



News Release

FOR RELEASE:
Friday, October 3, 2008
3 p.m. Eastern time

CONTACT:
Wendy Taylor May
NCAA Division II
Committee on Infractions
University of California, San Diego

ST. AUGUSTINE COLLEGE PUBLIC INFRACTIONS REPORT

A. INTRODUCTION.

This case was resolved through the summary disposition process, a cooperative endeavor that may be used in place of a formal hearing when the enforcement staff, the member institution and involved individuals agree to the facts of an infractions case and that those facts constitute major violations. This agreement was first reviewed by the NCAA Division II Committee on Infractions during an August 2008 meeting. The committee approved the factual findings and the self-imposed penalties, but felt that other penalties were warranted. The institution accepted the imposition of the additional sanctions.

This case continues a regrettable trend of Division II institutions failing to establish and maintain adequate athletics compliance systems. This committee has on numerous occasions reiterated that it is the duty of every institution to devote the resources necessary to affect a thorough and comprehensive campus-wide compliance system operated by trained and competent personnel. (See *University of Central Oklahoma*, Case No. M262 [2008]; *Lane College*, Case No. M254 [2008]; *Cheyney University*, Case No. M268 [2007]; *Kentucky Wesleyan College*, Case No. M235 [2006]; *Lincoln University*, Case No. M212 [2005]; *Benedict College*, Case No. M216 [2005]; *Oklahoma Panhandle State University*, Case No. M175 [2002]). As was the case with the institutions cited above, this institution was deficient in its basic duty of assuring that only eligible and properly certified student-athletes were allowed to practice and compete. These deficiencies, a result of the institution failing to control and monitor its department of athletics and properly train athletics personnel, led to a number of major violations. The violations are detailed in Part B of this report.

Beginning in the academic year 2003-04 and continuing through 2007-08, the institution allowed 29 student-athletes to practice or compete while ineligible to do so. Some of the ineligible student-athletes also received impermissible benefits in the form of athletically related financial aid and travel expenses. The student-athletes were ineligible for a

variety of reasons, including participation in their 11th semester of full-time enrollment, participation in a fifth season, deficient grade-point averages, mistakes in the certification of transfers and failure to obtain final Clearinghouse and/or amateurism certification. Of the 29 ineligible student-athletes, 15 participated in the sport of football.

The eligibility problems and subsequent lack of institutional control resulted from a deficient certification system, particularly for football. The system was put in place when football, which had been discontinued in 1967, was reinstated and resumed competing in 2002. Due to errors in completing various forms used to track eligibility, and because the individuals charged with tracking eligibility were not adequately educated regarding NCAA eligibility rules, mistakes were made and the ineligible student-athletes were allowed to compete.

A member of the Central Intercollegiate Athletics Association, the institution has an enrollment of approximately 1,350 students. The institution sponsors eight men's and eight women's intercollegiate sports. This was the institution's first major infractions case.

B. FINDINGS OF VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION.

1. INELIGIBLE PARTICIPATION. [NCAA Bylaw 14.2]

During the 2006 fall semester, six football student-athletes were permitted to participate in a fifth season of competition.

Explanation of Violation:

The enforcement staff and institution agreed on this finding and that these facts constitute violations of NCAA legislation. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

In the fall of 2006 the enforcement staff received confidential information regarding possible NCAA rules violation in the institution's football program. A subsequent investigation revealed these violations. All six of the student-athletes ("student-athletes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, respectively) initially enrolled at the institution and participated in football in the fall of 2002. All of them competed in at least some contests in the 2003, 2004 and 2005 seasons, thereby completing their eligibility. However, all six competed in two or more games in 2006 season.

An inadequate eligibility certification system, consisting of three stages, was in place at the time of the violations. The first step consisted of a conference eligibility form that was generated each fall prior to competition. Information on the form came from the offices of admissions and the registrar as well as the coaches and student-athletes.

