



News Release

FOR RELEASE:
Wednesday, June 18, 2008
3 p.m. Eastern time

CONTACT:
Josephine R. Potuto, chair
NCAA Division I
Committee on Infractions
University of Nebraska, Lincoln

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY **PUBLIC INFRACTIONS REPORT**

A. INTRODUCTION.

Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 32.7 (summary disposition) the Committee on Infractions reviewed this case through written submissions during its August and October 2007 hearing weekends. The summary disposition process is used in lieu of a formal, in-person hearing when the NCAA enforcement staff, the member institution and any involved individuals agree to the facts of an infractions case and that those facts constitute major violations. The committee accepted the agreed-upon facts contained in the summary disposition report but decided to impose penalties additional to those proposed by the institution. Neither the institution nor the former head coach agreed to the additional penalties. According to NCAA Bylaw 32.7.1.4.3, the committee could have conducted an expedited in-person hearing on the issue of penalties only, as requested by the institution, had the former head coach also agreed. Instead, he requested a full infractions hearing; that hearing was conducted on April 19, 2008, with both the institution and the former head coach attending.

The case centered on recruiting violations in the women's basketball program, primarily involving impermissible housing and transportation of prospects who moved to the vicinity of the institution in the summer prior to their first full-time enrollment. [Note: the prospects had previously committed to attend the institution.] An additional set of violations involved men's basketball transfer student-athletes. These student-athletes traveled with the team to away competition even though they had not yet satisfied the one-year residency requirement and, therefore, were not allowed to travel with the team. The committee finds that the institution lacked institutional control of its athletics program related to these violations and that the former head coach failed to monitor his program.

As early as 1998 (University of Cincinnati) the committee has warned, repeatedly, of the elevated risk of violations when prospects are on campus prior to their first full-time enrollment. The committee also has emphasized, repeatedly, that institutions have a concomitant heightened obligation to be vigilant in tracking these prospects to assure

compliance with NCAA bylaws. [See Brigham Young University (2008); University of Arkansas (2007); University of West Virginia (2007); University of Kansas (2006); Savannah State University (2006); University of Missouri (2004); University of Wisconsin, Madison (2001); University of Nevada, Las Vegas (2000); University of Arkansas, Little Rock (1999); California State University, Fullerton (1999).] Such heightened vigilance includes: (i) rules education, (ii) procedures in place which are reasonably calculated to track prospects and to assure rules compliance, and (iii) monitoring with follow-through to assure such procedures are followed. Failure to exercise such heightened vigilance demonstrates a lack of institutional control.

In this case, the institution failed to recognize or follow up on "red flags" in the women's basketball program that should have alerted it to the potential for violations. In fall 2003, the institution conducted an internal investigation prompted by rules violations alleged by members of the women's basketball team. During that investigation, the institution learned that women's basketball prospects were living in the vicinity of campus prior to their first full-time enrollment. Thereafter, the institution neither adopted procedures reasonably calculated to assure rules compliance nor monitored the presence of prospects on campus. In July 2004, the institution's then assistant director of athletics for compliance and student services wrote to the director of athletics expressing concern that, among other things, women's basketball prospects were "required" to live in the vicinity of campus during the summer prior to first full-time enrollment. The director of athletics said that he considered this second investigation to be a "continuation" of the 2003 inquiry. Once again the institution neither adopted procedures reasonably calculated to assure rules compliance nor monitored the presence of prospects on campus.

In addition to the lack of institutional control exhibited with regard to women's basketball prospects, the institution also failed to exercise institutional control regarding off-campus recruiting in women's basketball and in team travel in men's basketball. In both instances there were procedures in place; in both instances the institution failed to follow them. Partially as a result, two consequences ensued; 1) the women's basketball coaches committed several secondary violations and 2) the men's basketball coaches permitted three student-athletes to travel with the team when ineligible to do so.

A member of the Ohio Valley Conference, the institution has an enrollment of approximately 9,000 students. The institution sponsors six men's and nine women's intercollegiate sports. This was the institution's third major infractions case. Prior cases occurred in 1998 (men's basketball) and 1979 (men's basketball and men's track).

