

CASE SUMMARY

Michigan State football program violated recruiting rules

Mel Tucker violated head coach responsibility rules, failed to monitor program

Recruiting violations occurred at Michigan State when members of the football staff, including former football general manager/executive director of player personnel and recruiting Saeed Khalif and former assistant football coach Brandon Jordan, knowingly provided impermissible recruiting inducements in connection with prospective student-athletes' unofficial visits, according to a decision released by a Division I Committee on Infractions panel.

Michigan State reached an agreement with the NCAA enforcement staff on violations concerning recruiting activities and the school's failure to monitor the football program. Former head football coach Mel Tucker, who was not involved in the recruiting violations, contested his head coach responsibility violation, and his case was processed through a written record hearing.

Jordan and Khalif are included in Michigan State's negotiated resolution as nonparticipating parties. The panel approved the negotiated resolution on Sept. 25, bifurcating the case and allowing the school, Khalif and Jordan to immediately begin serving penalties while awaiting the panel's decision on Tucker's remaining contested portion of the case.

From October 2021 through March 2023, Khalif, Jordan and other members of the football staff offered and/or provided approximately \$10,764 in impermissible recruiting inducements to six prospects who traveled to Michigan State for unofficial visits. The inducements included payments for airfare and lodging for the prospects and the individuals who traveled with them.

Schools are not permitted to cover travel expenses for prospects or their traveling companions during unofficial visits.

Khalif also offered to pay for a prospect's family vacation so that prospect would not go on official visits to other schools and paid a prospect's trainer \$700 to attend a visit with the prospect.

Then, in January 2022, Khalif knowingly arranged for and/or provided approximately \$3,075 in impermissible recruiting benefits in the form of one-way air transportation to three football prospects to enroll at Michigan State and round-trip air transportation to their family members. As a result of these impermissible recruiting benefits, the three prospects competed in 26 contests while ineligible after they enrolled at Michigan State.

Based on these violations, Michigan State agreed that it failed over the course of two academic years to adequately monitor the football program's arrangement of unofficial visits to ensure compliance with NCAA recruiting legislation.

After separating from Michigan State, Khalif and Jordan failed to cooperate with the NCAA enforcement staff when they refused to participate in interviews and provide information relevant to the potential violations despite multiple attempts by the enforcement staff to secure participation.

Separate from the negotiated agreement, Tucker contested his responsibility for his program's violations through a hearing on the written record. The panel determined that he did not rebut the presumption of responsibility for the violations that occurred prior to Jan. 1, 2023, and is automatically responsible for the violations that took place after that date.

The panel noted that Tucker followed an NFL model for his program, running all off-field operations through Khalif, his general manager. As a result, Tucker failed to adequately monitor his program. Additionally, multiple members of Tucker's staff reported that he did not emphasize compliance, and they did not feel comfortable coming to him with concerns or potential violations.

Michigan State agreed to a Level I–Mitigated classification for its case. The school and enforcement staff agreed to the following penalties:

- Three years of probation.
- A fine of \$30,000, plus 1.5% of the football program budget.
- A reduction in football official visits by two home games during the 2025 football season and one home game during each of the 2026 and 2027 football seasons.
- A reduction in football unofficial visits by a total of 12 weeks during the 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28 academic years, with at least one week each year coinciding with a home game.
 - Michigan State previously self-imposed and is credited with a reduction of two weeks during spring 2025.
- A total six-week ban on recruiting communications in football during the 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28 academic years.
- A reduction of permissible recruiting person days in football by a total of 30 days over the 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28 academic years.
 - Michigan State previously self-imposed and is credited with a reduction of five days in spring 2025.
- A one-week ban on off-campus recruiting contacts and evaluations in football during each of the 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28 academic years.
- Vacation of team wins and records in which the ineligible student-athletes competed.

The violations were classified as Level I-Aggravated for Khalif and Jordan, with the following penalties:

- Khalif
 - A six-year show-cause order, during which time any employing member school must restrict him from all athletically related activity.
 - A suspension from 100% of the football regular season (12 contests) during the first season of employment within the show-cause order. During that suspension, Khalif cannot participate in any coaching activities.
- Jordan
 - A five-year show-cause order, during which time any employing member school must restrict him from all athletically related activity.
 - A suspension from 100% of the football regular season (12 contests) during the first season of employment within the show-cause order. During that suspension, Jordan cannot participate in any coaching activities.

