



"This report does not reflect the decisions made by the Division I Infractions Appeals Committee relative to this case. For a full explanation of the appeal committee's decision, see the Infractions Appeals Committee's report linked in on this case's webpage."

**UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, TUSCALOOSA
PUBLIC INFRACTIONS REPORT
JUNE 11, 2009**

A. INTRODUCTION.

On February 20, 2009, officials from the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa appeared before the Division I Committee on Infractions to address allegations of NCAA violations in the athletics program.

This case centered on impermissible benefits obtained by student-athletes through misuse of the institution's textbook distribution program. Although the issues in this case were narrow, there were a large number of student-athletes involved. Of the 201 student-athletes who received impermissible benefits, 22 were identified by the institution as "intentional wrongdoers" in that they were aware they received impermissible benefits.

The violations in this case were self-discovered and self-reported by the institution. The violations were first detected on October 17, 2007, when an employee of the institution's bookstore, who was reviewing textbook charges for student-athletes, reported to student services that she had detected questionable textbook charges by a women's track and field student-athlete. The charges were in excess of \$1,600 for the 2007 fall semester. This triggered an internal examination of scholarship student-athlete textbooks charges.

Once impermissible charges were detected, the institution declared the involved student-athletes ineligible. For the approximately 125 current student-athletes who the institution determined had impermissible charges of less than \$100, the institution arranged for those student-athletes to make restitution in accordance with NCAA Bylaw 16.01.1.1. For other student-athletes where the impermissible charges were greater than \$100, restitution, as well as withholding penalties, were assessed by the NCAA staff as appropriate.

The enforcement staff and the institution were in agreement with regard to the facts of this case and the institution acknowledged that it failed to monitor adequately its student-athlete textbook distribution system. Under such circumstances, cases can usually be

adjudicated through summary disposition, a process whereby the committee reviews a case on the written record in lieu of a full hearing. However, NCAA legislation in this case precluded the use of that process because of the institution's status as a "repeat violator."

Although the committee commends the institution for self-discovering, investigating and reporting the textbook violations, it remains troubled, nonetheless, by the scope of the violations in this instance and by the institution's recent history of infractions cases. In fact, not only is the University of Alabama currently a "repeat violator," because of the 2002 case, it was also in a "repeat violator" status when that case was adjudicated and when a 1999 case was decided. The committee addressed this issue in its February 1, 2002, decision in the previous Alabama case (Infractions Report No. 193):

Of foremost concern to the committee is that this is the second time in two years that the institution has appeared before the committee as a repeat major violator under NCAA Bylaw 19.6.2.3, following a major infractions case in football in 1995 (1999 men's basketball and 2001 football).

NCAA Bylaw 19.5.2.3.1 defines a "repeat violator" as the following:

An institution shall be considered a "repeat violator" if the Committee on Infractions finds that a major violation has occurred within five years of the starting date of a major penalty. For this provision to apply, at least one major violation must have occurred within five years after the starting date of the penalties in the previous case. It is not necessary that the Committee on Infractions' hearing be conducted or its report issued within the five-year period.

In fact, because of the institution's extensive recent history of infractions cases, the committee strongly considered making a more serious finding of a lack of institutional control, rather than a failure to monitor. However, because the institution ultimately detected the violations and promptly reported them, the committee decided against making the more serious finding of lack of institutional control.

A member of the Southeastern Conference, the institution has an enrollment of approximately 25,580 students. The institution sponsors seven men's and 10 women's intercollegiate sports. This was the institution's fifth major infractions case. As previously mentioned, the institution appeared before the committee in 2001, 1999 and 1995. Prior to that string of cases, the institution's remaining case was in 1964, involving the football program.

B. FINDINGS OF VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION.

1. IMPERMISSIBLE BENEFITS. [NCAA Bylaws 15.2.3 and 16.11.2.1 (Note: Bylaw citation is to the 2008-09 NCAA Division I Manual.)]