B. FINDINGS OF VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION.

1. RECRUITING VIOLATIONS – IMPERMISSIBLE TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND MEALS. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.2-(h), 13.2.7, 13.5.1, 13.5.4-(a), 13.11.3.9 and 13.12.1.5]

During the summers of 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005, members of the women's basketball program provided impermissible benefits to women's basketball prospects traveling to or living in the vicinity of the institution prior to their first full-time enrollment.

- a. During the summers of 2004 and 2005, seven prospects and the mother of one of them received impermissible automobile transportation from women's basketball managers, women's basketball student-athletes and/or prospective women's basketball student-athletes. The transportation was arranged for by members of the women's basketball coaching staff.
 - (1) In July 2004 a women's basketball student manager ("team manager A") drove a prospect ("prospect 1") to campus from Kansas City, Missouri (356 miles).
 - (2) In August 2004 team manager A drove a prospect ("prospect 2") to campus from Park Hills, Missouri (76 miles).
 - (3) In August 2004 a women's basketball student manager ("team manager B") drove a prospect ("prospect 3") to campus from the Nashville airport (221 miles).
 - (4) In August 2004 team manager B drove the mother of a prospect ("prospect 4") to campus from the St. Louis airport (121 miles). Prospect 4's mother rode in the car when team manager B drove prospect 4 to campus to enroll (permissible transportation).
 - (5) In August 2005, a women's basketball student-athlete ("student-athlete A") drove a prospect ("prospect 5") to campus from the St. Louis airport (121 miles).
 - (6) In July 2005 one prospect ("prospect 6") drove another prospect ("prospect 7") to campus from the St. Louis airport (121 miles).

- (7) In August 2005 an unidentified women's basketball student-athlete drove a prospect ("prospect 8") to campus from the St. Louis airport (121 miles).
 - (8) In August 2005 one prospect ("prospect 9") drove another prospect ("prospect 10") to campus from the St. Louis airport (121 miles).
- b. During the summers of 2003, 2004 and 2005, six prospects lived cost-free in an off-campus house rented by women's basketball student-athletes ("the house"). The house was first rented by members of the women's basketball team in summer 2003. Through academic year 2005 a revolving group of team members rented it. During the summers, prospects also lived in the house. Most of them paid rent; the ones listed below did not. The women's basketball coaching staff knew that on some occasions prospects lived in the house but made no effort to assure that they paid a commensurate share of the rent.
 - (1) In August 2003, a prospect ("prospect 11") lived in the house cost-free for three to four days and her mother stayed there cost-free for approximately two days.
 - (2) In July and August 2004, prospect 1 lived in the house cost-free for six to eight weeks.
 - (3) In August 2004, prospect 2 lived in the house cost-free for three to four weeks.
 - (4) In August 2004, prospect 3 lived in the house cost-free for approximately one week.
 - (5) In August 2005, prospects 8 and 10 lived in the house cost-free for approximately one week.
- c. During summer 2004 members of the women's basketball coaching staff provided impermissible transportation to four prospects from the house to venues in the locale.

- (1) In July 2004, an assistant women's basketball coach ("former assistant coach A") drove prospect 1 to purchase a bed and then transported the bed to the house.
 - (2) In August 2004, former assistant coach A drove a prospect ("prospect 12") and student-athlete A (who was a prospect at the time) from the institution's basketball facility to the house (four miles).
 - (3) In August 2004, an assistant women's basketball coach ("former assistant coach B") drove prospect 2 to a gas station and then back to the house (four miles round trip).
- d. During the summers of 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005, members of the women's basketball coaching staff permitted two prospects to observe or volunteer at women's basketball summer camps and to receive cost free housing and/or meals during the summers of 2002 and 2003.
- [Note: In fall 2003 NCAA membership services staff erroneously advised the institution that it was permissible for prospects to volunteer at camps. As a result, committee findings include as major violations only those involving volunteers who received cost-free housing and/or meals.]
- (1) During summer 2002 a prospect ("prospect 13") received free housing at an institutional residence hall while she worked as a volunteer at a camp.
 - (2) During summer 2003 prospect 11 and her mother received free housing and meals in an institutional residence hall while prospect 11 worked as a volunteer at a camp.
- e. In July and August 2004, former assistant coach A permitted prospect 1 to use his office computer to complete course work for a correspondence course offered by another institution.
- f. During summers 2004 and 2005, prospects engaged in voluntary summer workouts conducted by the institution's strength and conditioning coach even though they neither had signed a National Letter of Intent nor were receiving financial aid to attend summer school. In summer 2004

prospects 2 and 12 and student-athlete A (who was a prospect at the time) engaged in these workouts; in summer 2005 prospects 5, 7 and 9 also engaged in those workouts.