The panel classified the violations for Tucker as Level I–Standard, with the following penalties prescribed:

- A three-year show-cause order, during which time any employing member school must restrict him from all athletically related activity.
- A suspension from 30% of the football season during the first season of employment within the show-cause order. During that suspension, Tucker cannot participate in any coaching activities.

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

- Norman Bay, attorney.
- Bryan Blair, vice president and director of athletics at Toledo.
- Jody Conradt, special assistant to athletics at the University of Texas.
- Rich Ensor, former commissioner of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference and chief hearing officer.
- Jeremy Jordan, dean of the David B. Falk College of Sport and Human Dynamics at Syracuse.
- Kay Norton, president emerita of Northern Colorado; chair of the Committee on Infractions.
- Amy Parsons, president of Colorado State.



**MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
PUBLIC INFRACTIONS DECISION
November 12, 2025**

I. INTRODUCTION

The NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions (COI) is an independent administrative body comprised of individuals from the NCAA Division I membership and the public charged with deciding infractions cases involving member institutions and their staffs.¹ This case centered on recruiting violations in the football program at Michigan State University.

The hearing panel processed violations for Michigan State and two football staff members through a separate negotiated resolution (NR) process. Michigan State agreed to the facts, violations and penalties. The two football staff members—former general manager/executive director of player personnel and recruiting Saeed Khalif (Khalif) and former assistant football coach Brandon Jordan (Jordan)—were non-participating parties to the NR. The approved NR may be found at Appendix Two of this decision. Former head football coach Mel Tucker (Tucker) contested his alleged head coach responsibility violation. Thus, this decision solely relates to Tucker’s conduct.²

This case illustrates some of the inherent risks in utilizing an NFL-style organizational model—in which all off-field operations run through a general manager—without sufficient oversight and engagement by the head coach. The underlying violations in this case stemmed from Tucker’s over-reliance on his general manager, Khalif, coupled with his hands-off approach to compliance. As multiple football staff members reported, all recruiting operations ran through Khalif, and staff did not feel comfortable bringing concerns to the head coach. The structure of Tucker’s program and his general approach to compliance created an environment in which violations occurred for over a year and a half.

Specifically, from October 2021 through March 2023, Tucker’s staff regularly violated well-known recruiting legislation in an effort to bring prospects to campus for unofficial visits. Khalif, and sometimes Jordan, facilitated unofficial visits for six prospects during this time, arranging and/or providing airfare and hotel lodging for the prospects and the individuals who traveled with

¹ Infractions cases are decided by hearing panels comprised of COI members. Panels issue decisions on behalf of the COI.

² Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.10.6, approved NRs carry no precedential value. Thus, the panel could not and did not rely upon the institution’s NR as it related to the conduct underlying Tucker’s head coach responsibility allegation. As part of Tucker’s case, the panel conducted a separate, independent analysis of the factual information related to the underlying conduct and concluded the violations occurred.

them. Other football staff members provided transportation to and from the airport for these prospects, which resulted in impermissible off-campus recruiting contacts. In addition to his facilitation of unofficial visits, Khalif also arranged and/or provided airfare for three prospects and their family members who were traveling to Michigan State for the prospects' enrollment. Michigan State agreed via NR that this conduct—which resulted in nearly \$11,000 in recruiting inducements and over \$3,000 in impermissible pre-enrollment transportation—constituted two separate Level I violations of NCAA recruiting legislation. The panel accepted the parties' agreement, but for purposes of Tucker's head coach responsibility allegation the panel also concludes that the factual information establishes underlying Level I recruiting violations.³

Tucker did not rebut the presumption of responsibility for the violations that occurred prior to January 1, 2023, and he is automatically responsible for the violations that took place after that date.⁴ Tucker could not demonstrate that he promoted an atmosphere of compliance and monitored his staff when multiple staff members were involved in violations over a sustained period of time, and Khalif and Jordan engaged in intentional violations of well-known recruiting legislation. Moreover, the case record did not demonstrate that Tucker proactively looked for red flags, asked probing questions of his staff or conducted appropriate follow-up related to potential areas of concern. To the contrary, the record showed that Tucker ran all off-field operations through Khalif and simply trusted that he would follow the rules. Accordingly, Tucker's conduct violated Bylaw 11.1.1.1 head coach responsibility legislation. Because the head coach responsibility violation derives from underlying Level I conduct, it is a Level I violation.