Those responsible for certification in 2002 and 2003 were the director of athletics ("director of athletics"), the associate director of athletics ("associate director of athletics"), the faculty athletics representative ("faculty athletics representative") and a former registrar ("former registrar"). By 2004, the former registrar had been named athletics compliance officer. [Note: prior to that time, the associate director of athletics performed compliance duties]. The former registrar's replacement, ("registrar"), began certifying student-athletes at that time. Also starting in the fall of 2004, an additional signature was required on the form, that of the head football coach ("head football coach").

Once the form was completed and returned to the conference office, the student-athletes were allowed to participate unless informed otherwise by the conference. However, the conference office relied on the information included on the form being accurate.

The second step in the certification process occurred every winter, after football season ended. The head football coach generated a participation form denoting the total years of participation for the student-athletes (including the recently-concluded season). However, the head football coach relied solely on his memory when completing the form and did not check his recollections against the statistics from the season. Once he completed the form, it was signed by the director of athletics, the faculty athletics representative (FAR) and the former registrar/registrar, none of whom did any independent review or confirmation of the information.

The third and final step in the process took place each spring, when squad lists were generated. For most of the relevant time frame they were completed by the senior woman administrator ("senior woman administrator"). She relied on the information contained in the participation forms.

The violations regarding these six student-athletes resulted when the head football coach recorded erroneous information on participation forms and no one else in the process checked the information to confirm its accuracy. Regarding student-athletes 1, 2 and 6, the head football coach did not include their names on the 2002 participation form even though the young men each competed in one game that season. On the 2005 participation forms, even though the former head coach correctly listed student-athletes 3, 4 and 5 as having competed in the recently-completed season, for the second year in a row he wrote that they had just completed their third season of eligibility. Again, no one else involved

in the process verified the information, resulting in the four young men playing a fifth season in the fall of 2006.

2. IMPERMISSIBLE PARTICIPATION AND FINANCIAL AID. [NCAA Bylaws 14.2.2, 14.2.3.5 and 15.01.5]

During the fall of 2006, three football student-athletes impermissibly practiced, competed and received athletically related financial aid during their 11th semester of full-time attendance.

Explanation of Violation:

The enforcement staff and institution agreed on this finding and that these facts constitute violations of NCAA legislation. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

This information also came to light following the receipt of confidential information by the enforcement staff in the fall of 2006. During the ensuing investigation, it was discovered that three football student-athletes ("student-athletes 7, 8 and 9," respectively) were allowed to practice, compete and receive athletically related financial aid in the fall of 2006, their 11th semester of full-time enrollment. All were transfer student-athletes. The violations were the result of errors made by the former registrar and the registrar.

When completing eligibility forms from the fall of 2002 through August 2004, the former registrar only recorded full-time terms each student-athlete had completed at St. Augustine's and did not include any full-time terms attended at previous institutions. Once the former registrar was told by the conference office in August 2004 that she needed to include all terms of full-time enrollment on the forms, she complied. However, with respect to student-athletes 7, 8 and 9, she failed to correct or update their forms. As a result, the three young men, who had completed two or more full-time terms at other institutions prior to transferring to St. Augustine's, were treated as eligible student-athletes in the fall of 2006.

The head football coach also did not catch the errors. When he completed the forms every year, he referred to the previous year's forms to record the number of full-time semesters each student-athlete had completed.

3. INELIGIBLE PARTICIPATION. [NCAA Bylaws 14.01.1 and 14.4.3.2]

During the 2003 and 2004 fall semesters, two football student-athletes were permitted to compete even though they failed to meet the minimum grade-point average (GPA) requirement in order to be eligible for competition.

Explanation of Violation:

The enforcement staff and institution agreed on this finding and that these facts constitute violations of NCAA legislation. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

As with Findings B-1 and B-2, Finding B-3 was discovered after confidential information was supplied to the enforcement staff in the fall of 2006. Information obtained during the ensuing investigation confirmed that two football student-athletes ("student-athletes 10 and 11") were allowed to compete at times when their GPAs were deficient. Specifically, student-athlete 10 competed in the fall of 2003 despite a 1.50 GPA and student-athlete 11 was allowed to compete in the fall of 2004 with a 1.68.