Beginning in at least the 2005-06 academic year and continuing through the fall of 2007, the institution's textbook distribution system allowed approximately 200 student-athletes to obtain impermissible textbooks and supplies, with a total retail value of approximately \$40,000. Approximately \$21,950 of this total was obtained by student-athletes identified by the institution as "intentional wrong doers."

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff and the institution were in substantial agreement as to the facts of this finding and that violations occurred. The committee finds that the violations occurred. The circumstances of this infraction provide the basis for the failure to monitor finding set forth as Finding B-2.

201 student-athletes were implicated in this violation. These student-athletes represented 16 varsity sports; softball, baseball, women's gymnastics, football, men's basketball, women's basketball, men's golf, women's golf, men's swimming, women's swimming, men's tennis, women's tennis, men's track and field, women's track and field, women's soccer and women's volleyball. This finding involves two categories of infractions.

The first category involved intentional misconduct by 22 student-athletes, as mentioned in the introduction of this report. These intentional wrongdoers – 14 of whom were members of the men's and women's track and field programs – exploited the institution's textbook distribution system for scholarship student-athletes to acquire textbooks and materials of a value greater than \$100 for girlfriends, friends or other student-athletes.

All of the textbooks and materials were either returned at the end of the semester or charged to, and recovered from, the student-athletes' receivables account, as was required by the institution's textbook program. The investigation did not reveal that anyone converted the books or materials to cash by reselling the items, and did not reveal that anyone acquired items that were not academic in character, such as personal electronics devices or clothing. However, the university reported that these intentional wrongdoers knew that they were taking advantage of the institution and its bookstore. The value of the impermissible benefit obtained by these intentional wrongdoers ranged from a low of \$32.30 by a women's track student-athlete to a high of \$3,947.19 by a football student-athlete. The committee noted that the four highest amounts (\$3,947.19, \$3,344.10, \$3,061.38 and \$2,714.62) were obtained by football student-athletes.

The second type of infraction involved student-athletes who unintentionally received the impermissible use of non-required textbooks and materials. These optional or recommended materials were often included with students' pre-packaged required materials. The student-athletes received optional or recommended items through either: 1) confusion or haste by bookstore employees during the "book rush" at the beginning of the semester or; 2) mistaken packaging by bookstore employees, resulting from discrepancies among syllabi for different courses and for sections of the same course.

Among the student-athletes who unintentionally violated NCAA legislation, about 125 received benefits that totaled less than \$100 apiece. [Note: NCAA Bylaw 15.2.3.1.1 states:

For violations...in which the value of noncourse-related required books is \$100 or less, the eligibility of the individual (prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned on the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice.]

2. FAILURE TO MONITOR. [NCAA Constitution 2.8.1 (Note: Bylaw citation is to the 2008-09 NCAA Division I Manual.)]

The scope and nature of the violations detailed in Finding B-1 demonstrate that the institution failed to monitor effectively the student-athlete textbook distribution system, and failed to assure compliance by not providing adequate NCAA rules education pertaining to athletics book aid to student-athletes and book store personnel.

Committee Rationale

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

Although the institution had created and implemented a system to control the textbook distribution process for NCAA compliance, the institution fell short in the following three areas: 1) the institution did not provide adequate rules education on the textbook issuance process for institutional employees or student-athletes; 2) the institution did not sufficiently monitor the textbook process before the textbooks left the store to prevent the violations; and 3) the institution did not sufficiently monitor the textbook process after the textbooks left the store to detect the violations in a timely fashion.

There were two factors in the process before the textbooks left the bookstore which contributed to the violations occurring. Rules education was ineffective as there was a lack of knowledge of a key distinction in the applicable NCAA rule by some of the bookstore employees involved in the process. The applicable bylaw in this matter is NCAA Bylaw 15.2.3, which states that institutions may provide a student-athlete financial aid that covers the actual cost of *required* course-related books. In this case, a number of bookstore employees involved in the textbook process did not understand the distinction between required books and those books that were listed by an instructor as optional or recommended reading. As a result, bookstore personnel allowed a number of student-athletes to obtain textbooks in violation of NCAA legislation. Receipt of non-required textbooks accounts for the majority of the violations in this case. Rules education could have prevented most, if not all, of the violations involving the recommended and optional textbooks.

