

CASE SUMMARY

Former Baylor staffer violated sports betting rules

Sports betting violations occurred at Baylor when Sam Hancock, former director of resource development at Baylor, placed impermissible daily fantasy bets on professional and collegiate games from July 2019 through September 2024, including competitions involving Baylor teams, according to a decision released by a Division I Committee on Infractions panel.

Hancock placed 2,950 impermissible bets totaling \$45,979 on three different sports betting platforms — including bets on 113 contests that involved Baylor teams and student-athletes. Hancock acknowledged that he engaged in sports betting activities before his employment at Baylor and continued to bet on sports after he was hired, despite receiving rules education from Baylor and knowing that his conduct violated NCAA rules.

In October 2024, NCAA rules went into effect allowing sports betting violations that do not compromise the integrity of collegiate contests and/or involve lack of institutional oversight to be processed at different levels for the involved individual and school. This is the second case impacted by that rule change. Based on the nature of Hancock's conduct, the panel classified his case as Level II — Standard. The school's portion of the case has been processed separately as a Level III violation.

The parties agreed to the following penalties for Hancock:

- Two-year show-cause order for Hancock in which any employing institution must require Hancock to participate in gambling counseling and attend NCAA Regional Rules Seminars at his own expense.
- Two-week suspension during the first year of employment within the show-cause period, in which Hancock cannot participate in any athletics activities, which includes being present or communicating with development staff members, athletics staff members or student-athletes during the suspension period.

Members of the Committee on Infractions are drawn from the NCAA membership and public. The panel members who reviewed this case are:

- Stephen Madva, attorney in private practice.
- Vincent Nicastro, deputy commissioner and chief operating officer of the Big East Conference and chief hearing officer for the panel.
- James Stapleton, president and chief executive officer of B&R Consultants.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION¹

NCAA Member Institutions – Case No. 020412

April 10, 2025

I. CASE SYNOPSIS

Sam Hancock (Hancock), former director of resource development at Baylor University (Baylor), and the NCAA enforcement staff agree with the violations and penalties detailed below. The parties also agree that this case should be resolved as Level II – Standard for Hancock.²

The case originated August 31, 2024, when Baylor received notification that Hancock participated in impermissible sports betting activity through the daily fantasy betting website PrizePicks.³ The institution interviewed Hancock, who confirmed that he had placed impermissible daily fantasy wagers on professional and college games, including wagers on Baylor student-athletes or student-athletes competing in contests against Baylor.

On October 30, Baylor self-reported Hancock's sports betting violations to the enforcement staff. Baylor and the enforcement staff then began a collaborative investigation that substantiated Hancock participated in impermissible sports betting from July 2019 through September 2024. Hancock confirmed that he began participating in daily fantasy betting prior to starting his employment at Baylor and continued betting throughout his employment. Hancock acknowledged that his betting activity was limited to daily fantasy betting on three different platforms where he would bet on specific individuals to achieve certain benchmarks within a contest. Hancock's betting activity did not impact the integrity of the competitions and he did not utilize inside information to place any wagers. The data from those daily fantasy platforms confirmed Hancock placed 2,950 bets totaling \$45,979, and that 113 of the bets involved Baylor contests. The contestants that he bet on included professional and collegiate sports athletes as well as student-athletes from Baylor or those involved in contests where Baylor was participating. Hancock confirmed that he knew sports betting was against NCAA rules, received rules education related to sports betting from Baylor and acted alone without anyone's knowledge.

¹ In reviewing this agreement, the hearing panel made editorial revisions pursuant to NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions (COI) Internal Operating Procedure (IOP) 4-7-1-2. These modifications did not affect the substance of the agreement.

² Pursuant to Division I Bylaw 19.1.1.1, the institution's portion of the case was processed separately as a Level III violation.

³ The institution was alerted by a proactive prohibited bettor monitoring solution that it used to monitor sports betting on different platforms.

II. PARTIES' AGREEMENTS

A. Agreed-upon findings of fact, violations of NCAA legislation and violation levels.

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 10.01.1 and 10.3 (2018-19 through 2024-25)]
(Level II)

Hancock and the enforcement staff agree that from July 2019 through September 2024,⁴ Hancock violated the principles of honesty and sportsmanship when he knowingly participated in sports betting activities. Specifically, Hancock placed at least 2,950 daily fantasy bets totaling approximately \$45,979 on professional and intercollegiate sports competitions, including 113 daily fantasy bets on Baylor student-athletes or student-athletes in contests that Baylor programs were competing against.

B. Agreed-upon aggravating and mitigating factors.

Pursuant to Bylaw 19.10.3-(e), the parties agree that the aggravating and mitigating factors identified below are applicable.

The parties assessed the factors by weight and number and agree that this case should be properly resolved as Level II – Standard.

Involved Individual (Hancock):

1. Aggravating factors (Bylaw 19.12.3.1).
 - a. Conduct intended to generate pecuniary gain for the individual [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(h)].
 - b. Intentional, willful or blatant disregard for NCAA bylaws [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(i)].
2. Mitigating factors (Bylaw 19.12.4.2).
 - a. Prompt acknowledgement and acceptance of responsibility for the violations [Bylaw 19.12.4.2-(b)].
 - b. Affirmative steps to expedite final resolution of the matter [Bylaw 19.12.4.2-(d)].

⁴ Pursuant to Bylaw 19.7.1.1-(b), the violations in the case indicate a pattern of willful violations by the involved individual, which began before and continued into the four-year period of the statute of limitations.

- c. The absence of prior conclusions of Level I, Level II or major violations [Bylaw 19.12.4.2-(e)].