Committee Rationale

The institution and the enforcement staff agreed with the facts in this finding and that major violations of NCAA legislation occurred. It was the institution's position that, standing alone, each violation was secondary but that in the aggregate the violations were major. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

There is no question that these violations are major. There were numerous violations spanning a four-year period. The violations were neither isolated nor inadvertent, they provided more than a minimal recruiting or competitive advantage, and they included significant recruiting inducements or extra benefits. The prospects, including both high-school graduates and junior college transfers, were encouraged by the women's basketball coaches to live in the vicinity of the institution in the summer prior to their first full-time enrollment. Current student-athletes were encouraged to stay on campus. Yet as noted in Finding B-3, neither the coaching staff nor other institutional staff members took proper steps to monitor the activities of the prospects and student-athletes and to ensure that those activities were in compliance with NCAA legislation.

2. IMPERMISSIBLE TRAVEL EXPENSES. [NCAA Bylaw 16.8.1.2]

During the 2004-05 and 2005-06 academic years, three men's basketball student-athletes traveled with the team and received travel expenses even though they were ineligible to compete because they were serving a year of residence. One student-athlete ("student-athlete B") traveled with the team during the 2004-05 academic year (\$1,744.56 in travel expenses). Two others ("student-athletes C and D") traveled with the team during 2005-06. Travel expenses for student-athlete C were \$2,771.25 while those for student-athlete D were 1,842.55.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff and the institution agree with the facts of this finding and that violations occurred. However, the institution contended that the violations were secondary; the enforcement staff believed they were major.

The committee finds that the violations occurred and that they are major. The violations involved three student-athletes, occurred on multiple occasions over two academic years, and resulted in extra benefits totaling between \$1700 and \$2800 for each of the student-athletes. The competitive advantage gained was significant – because of the impermissible travel, three student-athletes not only had the opportunity to acclimate to road travel and further integrate in the team, but they also received additional coaching and practice time.

**3. LACK OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL; FAILURE TO MONITOR.
[NCAA Constitution 2.1.1, 2.8.1 and 6.01.1]**

The scope and nature of the violations detailed in Findings B-1, B-2, and C-4 (See Part C of this report, Secondary Violations, #4) demonstrate that the institution lacked institutional control over the conduct, rules compliance, and administration of its athletics program. The scope and nature of the violations detailed in Finding B-1 demonstrate that the former head coach failed to monitor the women's basketball program to assure compliance with all applicable NCAA rules.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff and the institution agreed as to the facts of this finding and that violations occurred. While the former head coach did not submit a written response to the notice of allegations, he agreed to the facts of this allegation and that violations occurred. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

Institutional Control. As the institution acknowledged, it failed to exercise the heightened vigilance required when prospects are on campus prior to their first full-time enrollment. Notwithstanding the need for heightened vigilance, the institution had no policies to assure monitoring of these prospects. The failure to exercise heightened vigilance occurred; moreover, in the face of warning signs that monitoring was needed. In fall 2003 athletics' administrators received information alleging rules violations in the women's basketball program committed in summer 2003. This information underscored

the fact that prospects were on campus. Even with this information, the athletics department both failed to implement policies or to establish an effective means to monitor the activities of prospects. Then, in July 2004, the institution's then assistant director of athletics for compliance and student services wrote the director of athletics expressing concern that women's basketball prospects were "required" to live in the vicinity of campus during the summer prior to their initial full-time enrollment. Again, at this time, the institution failed to implement policies or to establish an effective means to monitor the activities of prospects.

With regard to off-campus recruiting and team travel, the institution had policies requiring compliance audits and also policies regarding contact and evaluation forms and expense reports. Yet, during the 2002-03 and 2004-05 academic years, the athletics department failed to audit documents pertaining to off-campus recruiting activities, including contact and evaluation forms and expense reports. Similarly, during the 2004-05 and 2005-06 academic years, the athletics department failed to audit team travel documents. Adherence to these established policies might have avoided some of the violations outlined in Findings B-1 and B-2, as well as secondary violations set forth in Finding C.