There were also major deficiencies in the institutional system related to the textbook distribution process. These deficiencies explain how a limited number of student-athletes were able to intentionally obtain textbooks for their friends and family. Specifically, the intentional wrongdoers were able to bypass the process, were not restricted by any purchase limits, and were not required to show photo identification. While the institution's system called for the student-athletes on book aid to proceed to a specially designated counter in the back of the book store to obtain their books, some student-athletes learned that they could pull their own textbooks, as well as the textbooks for friends and family, and proceed directly to the cashier counter for check out. The cashiers did not know whether a particular student-athlete had obtained his/her textbooks on his/her own or through the designated system. The cashiers assumed they were ringing up orders packaged by the bookstore staff.

To compound the problem, there were no limits on the number of occasions a student-athlete could purchase textbooks, or on the total dollar amounts of textbooks a student-athlete could purchase. Although NCAA legislation does not place a dollar limit on an institution's provision of permissible required textbooks, institutional officials conceded that in hindsight, it would have been prudent to place some limitations on the check-out process, such as limiting the timeframe and dollar amount of student-athlete textbook purchases.

An additional weakness in the process was that student-athletes were not required to verify their identity to the cashiers in the check-out process. Cashiers were not required to ask the student-athletes to present photo identifications during the check-out process. The cashiers were simply required to ask for the student-athlete's name and their CWID (campus-wide identification) number. The student-athlete was then asked to sign a

receipt for the textbooks. Student-athletes (and others) were able to take advantage of this situation by using other student-athletes' names (who had scholarships which provided books) and CWID numbers, with no photo identification required to verify identities, in order to obtain textbooks to which they were not entitled.

There were also serious deficiencies in the maintenance of these accounts within the athletics department. There was no review of monthly billing reports for NCAA compliance purposes. Had this monitoring been done, it is possible that the violations in this case could have been detected much earlier. The student-athletes' purchases were consolidated by the bookstore into a monthly billing report which was sent to the athletics department for payment. The billing report included a list of each student-athlete and their purchase invoice totals. However, it did not contain an itemized list of purchases for each student-athlete nor was it organized by sport for billing purposes.

Once the monthly billing report was received in the athletics department, it was reviewed by an administrative assistant whose responsibility was limited to ensuring that the correct billing code was listed for each sport. The administrative assistant did not look at the individual student-athlete charges, or check for NCAA compliance purposes. The billing report was then sent to the assistant athletics director for student services ("assistant director"), who had oversight responsibility for the administration of the institution's textbook distribution to those student-athletes on book aid. The assistant director explained that when he examined the monthly billing reports, he was looking for "anything that pops out as unusual," such as inordinately high charges. The assistant director stated that he never compared student-athlete charges from one month to the next. Had this occurred, he may have detected the occasions when student-athletes made numerous purchases over the course of several months. The assistant director reported that, up until October 17, 2007, when the violations of this case were first discovered, he was not aware of violations in the institution's administration of its book aid for student-athletes.

After the assistant director approved payment of the monthly billing report, the report was forwarded to an associate athletics director ("associate director"), who is the assistant director's supervisor. It was noted that the associate director had previous experience as the assistant director in charge of approving the monthly billing report. The associate director stated that he simply approved the report authorizing payment. The monthly billing report was then taken to the athletics business office, which then issued payment to the book store. In reviewing this process, the committee concluded that the assistant director was in the best position to check each month for irregularities in an effort to assure NCAA compliance and greater diligence would likely have detected the more serious violations.

As a result of these violations, there was also a sharp increase in the total cost of books and supplies over a two-period. Specifically, there was a 30 percent "spike" in charges between the 2004-05 academic year and the 2006-07 academic year. Had the institution been carefully monitoring these numbers, it seems likely that this increase would have been investigated. However, the "spike" was not noted and no inquiry was conducted until the matter was discovered October 17, 2007.