Interviews during the investigation showed that a lack of rules education and confusion regarding certain compliance-related duties were responsible for these errors. The former registrar, who admitted having no knowledge of minimum GPA requirements during her time as registrar, stated that it was the responsibility of the director of athletics and associate director of athletics to monitor GPAs.

Regarding student-athlete 10, the associate director of athletics, who had the responsibility of tracking GPAs in 2003, simply failed to ensure that the young man was withheld from competition. The violation regarding student-athlete 11 occurred for two reasons. In the fall of 2004, the former registrar was transitioning into her position as compliance officer and was not aware of the GPA requirements. Secondly, the associate director of athletics mistakenly signed off on the certification form that the young man was eligible.

4. INELIGIBLE PARTICIPATION. [NCAA Bylaws 14.5.5.1 and 14.11.1]

During the fall of 2006, a transfer football student-athlete participated in three dates of competition while ineligible.

Explanation of violation:

The enforcement staff and institution agreed on this finding and that these facts constitute violations of NCAA legislation. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

A football student-athlete ("student-athlete 12") transferred to the institution for the fall 2006 semester. The institution initially certified him as eligible to compete and allowed him to participate in a contest on September 2. However, upon his review of student-athlete 12's records, the conference compliance officer ("conference compliance officer") informed the institution in writing on September 7 that the young man was ineligible for competition. His conclusion was based on a conference rule as well as NCAA bylaws. Nonetheless, based on an erroneous interpretation of transfer rules by the registrar (in her new capacity as compliance director), the institution allowed student-athlete 12 to compete on September 9.

On September 14, the president contacted the conference commissioner to discuss student-athlete 12. The conference commissioner erroneously informed the president that student-athlete 12 was eligible; therefore, the institution allowed him to compete on September 16.

On September 20, the conference compliance officer again notified the registrar that student-athlete 12 was ineligible. The next day, the president contacted the conference compliance officer, referenced her conversations with the conference commissioner, and stated that the institution considered student-athlete 12 to be eligible. However, after another memorandum was sent to the registrar from the conference compliance officer on October 3 reiterating that the young man was ineligible, the institution withheld him from further competition.

[Note: The institution's failure to report the violation to the NCAA is partial basis for the finding of a lack of institutional control (Finding B-7-b).]

**5. INELIGIBLE PARTICIPATION BY TRANSFER STUDENT-ATHLETES.
[NCAA Bylaws 14.5.4.2 and 14.5.5.1]**

During the 2006-07 academic year, four transfer student-athletes were permitted to compete while ineligible, and during the 2007-08 academic year, one transfer student-athlete was allowed to compete while ineligible.

Explanation of Violation:

The enforcement staff and institution agreed on this finding and that these facts constitute violations of NCAA legislation. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

These violations occurred as a result of the institution erroneously applying NCAA transfer rules and involved student-athletes from four sports. The violations were as follows:

- A men's basketball student-athlete ("student-athlete 13") competed in one exhibition game during the fall of 2006 although he did not satisfy two-year transfer requirements.
- A women's outdoor track and field student-athlete ("student-athlete 14") competed in two dates of competition during the 2006-07 academic year despite failing to meet four-year transfer requirements.
- A men's indoor track and field student-athlete ("student-athlete 15") competed in five dates of indoor track and field competition, including the 2007 indoor track championship, and received travel expenses during the 2006-07 indoor season despite failing to meet four-year transfer requirements.
- A men's outdoor and indoor track and field student-athlete ("student-athlete 16") participated in 34 countable athletically related activities after the 45-day grace period, competed in two dates of indoor track and field competition (including the indoor championships), competed in five dates of outdoor track and field competition (including the outdoor championships), and received travel expenses during the 2006-07 academic year despite failing to meet two-four transfer requirements.
- During the 2007-08 academic year, a women's basketball student-athlete ("student-athlete 17") competed in three contests while ineligible during January 2008. The institution mistakenly considering her a 4-2-4 transfer instead of a 4-4-4 transfer.