Failure to Monitor by the Former Head Coach. The former head coach knew that during the summers of 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005, multiple prospects were in the vicinity of the institution working in summer camps and participating in summer conditioning activities. He failed to monitor their activities or assure that there was a system in place to monitor them. Nor did he exercise his responsibility as head coach to create and maintain an atmosphere for NCAA rules compliance in his program. Coaches, other staff, and student-athletes became involved in violations related to impermissible transportation and other benefits and coaches also engaged in impermissible observations of the prospects' summer workouts. Partly as a result of his failures, the violations outlined in Findings B-1 occurred.

**C. SECONDARY VIOLATIONS SELF-REPORTED BY THE INSTITUTION:
[NCAA Bylaws 11.5.1, 11.7.4 (2004-05 Manual), 11.7.5.1 (2002-03 Manual), 13.1.2.1,
13.2.1, 13.6.6.5-(a), 13.8.1, 13.11.1, 13.12.1.5, 16.5.2-(e)-(1), 16.11.2.1, 17.02.13,
17.1.5.2-(a) and 17.5.6]**

1. During the summers of 2004 and 2005, four prospective student-athletes worked as volunteers at women's basketball summer camps.

2. During the summers of 2003, 2004 and 2005, members of the women's basketball coaching staff, including the former head coach, engaged in limited and brief observations of the on-campus summer activities of women's basketball student-athletes and prospects who had committed to the institution. Additionally, during fall 2004 women's basketball coaches required a women's basketball student-athlete to participate in countable athletically related activities that exceeded the maximum eight hours per week.
3. Between December 21 and December 24, 2005, the former head coach provided three prospects and a current women's basketball student-athlete \$80 to \$120 each in meal money (\$20 to \$30 a day for four days) for the days they spent on campus over Christmas break. Such meal money is permitted only if student-athletes are required – as these were not – to stay on campus for practice or competition.
4. During the 2002-03, 2003-04 and 2004-05 academic years, the following NCAA recruiting violations occurred in the women's basketball program:
 - a. The institution exceeded by one the permissible number of coaches who could recruit off campus on three days in March 2003 and two days in September 2004.
 - b. In October 2004 a women's basketball team manager as well as a friend of an assistant women's basketball coach had impermissible off-campus contact with a prospect while the prospect was driven to campus for her official visit.
 - c. In June 2005 a prospect on an official visit used approximately \$10 of student host money to buy a CD; the women's basketball student-athlete acting as host gave her the money.
5. On March 3 and 4, 2006, a former assistant women's basketball coach, who at the time was a high school coach, kept the scorebook for the team at the Ohio Valley Conference Women's Basketball Tournament. The former assistant coach was provided free admission to the tournament games and sat in the team bench area.

D. PENALTIES.

The Committee on Infractions finds that this case involved major violations of NCAA legislation. In determining the appropriate penalties to impose, the committee considered the institution's self-imposed penalties and corrective actions. It also considered the institution's cooperation in the investigation, its proactive investigation once violations were discovered, and the length of time involved in the processing of this case. On the other hand, the committee also noted that the time involved to process the case is an inevitable consequence of the summary disposition process in instances in which the committee does not accept the summary disposition. In addition, the committee took into account the fact that many of the violations involved conduct about which the committee for ten years has warned schools and athletics administrators. Institutional staff members knew that prospects were on campus prior to their first full-time enrollment, and yet twice failed to heed specific warning signs regarding this potential for violations.

The committee accepted all of the penalties proposed by the institution in its summary disposition report. On the basis of that report, the committee initially decided that there should also be imposed a vacation of all wins in women's basketball for the 2002-03 through 2005-06 seasons. After considering the institution's presentation at the April infractions hearing, however, the committee decided that the vacation penalty should include only the 2004-05 and 2005-06 seasons. The committee decided not to impose the vacation penalty in 2002-03 and 2003-04 because of the relatively limited nature of the violations during those years and because the clearest warning signs regarding the potential for violations (including specific concern from the assistant director of athletics for compliance and student services about the presence of prospects on campus during the summer prior to their first full-time enrollment) came in July 2004. After that time, there was little justification for failure to heed the warnings.