Finally, the committee notes that the institution was unable to produce any records prior to the 2005 fall semester. As a result, the institution could not ascertain whether violations of this nature may have occurred prior to the fall of 2005; therefore the scope of the case was limited to violations which occurred after that date.

C. PENALTIES.

For the reasons set forth in Parts A and B of this report, the Committee on Infractions found 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. The committee determined that that the institution's self imposed penalties were not sufficient in light of the facts and circumstances of the case. The committee believes that additional penalties are necessary to address the severity of the case. However, the committee finds that the corrective actions are meaningful, and took those into account in not imposing more serious penalties such as a ban on postseason competition. [Note: The institution's corrective actions are contained in Appendix Two.] Further, the committee considered the institution's cooperation in this case and determined that the cooperation exhibited by the institution consistent with its obligation under Bylaw 32.1.4, Cooperative Principle, which requires member institutions to cooperate in investigations. The committee recognizes that the case was limited in terms of the NCAA legislation which was violated. Nonetheless, the scope was large in that more than 200 student-athletes were involved, 22 of whom were aware that they were receiving impermissible benefits through their actions. Moreover, the institution admittedly failed to effectively monitor its book distribution system which was a significant contributing factor in the violations occurring. Finally, because of the institution's status as a repeat violator, the Committee on Infractions considered both a ban on postseason competition and the enhanced penalties for repeat violators set forth in Bylaw 19.5.2.3.2. The committee decided against those penalties because the violations were spread across several sports and other penalties, such as vacation of records, were more appropriate. It is for these reasons that the committee imposes the following penalties:

1. Public reprimand and censure.
2. Three years of probation commencing June 11, 2009, and concluding June 10, 2012.
3. The violations in this case involve three of the factors identified as relevant to imposition of a penalty in a major case in which records are vacated: 1) there were a large number of violations – the violations were committed by approximately 200 student-athletes in 16 separate sports and the violations in some instances were serious and involved amounts in the thousands of dollars; 2) at least 22 of the student-athletes committed willful and intentional violations; and 3) the institution admitted that it failed to monitor the student-athlete textbook distribution system. Therefore, pursuant to NCAA Bylaws 19.5.2.2-(e)-(2) and, 31.2.2.3-(b), the institution will vacate all wins in which any of the seven football student-athletes identified by the institution as "intentional wrongdoers" competed while ineligible during the 2005-06 through 2007-08 academic years. Further, in the sports of men's tennis, men's track and women's track, the individual records of the 15 student-athletes identified as "intentional wrongdoers" shall be vacated and team point totals shall be reconfigured accordingly. This includes regular season contests, postseason contests and any NCAA championship competition. The institution's records regarding all of the involved sports, as well as the records of the head coaches of those sports, will reflect the vacated records and will be recorded in all publications in which these records are reported, including, but not limited to, institution media guides, recruiting material, electronic and digital media plus institution and NCAA archives. Any public reference to tournament performances won during this time shall be removed, including, but not limited to, athletics department stationery and banners displayed in public areas such as the venues in which the specified teams compete. Any trophies won in the course of NCAA championship competition impacted by these penalties shall be returned to the NCAA national office. Finally, to ensure that all institutional and student-athlete statistics and records are accurately reflected in official NCAA publication and archives, the sports information director (or other designee as assigned by the director of athletics) must contact the NCAA director of statistics to identify the specific student-athlete(s) and contest(s) impacted by the penalties. In addition, the institution must provide a written report to the NCAA statistics department detailing those discussions with the director of statistics. This document will be maintained in the permanent files of the statistics department. This written report must be delivered to the NCAA statistics department no later than 45 days following the initial Committee on Infractions release or, if the vacation penalty is appealed, the final adjudication of the appeals process.

