw 13.2.1]
3. During the summer of 1996, while employed as a counselor in the Michigan State wrestling camps, a prospective student-athlete was provided with 24 days of lodging free of cost. Prior to the prospective student-athlete's arrival on the Michigan State campus, he was informed by an assistant coach that he would arrange for the prospect to reside with enrolled student-athletes while he worked in the Michigan State camps. The prospective student-athlete resided, without paying rent, with two student-athletes for approximately one week and with a former student-athlete for approximately two weeks. Also, during August or September 1995 a prospective student-athlete resided with a student-athlete for approximately 14 days without paying rent. Prior to the prospective

student-athlete's enrollment at Michigan State in the fall of 1995, he was provided with local automobile transportation on approximately 15 occasions by three student-athletes.

E. UNETHICAL CONDUCT [NCAA BYLAW 10.1-(d)]

1. The head women's track and field coach failed to deport herself with the generally recognized high standards normally associated with the conduct and administration of intercollegiate athletics and violated the provisions of ethical conduct when she attempted to influence the statements of two student-athletes to institutional representatives charged with the responsibility of conducting the institution's internal investigation.

Specifically, during a June 12, 1996, interview with institutional representatives, one student-athlete reported that she wanted to correct an earlier statement she had made to university officials during an April 24, 1996 interview. In the first interview she had denied knowing a volunteer assistant track and field coach. At the second interview she admitted she knew the volunteer coach and observed him instructing student-athletes at track and field practices. She went on to report that prior to the initial interview she had been instructed by the head coach and another volunteer assistant coach to deny knowledge of the first volunteer assistant track and field coach. She further stated that if asked how an ineligible student-athlete had obtained track shoes, she was to say that the student had not received them from any member of the coaching staff but from another student.

Another student-athlete stated that on the day of the interview the head women's track and field coach instructed her as to what questions she should anticipate and how they should be answered.

Although not the basis for a charge since it occurred after the head track and field coach had been terminated, the committee took note of the fact that she had submitted several student affidavits to the NCAA enforcement staff regarding possible rules violations by another of the institution's coaches, who was not otherwise involved in this case. The affidavits were identical and had been circulated to a number of student-athletes by or on behalf of the head coach. The students had never been interviewed prior to the receipt of the affidavits. A number did not sign or return them. One of the students, when interviewed, admitted she had

signed the affidavit without reading it and that more than half of the statements were false or inaccurate.

2. The volunteer assistant women's track and field coach failed to deport himself with the generally recognized high standards normally associated with the conduct and administration of intercollegiate athletes and violated the provisions of ethical conduct when he attempted to influence the statement of a former student-athlete to institutional representatives charged with the responsibility of conducting the institution's internal investigation.

Specifically, during a June 12, 1996, interview with institutional representatives, a former student-athlete reported that she wanted to correct an earlier statement she had made to university officials during an April 24, 1996, interview. She reported that initially, she had denied knowing a volunteer assistant women's track and field coach. She reported that she knew the volunteer assistant coach and had observed him at track and field practices assisting student-athletes. She reported that another former volunteer assistant coach had told her prior to her initial interview with university officials that she was to deny that she knew the first volunteer assistant coach. She further reported that she was told that if she was questioned about how an ineligible track and field student-athlete had received them from another individual as opposed to having received them from a women's track and field coaching staff member. The student-athlete reported that the volunteer assistant coach also instructed her to report that the ineligible student-athlete had not practiced with the team but instead practiced on her own after the team had concluded practice, which was contrary to what the student-athlete knew to be accurate information.

F. SECONDARY VIOLATIONS RELATING TO THE WOMEN'S TRACK AND FIELD PROGRAM: COACHING STAFF LIMITATIONS AND EXTRA BENEFITS [NCAA BYLAWS 11.7.4.2.3, 16.10.2.4 16.12.2.1 AND 16.12.2.2]

During the 1995-96 academic year, the women's track and field program violated NCAA legislation relating to coaching staff limitations. On several occasions members of the women's track and field coaching staff violated NCAA extra-benefit legislation. Specifically:

1. During the 1995-96 academic year, the women's track and field program exceeded the number of permissible volunteer assistant coaches by one. Specifically, in August 1995, the university officially designated a volunteer assistant coach for the 1995-96 academic year in the women's track program. However, for at least a one-month period during the spring of 1996, the women's track program utilized the coaching services of a friend of the volunteer assistant coach who served as a coach at an area community college. This friend assisted in coaching field events, particularly the heptathlon and the long jump, for the women's track and field program.
2. On March 10 and 11, 1995, the head women's track and field coach arranged for and provided impermissible automobile transportation and lodging for a student-athlete in conjunction with the young woman's participation in the NCAA YES Clinic in Indianapolis, Indiana, held March 11, 1995, contemporaneous with the 1995 NCAA Indoor Track and Field Championships. Specifically, on or about March 10 and 11, 1995, the head coach arranged for the student-athlete to reside in the room provided for another student-athlete by the YES Clinic. The total cost of the YES Clinic hotel room for the two nights was \$180.40. The head coach provided one-way transportation for the student-athlete from Indianapolis to East Lansing, Michigan following the student-athlete's participation in the YES Clinic and viewing of the championship meet. The student-athlete did not qualify to compete in the championship meet and was not approved by the university or the NCAA YES Clinic to receive transportation or lodging expenses.
3. On April 12, 1996, the head coach provided impermissible lodging to two student-athletes when she allowed the student-athletes to reside in her hotel room in Champaign, Illinois, prior to their participation as unattached competitors in an outdoor track meet held at the University of Illinois on April 13.
4. On March 6, 1996, the volunteer assistant women's track and field coach transported an ineligible student-athlete in a university vehicle from East Lansing, Michigan, to the 1996 NCAA Indoor Track and Field Championship held in Indianapolis, Indiana. While at the championship, the volunteer assistant coach provided local automobile transportation to the ineligible student-athlete and she stayed in an Embassy Suites hotel room at the university's expense with a student-athlete who qualified to participate in the championship.

5. On April 16, 1996, the volunteer assistant coach arranged for the ineligible student-athlete to receive a discount on a round-trip airline ticket from Lansing, Michigan, to Des Moines, Iowa. The ineligible student-athlete was not authorized to receive the discount because she was not traveling as a student-athlete on official university business. She flew from Lansing to Des Moines on April 25 in order to participate as an unattached competitor in the Drake Relays held April 26 and 27 and then flew back to Lansing following the relays. At the Drake Relays, the volunteer assistant coach also provided local transportation to the ineligible student-athlete from her hotel to the site of competition and to local restaurants with the women's track and field team.
6. On June 10, 1996, the volunteer assistant coach arranged for the ineligible student-athlete to receive a round-trip airline ticket for transportation from Lansing to Atlanta, Georgia, on June 14 in order for her to compete in the United States Olympic trials. The ineligible student-athlete wrote a personal check to in the amount of \$559 to cover the cost of the round-trip airline ticket to Atlanta to the volunteer assistant coach, as well as the airline ticket from Lansing, Michigan to Des Moines, Iowa referenced earlier. The total cost of the two tickets, including the discount on the round-trip airline ticket to Des Moines, was more than the amount of check. The volunteer assistant coach did not forward the ineligible student-athlete's payment of \$559 to the travel agency from which the tickets were purchased. The bill for each of the tickets remains unpaid on the volunteer assistant coach's account at a local travel agency.

G. SECONDARY VIOLATIONS RELATING TO THE WRESTLING PROGRAM RECRUITING AND EXTRA BENEFITS [NCAA BYLAWS 13.2.1, 13.12.1, 13.7.5.5-(a), 13.7.5.5.1, 16.10.2.4, 16.12.2.1 AND 16.12.2.2]

During the 1994-95 through the 1996-97 academic years, the wrestling coaching staff members and student-athletes violated NCAA legislation relating to recruiting and extra benefits. Specifically:

1. In March 1997, during the official paid visit of a prospective student-athlete an assistant coach took the prospective student-athlete and his host to a local country music concert on the Michigan State campus, for which the assistant coach provided the tickets, utilizing money in excess of the entertainment money provided to the prospective student-athlete's host. During the visit, the assistant coach also permitted the prospective student-athlete to use approximately \$20 of entertainment money to

purchase souvenirs (T-shirts and hats) at a local sporting goods store. [Bylaws 13.2.1 and 13.7.5.5-(a)]