Over the past two years the committee has made substantial efforts to articulate and adhere to coherent, consistent standards for imposing a vacation penalty. Those efforts included the appointment of a subcommittee to examine the issue of vacation penalties, three meetings at which subcommittee recommendations were developed, and adoption of a new policy by the full committee in June 2007. That policy, developed with guidance from decisions of the Infractions Appeals Committee, states that while the committee retains discretion to apply (or not apply) the vacation penalty under any circumstances it believes to be appropriate, the likelihood of such a penalty is significantly increased when *any* of the following aggravating factors are present: academic fraud; serious intentional violations; direct involvement of a coach or high-ranking school administrator; a large number of violations; competition while academically ineligible; ineligible competition in a case that includes a finding of failure to monitor or a lack of institutional control; or when vacation or a similar penalty would

be imposed if the underlying violations were secondary. In this case, three of these aggravating factors are present – direct involvement of a coach, a large number of violations, and ineligible competition in a case involving both a failure to monitor and a lack of institutional control. The penalties in this case are as follows (those self-imposed by the institution are so noted):

[Note: The institution's corrective actions are contained in Appendix Two.]

1. Public reprimand and censure.
2. A two-year probationary period effective June 18, 2008, and ending June 17, 2010.
3. A reduction by three in the number of grants-in-aid to be awarded to student-athletes in women's basketball in the 2006-07 academic year (from 15 to 12). (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee.)
4. A reduction by five in the number of recruiting days in women's basketball (from 85 to 80) between September 2006 and August 2007. (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee.)
5. A prohibition on off-campus recruiting by the former head coach during the July 2006 evaluation period. (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee.)
6. Imposition of a financial penalty of approximately \$12,600 (twice the value of the costs associated with the three men's basketball student-athletes who traveled to away games) upon the men's basketball program in the 2006-07 fiscal year. (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee.)
7. A reduction in the number of recruiting days in men's basketball from 130 to 125 between September 2006 and August 2007. (Self-imposed penalty adopted by the committee.)
8. Pursuant to NCAA Bylaws 19.5.2.2-(e)-(2) and 31.2.2.3-(b), the institution will vacate all wins in which ineligible student-athletes competed during the 2004-05 and 2005-06 women's basketball seasons. Further, the institution's records regarding women's basketball as well as the record of the former head coach will

be reconfigured to reflect the vacated wins and so recorded in all publications in which women's basketball records for the affected seasons and post season are reported, including, but not limited to, media guides, recruiting material, electronic media and institutional and NCAA archives. Finally, any public reference to these vacated contests, including the institution's appearance in the 2006 NCAA Division I Women's Basketball Tournament, shall be removed from athletics department stationery, banners displayed in public areas and any other forum in which they may appear.

9. During this period of probation, the institution shall:
 - a. Continue to develop and implement a comprehensive educational program on NCAA legislation, including seminars and testing, to instruct the coaches, the faculty athletics representative, all athletics department personnel and all institution staff members with responsibility for the certification of student-athletes for admission, retention, financial aid or competition;
 - b. Submit a preliminary report to the office of the Committees on Infractions by August 1, 2008, setting forth a schedule for establishing this compliance and educational program; and
 - c. File with the office of the Committees on Infractions annual compliance reports indicating the progress made with this program by May 1 of each year during the probationary period. Particular emphasis should be placed on monitoring of prospective student-athletes who arrive on campus prior to full-time enrollment and adherence to established policies and procedures. The reports must also include documentation of the institution's compliance with the penalties adopted and imposed by the committee.
 10. The above-listed penalties are independent of and supplemental to any action that has been or may be taken by the Committee on Academic Performance through its assessment of contemporaneous, historical, or other penalties.
 11. At the conclusion of the probationary period, the institution's president shall provide a letter to the committee affirming that the institution'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, Southeast Missouri State University 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, June 18, 2008.

Should Southeast Missouri State University or the 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 advises 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

Paul T. Dee
Eileen K. Jennings
Alfred J. Lechner, Jr.
Edward (Ted) Leland
Gene A. Marsh
Andrea (Andi) Myers
Josephine (Jo) R. Potuto, chair
Dennis E. Thomas

APPENDIX ONE

Case Chronology

2003

Fall – Women's basketball student-athletes reported to athletics administrators possible NCAA rules violations involving coaches' impermissible observations of summer activities. The athletics department self-reported secondary violations involving student-athletes' impermissible use of athletics department laundry facilities and time limits of preseason practice. At this time, the athletics department became aware that several prospects were in the institution's locale the summer prior to their first full-time enrollment.