III. OTHER VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION SUBSTANTIATED; NOT ALLEGED

None.

IV. REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES

None.

V. PARTIES' AGREED-UPON PENALTIES⁵

All penalties agreed upon in this case are independent and supplemental to any action that has been or may be taken by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics through its assessment of postseason ineligibility, historical penalties or other penalties.

Pursuant to Bylaw 19.10.3-(e), the parties agree to the following penalties:

Core Penalties for Level II – Standard Violations (Bylaw 19.12.7)

1. Show-cause order: Hancock violated the principles of honesty and sportsmanship when he knowingly participated in sports betting activities. Therefore, Hancock shall be subject to a two-year show-cause order from **April 10, 2025, through April 9, 2027**. In accordance with Bylaw 19.12.7.4 and Committee on Infractions Internal Operating Procedure 5-15-5, any employing member institution shall require Hancock to seek and participate in gambling counseling and attend the annual NCAA Regional Rules Seminar at his own expense. Any member institution that employs Hancock in an athletically related position during the two-year show-cause period, shall abide by the terms of the show-cause order unless it contacts the office of the Committees on Infractions to make arrangements to show cause why the terms of the order should not apply.
2. Suspension: Bylaw 19.12.7.5 and Figure 19-1 penalty guidelines contemplate suspensions. Therefore, any member institution that employs Hancock in an athletically related position shall suspend Hancock for two weeks from all

⁵ All penalties must be completed during the time periods identified in this decision. If completion of a penalty is impossible during the prescribed period, the institution shall make the Committee on Infractions aware of the impossibility and must complete the penalty at the next available opportunity.

athletically related duties during the first year of employment within the show-cause period. Because Hancock was a development officer and not a coaching staff member, his suspension relates directly to his athletically related duties rather than a percentage of the regular season contests. The provisions of the suspension require that Hancock not be present or have contact or communication with development staff members, athletics staff members or student-athletes during the suspension period. The prohibition includes all development and athletics activities for the period of time that begins at 12:01 a.m. on Sunday and ends at 11:59 p.m. the following Saturday. During the suspension period Hancock may not participate in any athletics activities, including, but not limited to, development and ticketing activities. Should Hancock be hired as a coaching staff member, any employing institution may not utilize Bylaw 11.02.2.1 to replace Hancock on a temporary basis during the period of suspension. The results of any contests from which Hancock is suspended shall not count toward the coach's career record if he is in the role of a head coach at the time of suspension.

Additional Penalties for Level II – Standard Violations (Bylaw 19.12.9)

3. Public reprimand and censure through the release of the negotiated resolution agreement.

VII. OTHER AGREEMENTS

The parties agree that this case will be processed through the NCAA negotiated resolution process as outlined in Bylaw 19.10, and a hearing panel comprised of members of the Committee on Infractions will review the negotiated resolution. The parties acknowledge that the negotiated resolution contains agreed-upon findings of fact of NCAA violations and agreed-upon aggravating and mitigating factors based on information available at this time. Nothing in this resolution precludes the enforcement staff from investigating additional information about potential rules violations. The parties agree that, pursuant to Bylaw 19.1.3, the violations identified in this agreement occurred and should be classified as Level II – Standard.

If a hearing panel approves the negotiated resolution, Hancock agrees that they will take every precaution to ensure that the terms of the penalties are observed. Hancock acknowledges that they have or will impose and follow the penalties contained within the negotiated resolution, and these penalties are in accordance with those prescribed in Bylaws 19.12.7, 19.12.8, 19.12.9 and 19.12.10. The office of the Committees on Infractions will monitor the penalties during their effective periods. Any action by Hancock contrary to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations may be considered grounds for prescribing more severe penalties or may result in additional allegations and violations.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Baylor University - Case No. 020412

April 10, 2025

Page No. 5

The parties acknowledge that this negotiated resolution may be voidable by the Committee on Infractions if any of the parties were aware or become aware of information that materially alters the factual information on which this negotiated resolution is based.

The parties further acknowledge that the hearing panel, subsequent to its review of the negotiated resolution, may reject the negotiated resolution. Should the hearing panel reject the negotiated resolution, the parties understand that the hearing panel will issue instructions for processing of the case pursuant to hearing resolution (Bylaw 19.8) or limited resolution (Bylaw 19.9) and prior agreed-upon terms of the rejected negotiated resolution will not be binding.

Should a hearing panel approve the negotiated resolution, the parties agree that they waive NCAA hearing and appellate opportunities.

VIII. DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS APPROVAL

Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.10.1, the panel approves the parties' negotiated resolution agreement. The panel's review of this agreement is limited. Panels may only reject a negotiated resolution agreement if the agreement is not in the best interests of the Association or if the agreed-upon penalties are manifestly unreasonable. *See* Bylaw 19.10.4. In this case, the panel determines the agreed-upon facts, violations, aggravating and mitigating factors, and classifications are appropriate for this process. Further, the parties classified this case as Level II-Standard for Hancock. The agreed-upon penalties align with the ranges identified for core penalties for Level II-Standard cases in Figure 19-1 and Bylaw 19.12.7 and the additional penalties available under Bylaw 19.12.9. Pursuant to Bylaw 19.10.6, this negotiated resolution has no precedential value.

The COI advises Hancock that he should take every precaution to ensure that he observes the terms of the penalties. Any action by Hancock contrary to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations shall be considered grounds for prescribing more severe penalties and/or may result in additional allegations and violations.

NCAA COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS PANEL

Steve Madva

Vince Nicastro, chief hearing officer

James Stapleton