2. In the fall of 1995 and in the spring and fall of 1996, three prospective student-athletes, during each of their official paid visits, were transported by enrolled student-athletes for purposes of entertainment beyond the NCAA thirty mile limit. Destinations were a night club 90 miles away from the campus and a casino 75 miles away.
3. From the summer of 1995 through the spring of 1997, the head wrestling coach, the assistant wrestling coach and a volunteer assistant coach engaged in a limited number of wrestling activities with four prospective student-athletes
4. In March 1997, the assistant coach provided each of four student-athletes with a restaurant meal in conjunction with the university's participation in the 1997 NCAA Division I Wrestling Championship hosted by the University of Northern Iowa, in which the student-athletes did not qualify to compete. In the spring of 1997, during the official paid visit of a prospective student-athlete, the wrestling coaching staff provided a student-athlete as well as the prospective student-athlete's student host each with a free meal at a local restaurant.
5. During the period of the fall of 1994 through the summer of 1997, the assistant coach provided eight student-athletes with alcoholic beverages at no cost to the young men.
6. During the 1996-97 academic year, an assistant wrestling coach provided impermissible coaching services to two redshirted student-athletes during their participation in wrestling competitions in which the young men were not representing Michigan State. [NCAA Bylaw 16.12.2.1]

III. COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS PENALTIES

For the reasons set forth in Parts I and II of this report, the Committee on Infractions found that this case involved several major violations of NCAA legislation. In determining the appropriate penalties to impose, the committee considered the institution's self-imposed corrective actions and penalties

A. CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE UNIVERSITY

Actions listed by the university include:

1. The university has informed the coaches and athletics administrators of its unequivocal commitment to compliance with all NCAA and conference rules and regulations, and in particular emphasized the need to seek rule interpretations when uncertain, report violations, follow travel policies including the use of discounts only for official business, adhere to rules regarding the number of coaches permitted, follow rules regarding issuance of equipment and apparel, prohibit student-athletes from using department phones for improper calls, and prepare, maintain and submit expense reports, recruiting records and weekly hour limitation records.
2. All student-athletes at a fall 1997 orientation meeting were informed of NCAA and conference rules regarding travel. Student-athletes declared ineligible were also informed of rules regarding travel. Student-athlete hosts are now required to review and sign instruction forms before receiving money to host prospects.
3. In addition to the regularly scheduled Athletics Department compliance meetings, the wrestling coaching staff has been required to attend at 1998-99 NCAA Regional Compliance Seminar and special seminars conducted by the university's compliance services regarding summer camps, extra benefits and recruiting.
4. The summer wrestling camp has been subject to a comprehensive audit, in addition to regular scheduled university audits. The head wrestling coach is now required annually to submit to the Director of Athletics for approval the pay scale of all camp employees.
5. An Assistant Director of Athletics has been put in charge of coordinating all the university's summer camp programs and prior to the 1998 summer camps developed a summer camp manual that was reviewed by all coaching staff members.

B. PENALTIES SELF-IMPOSED BY THE UNIVERSITY

The Committee on Infractions adopted as its own the following penalties self-imposed by the institution:

1. The women's track and field program was placed on probation for two years, beginning January 1, 1997.
2. The head women's track and field coach was replaced as head coach of the program. Her employment with the university ended on January 31, 1997.
3. The volunteer assistant women's track and field coach was not retained as a coach for the 1996-97 academic year. The position of volunteer assistant coach remained unfilled during that year. In addition, the volunteer assistant coach was disassociated from the institution's athletics programs.
4. An additional volunteer assistant women's track and field coach was disassociated from the institution's athletics programs.
5. The university reduced by two the total number of athletics financial aid grants available to the sport of women's track and field for the 1997-98 academic year.
6. The university declared several women's track and field student-athletes ineligible for their sport. Subsequently, the university appealed to both the NCAA Eligibility Committee and the Big Ten Conference for the restoration of their eligibility.
7. The wrestling program has been placed on probation for two years beginning July 1, 1998.
8. The head wrestling coach was suspended from his coaching duties for 60 days without pay from August 15 – October 14, 1998. During his suspension, the head coach was not allowed to perform any activities related to the wrestling program and was not permitted to engage in any recruiting activity.
9. The head wrestling coach's salary was maintained at the 1997-98 level for the 1998-99 year.
10. A letter of reprimand was issued to the head wrestling coach.
11. A former volunteer assistant wrestling coach has been disassociated from the university's athletics programs.