4. The institution shall pay a fine of \$43,900 to the NCAA. This figure represents the approximate value of the benefits obtained by the "intentional wrongdoers" (\$21,950) multiplied by a factor of two. ($\$21,950 \times 2 = \$43,900$).
5. 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, 2009, 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 February 15 of each year during the probationary period. Particular emphasis should be placed on monitoring of book store and related charges incurred by student-athletes. The reports must also include documentation of the institution's compliance with the penalties adopted and imposed by the committee.
6. 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.
7. 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, the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, shall again 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 11, 2009.

Should Alabama 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. Any action by the institution contrary to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations shall be considered grounds for extending the institution's probationary period or imposing more severe sanctions or may result in additional allegations and findings of violations.

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

Britton Banowsky

John S. Black

Melissa ("Missy") Conboy

Paul T. Dee, chair

Eileen K. Jennings

Dennis E. Thomas

APPENDIX ONE

CASE CHRONOLOGY.

2006

January – The athletics department and Institution bookstore implemented "Banner," an administrative software application, to automate its textbook distribution system.

2007

October 17 – The senior textbook buyer at the institution's bookstore detected and reported textbook charges in excess of \$1,600 for a women's track and field student-athlete's account for the 2007 fall semester.

October 19 – The institution determined that due to the start of the fall sports season, the institution's textbook review team, as appointed by the institution's president, would focus on the 2007 fall semester back through the 2006 spring semester.

October 23 – The institution retained a law firm to oversee a review of textbook purchases for student-athletes.

October 31 – The commissioner and associate commissioner of the Southeastern Conference, the institution's director of athletics, the institution's counsel, the associate athletics director and the institution's outside counsel met with NCAA enforcement staff members to discuss the institution's preliminary findings.

November 16 – The institution expanded its review of textbook charges to include the 2005 fall semester.

November 20 – The enforcement staff issued a notice of inquiry to the institution.

2008

April 16 – Membership services provided a response to a joint request for interpretation, which indicated that the provision of books and supplies that were not required for a particular course would constitute an extra-benefit violation.

May 19 – The enforcement staff issued a notice of allegations to the institution.

September 16 – The institution submitted its response to the notice of allegations.

2009

January 8 – Academic and membership affairs (formerly membership services) provided a response to a joint interpretation request, which clarified that the provision of books and supplies by student-athletes who received athletics aid to student-athletes who did not receive athletics aid would constitute an extra-benefit violation; the provision of recommended/optional books or books unrelated to the student-athlete's course work to student-athletes who received athletics aid would constitute a violation of NCAA Bylaw 15.2.3.

February 20 – The institution appeared before the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions.

June 11 – Infractions Report No. 299 is released.

APPENDIX TWO

CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AS LISTED IN THE INSTITUTION'S SEPTEMBER 16, 2008, RESPONSE TO THE NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS.

The institution has implemented several corrective measures. These measures are the result of a careful and deliberate effort to identify the root causes that gave rise to the violations. These efforts should foreclose those unauthorized activities from occurring in the future.

1. The institution required all involved student-athletes with eligibility remaining to make full restitution for the improperly obtained texts and materials. Moreover, those student-athletes with violations involving an amount greater than \$100 were required to serve the appropriate suspension and to seek reinstatement from the NCAA.
2. The institution reprimanded the assistant athletics director for student services and to the director of the institution's bookstore. Reprimand letters for both advised that the violations could have been prevented or mitigated by more diligent and consistent enforcement of existing procedures; continuing updates and modifications of procedures; additional and improved inter-departmental communication; more comprehensive training of employees; and more thorough reconciliations. Both employees were advised to comply with new procedures, continue monitoring and suggestions, maintain and improve communication and education, and provide additional reconciliations and record keeping, in line with newly adopted procedures. Both employees were deemed ineligible for the next merit increase available at the institution and both were warned that additional facts or further incidents could lead to more severe sanctions up to and including termination.
3. When the institution's bookstore employee detected questionable textbook charges by a scholarship student-athlete and the same day reported her suspicion to the academic services area and then to the athletic compliance office, the institution immediately began a fact-finding effort to determine whether or not a rules violation had occurred. During the interview that day, the student-athlete admitted that she had impermissibly charged textbooks and volunteered the names of other student-athletes who also had impermissibly charged textbooks. Armed with that information, the institution that afternoon initiated a preliminary internal examination of fall 2007 semester textbook charges by scholarship student-athletes.
4. When this limited review detected additional questionable textbook charges, over the ensuing three days, the institution broadened its examination of textbook charges for the fall 2007 semester, commencing with those sports, such as football and track and field, that had or would shortly start their competition season.