6. COMPETITION PRIOR TO RECEIVING FINAL CLEARINGHOUSE AND/OR AMATEURISM CERTIFICATION. [NCAA Bylaws 12.1.1.1.3 and 14.3.1]

During the 2006-07 academic year, four student-athletes were allowed to travel, practice and compete prior to receiving final certification from the NCAA Initial-

Eligibility Clearinghouse. Further, during the 2007-08 academic year, eight student-athletes were permitted to compete prior to receiving final amateurism certification from the clearinghouse. One of the student-athletes was allowed to compete prior to receiving both academic certification and amateurism certification.

Explanation of Violation:

The enforcement staff and institution agreed on this finding and that these facts constitute violations of NCAA legislation. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

These violations were discovered by the current assistant athletics director for compliance ("current compliance director") when he conducted a review of eligibility records upon commencing his employment in October 2007. The violations were a result of the former registrar, in her capacity of compliance director, erroneously interpreting information on clearinghouse forms and/or failing to ensure that the student-athletes had been properly certified as eligible for competition. The violations were as follows:

2006-07 academic year:

- Three men's tennis student-athletes ("student-athletes 18, 19 and 20," respectively) participated in 11 dates of competition, practiced (beyond the allowable grace period) and received travel expenses without final clearinghouse certification. When student-athlete 18 enrolled at the institution, his name was not added to the institution's request list. Student-athlete 19's name was added to the wrong recruiting cycle when he enrolled, and student-athlete 20, a partial qualifier, was allowed to compete when he should have spent the academic year in residence;
- A men's cross country and track student-athlete ("student-athlete 21") had met the thresholds in test scores and GPA when he enrolled but was lacking one social science core course. An Initial Eligibility Waiver had been filed on his behalf by an NCAA Division I institution, but to be eligible at a Division II institution another waiver request was needed. The institution did not file the request and allowed student-athlete 21 to compete throughout the cross country and indoor and outdoor track seasons;

2007-08 academic year:

- A women's volleyball student-athlete ("student-athlete 22") was allowed to compete even though she had not received final certification for initial eligibility or amateurism. She had received preliminary approval;
- A women's cross country student-athlete ("student-athlete 23") and a women's volleyball student-athlete ("student-athlete 24") were certified for initial eligibility upon enrollment but did not complete and submit amateurism questionnaires to the clearinghouse. Both were permitted to compete;
- Three football student-athletes ("student-athletes 25, 26 and 27," respectively), competed prior to completing their eligibility questionnaires;
- A men's cross country and track student-athlete ("student-athlete 28"), a transfer to the institution, practiced and completed prior to receiving final certification from the amateurism clearinghouse;
- A women's volleyball and softball student-athlete ("student-athlete 29") received final amateurism certification prior to competing in volleyball. However, she competed in one softball contest before being informed that she must be certified in that sport also.

All eight student-athletes were ultimately deemed eligible.

7. LACK OF INSTITUTIONAL CONTROL. [NCAA Constitution 2.1.1, 2.8.1 and 6.01.1]

The scope and nature of the violations detailed in Findings B-1 through B-6 demonstrate that the institution lacked control over the athletics program from the 2002-03 through 2006-07 academic years, which contributed to the ineligible participation of 21 student-athletes over the five-year period.

Explanation of violation:

The enforcement staff and institution agreed on this finding and that these facts constitute violations of NCAA legislation. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

As demonstrated by the facts supporting Findings B-1 and B-3 above, the institution failed to implement adequate systems, operated by knowledgeable personnel, to monitor

the eligibility certification of football student-athletes. As a result, 15 football student-athletes over five years were allowed to practice, compete, travel and receive athletically related financial aid while ineligible to do so. The institution erroneously applied NCAA rules relating to seasons of competition, the 10-semester period of eligibility, minimum grade-point average requirements and transfer legislation.

From the fall of 2002 through the fall of 2006, staff members from compliance, football and the registrar's office reviewed and completed an annual eligibility certification cycle through the use of Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association (CIAA) eligibility forms, transfer lists, certified participation forms and NCAA squad lists. Although these documents were reviewed by athletics administrators, they were not cross-checked with annual football statistics, previous years' certified participation forms and transcripts from all institutions attended to ensure that football student-athletes did not compete while ineligible.