12. During the program's two-year probation, the wrestling staff will not be permitted to make housing arrangements or arrange local jobs for prospective student-athletes who have signed National Letters of Intent with the University.
13. No prospective student-athletes will be allowed access to the university's wrestling facilities for purposes of training or wrestling prior to the prospect's matriculation at the university.
14. The head wrestling coach will be responsible for directing and managing all aspects of the Michigan State University summer wrestling camp. In addition, the head coach was required to work the 1998 summer wrestling camp for a flat salary, and was not allowed to participate in profit sharing for the 1998 summer wrestling camp.
15. The wrestling program's athletics grants-in-aid were reduced from the NCAA limit by 1.5 scholarships for the 1999-2000 academic year and by 1.5 scholarships for the 2000-2001 academic year.
16. The university declared student-athletes ineligible for their sport. Subsequently, the University appealed to both the NCAA Eligibility Committee and the Big Ten Conference for the restoration of the student-athletes' eligibility.

C. ADDITIONAL PENALTIES IMPOSED BY THE COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS

The committee chose not to impose all of the presumptive penalties permitted under Bylaw 19.6.2.1 or the repeat-violator penalties permitted under Bylaw 19.6.2.3.2. The committee decided not to impose the presumptive penalties because of the university's actions to institute appropriate corrective measures and to self-impose penalties upon its wrestling and women's track and field programs. The committee decided not to impose all of the repeat-violator penalties because the most recent violations were in sports different than those involved in the institution's previous case, the major violations were limited in number and scope, and many of the violations were secondary in nature.

The Committee on Infractions agreed with and approved of the actions taken by the university, but it imposed the following additional penalties because of the excessive number of secondary violations in the case, some of which involved the former head women's track and field coach and because of the large number of

violations in the wrestling program, including involvement of the head wrestling coach.

1. Public reprimand and censure.
2. Extension of the institution's probation an additional two years from the conclusion of its current four-year period of probation December 1, 1999 resulting from its previous infractions case, to December 2, 2001.
3. The number of expense-paid visits to the institution's campus in the sport of women's track and field shall be limited to 3 during each of the 1999-00 and 2000-01 academic years.
4. Due to her involvement in certain violations of NCAA legislation found in this case, the former head women's track and field coach has been advised in writing by the NCAA that if she seeks employment or affiliation in an athletically related position at an NCAA member institution during a period of time beginning with the date her employment was terminated with the institution and September 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000, she 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 procedures of Bylaw 19.6.2.2-(1), which could limit her athletically related duties at the new institution for a designated period.
5. Due to his involvement in certain violations of NCAA legislation found in this case, the former volunteer assistant women's track and field coach has been advised in writing by the NCAA that if he seeks employment or affiliation in an athletically related position at an NCAA member institution during a period of time beginning with the date his affiliation with the institution ended (May 15, 1996). This period will continue from September 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000. If employed at a member institution, he and the involved institution shall be requested to appear before the Committee on Infractions to consider whether the institution should be subject to the show case procedures of Bylaw 19.6.2.2-(1), which could limit his athletically related duties at the new institution for a designated period.
6. In addition to the institution's self-imposed reduction of 1.5 initial athletically related financial aid awards in wrestling imposed during each of the 1999-00 and 2000-01 academic years, the institution's wrestling

program shall be required to reduce one additional financial aid award in wrestling during the 2001-02 academic year.

7. During the 1999-00 and 2000-01 academic year(s), the university shall be limited to no more than a total of eight official paid visits in wrestling during the two-year period.
 8. During this period of probation, the institution shall:
 - a. Continue to enhance its educational program on NCAA legislation, including seminars and testing, to instruct the coaches, the faculty athletics representative, all athletics department personnel and all university staff members with responsibility for the certification of student-athletes for admission, retention, financial aid or competition;
 - b. Submit a preliminary report to the director for the NCAA infractions committees, Shepard C. Cooper, by October 15, 1999, setting forth a schedule for establishing this compliance and educational program;
 - c. File with the committee's director annual compliance reports indicating the progress made with this program by February 15 of each year during the probationary period. Particular emphasis should be placed on compliance with extra benefit legislation; bylaws governing the administration of summer sports camps and recruiting legislation, most notably, bylaws pertaining to official paid visits. The reports must also include documentation of the university's compliance with the penalties adopted by the institution and those imposed by the committee.
 9. The institution's president 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, Michigan State University shall be subject to the provisions of NCAA Bylaw 19.6.2.3, concerning repeat violators, for a five-year period beginning on the effective date of the hearing in this case, June 6, 1999.

Should Michigan State University or the coaches who participated in the processing of this case 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, with a copy to any party who may appeal. This response may include additional information in accordance with Bylaw 32.10.5.

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 Conventions 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 DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS

Jack H. Friedenthal
Frederick B. Lacey
James Park Jr.
David Swank (chair)
Thomas E. Yeager