5. Five days after the date the first impermissibly charged textbook was detected, the associate vice president for financial affairs convened a committee of representatives from athletic compliance, athletic academic services and the institution's bookstore, as well as the director of business services and the faculty athletics representative. The assembled group's purposes were to review the circumstances of the detected questionable textbook purchases; to review and evaluate the current system for textbook issuance to scholarship student-athletes; to assign responsibility for the assembly of the records necessary to audit textbook charges and reconcile any record discrepancies regarding those charges by scholarship student-athletes; to develop a plan for the internal review of textbook purchases by all scholarship student-athletes; and to recommend and develop revisions to the textbook issuance process based upon its findings and its evaluation of the current textbook distribution process. The expanded review detected several more incidents of impermissible textbook charges.
6. As a result of its internal examination of scholarship student-athlete textbook charges and the then current textbook distribution policy and process, the committee recommended and undertook the development of a new, more comprehensive policy and procedure. This recommendation in part was due to weaknesses in the current policies and procedures which were identified during the internal review of the textbook charges and to accommodate changes in the institution's computer data management software.
7. Approximately two months later, the committee adopted a new 21-page Policies and Procedures Student-Athlete Textbook Purchases and Return guideline. This revised document outlines a more comprehensive scheme of checks and balances to allow better reconciliation of textbook charges by scholarship student-athletes and earlier detection of impermissible charges. The timely completion of this new procedure permitted the institution to implement it for textbook charges by scholarship student-athletes for the 2008 spring semester.
8. In addition to the examination process and the development of a revised textbook issuance policy, the bookstore began in October 2007, the first of many training and rules education sessions for its employees. These sessions included not only training with regard to textbook returns but also with the revised policy in order to have it effectively implemented some two months later for the spring 2008 book rush. The bookstore also developed and issued 15 quick reference sheets or guides to assist its personnel with the implementation and operation of the textbook issuance process.
9. Another byproduct of the institution committee's review of the textbook process and procedure was a recommendation that the institution changes from a textbook charge and return program to a textbook charge and retain program. Prior to the 2008 fall semester, the institution's textbook program was such that student-athletes with book scholarships

would charge the purchase of required textbooks and supplies to the athletic department. When a student-athlete either dropped a course or completed a course, the student-athlete was to return the textbook to the bookstore, which would then apply a credit for the buyback value of the returned textbook to the athletic department's account. If the student-athlete failed to return the textbook, the cost of the textbook was charged to the student-athlete's receivables account, unless special circumstances applied and a waiver was granted. The internal review committee found that this return obligation often created problems in accounting for textbook returns. The textbook return policy also penalized those student-athletes who wanted to retain their required textbooks for future academic reasons but who were unable financially to pay for them. As a consequence, the institution transitioned to a textbook charge and retention program effective with the 2008 fall semester, and the newly adopted Policies and Procedures Student-Athlete Textbook Purchases and Return guideline was updated to reflect this procedural change.

10. To complement the revisions to the textbook policies and procedures for scholarship student-athletes, athletic compliance is and will continue to conduct periodic rules-education sessions for Athletics Student Services and bookstore employees to foster a greater awareness, particularly among non-exempt employee levels, of the rule regarding "required" textbooks and the institution's procedures and policies governing textbook distribution to scholarship student-athletes. Similar educational efforts have involved and will continue to involve the coaches and student-athletes in each sport.