Further, as set forth in detail in Finding B-4, the institution failed to ensure that an ineligible transfer student-athlete was withheld from competition. Once the violation was discovered, the institution failed to report it to the NCAA.

As set forth in Finding B-5, the institution also failed to implement adequate systems to monitor whether the transfer-eligibility certification of men's basketball, women's track and field, men's track and field, and women's basketball student-athletes was in compliance with NCAA rules relating to two- and four-year college transfer legislation. The institutional systems in place for monitoring compliance relating to eligibility certification included the following:

During the 2006-07 academic year, staff members from compliance, men's basketball, women's track and field, and the registrar's office reviewed and completed an annual eligibility certification cycle through the use of CIAA eligibility forms, transfer documents, certified participation forms and NCAA squad lists. Although these documents were reviewed by athletics administrators, they were not cross-checked with transcripts to ensure that student-athletes did not participate while ineligible.

As set forth in the portion of Finding B-6 related to the 2006-07 academic year, the institution failed to implement adequate systems to monitor the initial-eligibility certification of student-athletes.

Finally, the institutional systems in place to provide adequate rules education were deficient. As noted in Finding B-1 through B-6, from the 2002-03 through 2006-07 academic years, the institution's compliance staff and athletics administration failed to establish proper systems for NCAA compliance specific to (1) rules education for eligibility certification and (2) rules education regarding the responsibility to report

violations to the NCAA. Partly as a result of this failure, many of the violations detailed in this report occurred.

C. PENALTIES.

As this case came to the committee as a summary disposition, the self-imposed penalties have been adopted as set forth below. The institution also agreed to further penalties. The institution's corrective actions are set forth in Appendix Two.

1. Public reprimand and censure.
2. A three year period of probation beginning on October 3, 2008, and expiring on October 2, 2011.
3. The institution will confirm the implementation and use of the NCAA Compliance Assistant Software within six months.
4. The institution shall vacate all wins in which ineligible student-athletes participated, both in the regular season and all postseason competition including conference and NCAA Championships. The institution shall also vacate all records and statistics compiled by the individual student-athletes at times they were ineligible. Additionally, the institution shall reconfigure the records of the head coaches in the affected sports to reflect the vacated performances, and the vacated records/results shall be included in all publications in which athletics performances are referenced, including but not limited to media guides, recruiting materials, Web sites, institutional and NCAA archives. The institution shall notify all opponents in writing of competition results that have been vacated and it shall provide confirmation in its compliance reports that it has fully complied with this order of vacation. Finally, any public reference to any team or individual performance that includes a vacated result shall be removed, including but not limited to athletics department stationary and banners displayed in public areas such as the venues in which the affected teams compete.

If, after points are vacated, the reconfigured records result in the institution losing a championship, any championship trophies won in whole or in part by ineligible student-athletes shall be returned to the association (the institution vacated only the records of student-athlete 14).

5. The institution shall initiate an external review of its campus compliance system by a competent reviewer as soon as one can be scheduled. The background and

qualifications of the reviewer shall be provided to the committee and the institution shall comply with all recommendations made by the reviewer in a timely fashion. If the institution needs assistance or guidance in scheduling the review or finding a qualified reviewer, it should contact NCAA Membership Services.