2004

Summer – Women's basketball student-athletes and their parents reported additional information to athletics administrators regarding possible NCAA rules violations.

September to December – A recently hired assistant women's basketball coach reported to the director of athletics alleged impermissible recruiting activities in the women's basketball program.

2005

December – A confidential source reported information to the enforcement staff describing violations in the women's basketball program. The enforcement staff began an independent investigation.

2006

February – The institution contacted the Ohio Valley Conference and requested assistance regarding accusations made by an assistant coach.

April 10 – The enforcement staff issued a notice of inquiry to the institution.

May 2006 – The institution self-reported a secondary violation involving impermissible benefits provided to a high school coach.

September 15 – The enforcement staff drafted a notice of allegations and provided it to the institution and the former head coach, through a custodial arrangement, for their review. The

enforcement staff, the institution and the former head coach subsequently agreed to process the case using the summary disposition process.

November and December – The former head coach was put on paid administrative leave and subsequently resigned effective December 31.

2007

July 19 – The summary disposition report was provided to the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions.

August 12 – The summary disposition report was initially reviewed by the committee during its regularly scheduled August meeting.

September 10 – The committee sent a letter to the institution's president notifying him that the committee planned to revisit the case during its October meeting.

October 9 – The committee decided that additional penalties were appropriate and notified the institution.

October 12 – The institution requested an expedited hearing. The committee scheduled the expedited hearing for December 8, 2007.

December 3 – The former head coach requested a full hearing before the committee.

December 17 – The enforcement staff issued a notice of allegations to the institution and to the former head coach.

2008

February 26 – The institution submitted a response to the notice of allegations.

April 19 – The institution and the former head coach appeared before the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions.

June 18 – Infractions Report No. 282 was released.

APPENDIX TWO

Corrective Actions as Listed in the July 19, 2007, Summary Disposition Report.

1. Requested that the conference office conduct an annual compliance audit of certain recruiting documents such as contacts and evaluations, official visit records, etc., in women's basketball. Also requested that the conference office review generally the institution's monitoring of recruiting records in all sports and the means by which it monitors those student-athletes who are ineligible to travel.
2. Included in the new contract of the then head women's basketball coach that: (a) if a major violation is found by the NCAA Committee on Infractions that occurred during a period in which he was the head coach, regardless of whether he is named in the finding, he could be released from his contract; and (b) specific evaluation criteria in the compliance area (e.g., timely submission of monthly reports, attendance at educational sessions) will be part of his performance evaluation.
3. Restructured the assistant director of athletics for compliance and academic services position and reassigned the responsibilities for supervision of the academic services area (.25 full-time employee) to another individual within the athletics department resulting in the compliance position being considered at 1.0 full-time employee. Also, reaffirmed that the compliance assistant position would remain to be funded as .5 full-time employee resulting in those individuals assigned total responsibility in the compliance area as 1.5 full time employee.
4. Developed a Coaches Compliance Manual that all coaches will receive annually.
5. Developed a policy and stated in the Coaches Compliance Manual that prospective student-athletes who wish to reside in Cape Girardeau during the summer must receive prior permission from the director of athletics. All requests for lodging must be forwarded by the head coach on behalf of the prospect to the director, who will only approve such situations in legitimate and/or extraordinary circumstances.
6. Developed a policy to monitor the activities of student-athletes who remain in Cape Girardeau during the summer. All student-athletes who remain in Cape Girardeau must complete a practice chart, which was provided to all coaches, that is forwarded monthly to the compliance office.

7. Developed a recruiting log booklet that allows coaches to quickly log any phone call or contact, whether they are in their office or on the road. The booklet is divided into two sections – one section strictly for phone calls and the other for both contacts and evaluations. The coaches' booklets are reviewed by the compliance office every 30 to 45 days. On a periodic basis, the recruiting booklets are cross-referenced with the institution's cell phone and land line billing statements/call logs.
8. Developed a policy that requires all coaches to submit a team travel roster to the compliance office at least 12 hours before departure. The roster is then verified by the assistant athletics director of compliance and filed for documentation purposes. The coaches are allowed to hand deliver or e-mail the roster. After the trip, the assistant athletics director of compliance then reviews all expense reports related to team travel to assure compliance by the coaching staff.