6. It is imperative that the institution fully understand that its commitment to compete as a member of NCAA Division II comes with a responsibility to commit sufficient resources to its compliance effort and implement a campus-wide system of rules compliance administered by competent staff members. Therefore, in its preliminary compliance report the institution shall identify to the committee specific individuals who have compliance oversight duties in the following departments: admissions, housing, registrar, academic services and financial aid. The specific individuals identified in each department, as well as the faculty athletics representative, compliance director and director of athletics shall all attend an NCAA Regional Rules Compliance Seminar prior to the expiration of the probationary period. The director of athletics and the compliance director shall attend one of the seminars during the first two years of probation.
7. The dollar amount of the athletically related financial aid awards in the sports of football, men's basketball, softball, volleyball, men's tennis, men's track and women's track for the academic years 2009-10 and 2010-11 shall total no more than 90 percent of the amounts awarded in those sports during the 2006-07 and 2007-08 academic years. In determining the amount it is allowed to award, the institution shall first average the amounts given in the sports during the 2006-07 and 2007-08 academic years. The institution shall then award no more than 90 percent of that amount in each sport for the 2009-10 and 2010-11 academic years. Further, the institution in its annual compliance reports shall detail the amount it determined to be the average, how it arrived at that amount, and the reductions for each of the sports. (The institution reduced football grants by two for the 2008-09 academic year and by .25 in the men's basketball and women's indoor track program for the same academic year).
8. Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 31.2.2.5, the institution shall pay a financial penalty of \$2,500 to the association.
9. The institution shall 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 university staff members with responsibility for the certification of student-athletes for admission, retention, financial aid or competition.

10. 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 December 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 August 15 of each year during the probationary period. Particular emphasis should be placed on correctly certifying the eligibility of initial enrolling, continuing and transfer student-athletes. The reports must also include documentation of the institution's compliance with the penalties adopted and imposed by the committee.

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, St. Augustine's College 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, October 3, 2008.

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.

NCAA COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS

Larry Blumberg

Jean Paul Bradshaw II

Bruce Kirsh

Bridget Lyons

Wendy Taylor May, chair

APPENDIX ONE

CASE CHRONOLOGY.

In the fall of 2006, a confidential source reported potential violations in the football program at Saint Augustine's College. The case was assigned to major enforcement, and from March through November 2007, the staff interviewed current and former members of the football program, as well as institutional administrators. Unrelated to the information reported in the fall of 2006, the enforcement staff received information in March 2007 related to the men's and women's track programs. The information was reviewed by the secondary enforcement staff, which conducted follow up interviews with the institution during the spring of 2007, and then forwarded the information to the major enforcement staff for further review.

Notice of inquiry letter was sent September 7, 2007.

The NCAA Division II Committee on Infractions reviewed the summary disposition report on September 24, 2008.

Infractions Report No. 288 was released October 3, 2008.

APPENDIX TWO

CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AS LISTED IN THE INSTITUTION'S JUNE 20, 2008, RESPONSE TO THE NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS.

The actions taken by the institution to correct, eliminate or strengthen the compliance program are as follows:

- Removed the former registrar from the position of compliance officer in October 2007. She now serves as the assistant to the athletics director/director of athletics academic services.
- Hired the new compliance director in October 2007. He has a B.S. in Sports Management from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, and has served as the NCAA/CIAA compliance coordinator at another institution for over five years.
- The current senior woman administrator will be transferred from the athletics program to student affairs. (Anticipated date of reassignment May 2008.)
- The president, director of athletics, FAR, new assistant director of athletics for compliance, the registrar and senior woman administrator were in attendance at the 2008 NCAA Convention in Nashville, Tennessee.
- Participated in a Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association (CIAA) Peer Review in 2007 to identify areas that could be strengthened.
- Reviewed and updated Athletic Policies and Procedures Manual and Student Athlete Handbook to ensure compliance with institutional, conference and NCAA regulations.
- Changed the signing sequence for the eligibility forms to conform to NCAA regulations.
- All coaches, athletics administrators, the provost and vice president for academic affairs and the assistant vice president for institutional planning and effectiveness/interim chief information officer hosted and participated in a CIAA compliance training workshop in October 2007.
- Fully use the athletics database system that was developed by the NCAA for the tracking of student athletes at the institutional level and to use the information contained therein to prepare the required eligibility forms, squad list, participation forms, etc.

- Recruiting records will become more detailed, and the assistant athletics director will review those records periodically for accuracy and compliance.
- The director of athletics will conduct end-of-season reviews with all head coaches and examine the records of all sports.
- The assistant athletics director for compliance will conduct monthly coaches meetings and regular on-campus compliance sessions to reinforce NCAA legislation.
- Football staff attended the American Football Coaches Convention in January 2007 and 2008.