The panel classifies this case as Level I-Standard for Tucker. Utilizing the NCAA membership's current penalty guidelines, the panel prescribes a three-year show-cause order for Tucker, as well as a 30 percent suspension should he become employed during the term of his show-cause order.

II. CASE HISTORY

The violations in the overall case first came to light in the summer of 2023 during the institution's routine business office audit. Through the audit, Michigan State discovered that Khalif provided payment to a local hotel to cover the lodging expenses of a prospect, his father and his trainer during an unofficial visit. Michigan State self-reported the conduct to the NCAA enforcement staff as a Level III violation in June 2023. In August 2023, the enforcement staff received information regarding potential additional recruiting violations by the football program that were similar in nature to the violation the institution self-reported. Shortly thereafter, Michigan State and the enforcement staff began a collaborative investigation.

³ The panel recognizes that the landscape of collegiate athletics has changed significantly in recent years, including changes in what institutions may offer and provide to prospects in the recruiting space. However, the underlying conduct in this case violated NCAA recruiting legislation at the time it occurred, and the conduct remains impermissible under current NCAA legislation. Given the timing and intentionality of the underlying conduct, the panel confirmed that the violations occurred and are Level I.

⁴ On January 1, 2023, legislation went into effect that eliminated the rebuttable presumption for head coach responsibility and established that head coaches are automatically responsible for the violations that occur in their programs. *See* Bylaw 11.1.1.1.

In November 2024, the enforcement staff shared a draft notice of allegations (NOA) with Michigan State, Khalif, Jordan and Tucker. The institution informed the enforcement staff that it wished to pursue an NR, Tucker requested a full hearing, and Khalif requested access to the full case record before determining which resolution path he wished to pursue. Jordan did not respond to the enforcement staff's request to select a resolution method for his portion of the case.

The COI chair held a status conference with the institution and representatives for Tucker and Khalif on January 21, 2025. The following day, the chair approved Michigan State's request to process its case via NR and determined that Tucker's and Khalif's cases would best be resolved through a full hearing. Due to Jordan's failure to respond, the chair noted that he should be included in the NR as a non-participating party pursuant to Bylaw 19.10.2.1.

In late January 2025, the enforcement staff received new information regarding potential additional violations similar in nature to those identified in the draft NOA. Following additional investigation, the enforcement staff shared a new draft notice of allegations with the parties on March 7, 2025, which included an additional allegation. On March 13, 2025, Khalif notified the enforcement staff that he would no longer participate in the processing of the case. One week later, on March 21, 2025, Tucker notified the enforcement staff that he no longer wanted a full hearing and instead wished to have his case resolved via a hearing on the written record.

On April 14, 2025, the enforcement staff notified the COI chair of the new information and allegation, as well as the parties' change in positions regarding their participation and respective resolution methods. In light of Khalif's non-participation, the enforcement staff sought approval to include him in the NR as a non-participating party. On April 17, 2025, the chair approved the enforcement staff's request and confirmed the following resolution methods: NR for Michigan State, Khalif and Jordan, and written record hearing for Tucker.

The enforcement staff issued an NOA to Tucker on April 29, 2025. On June 17, 2025, Tucker's counsel requested a 21-day extension of time in which to submit Tucker's response to the NOA. Although acknowledging that NCAA legislation prohibits extensions absent exceptional circumstances, Tucker's counsel argued that an extension was warranted due to an outage of the online platform that houses the case record. The COI chair granted a more limited extension of seven days, noting that the inability to access case documents appeared to be an exceptional circumstance, but the outage lasted only one half of a day. Thus, the chair established a deadline of July 7, 2025, for Tucker's NOA response.

Tucker submitted his response to the NOA on July 2, 2025. On August 18, 2025, the enforcement staff submitted its written reply. The following day, August 19, 2025, the enforcement staff and Michigan State submitted an NR, which also included Khalif and Jordan as non-participating parties.⁵ The hearing panel convened via videoconference on September 25, 2025, to assess the

⁵ In addition to the underlying recruiting violations, the NR also included an agreed-upon failure to monitor violation for Michigan State, as well as an unethical conduct violation for Khalif and post-separation failure to cooperate violations for both Khalif and Jordan. Additionally, the NR included a head coach responsibility violation, which related only to Michigan State's accountability for Tucker's conduct.

NR and consider Tucker’s case on the written record. The panel approved the NR, and the penalties for Michigan State, Khalif and Jordan went into effect that day.

III. FINDINGS OF FACT

Michigan State hired Tucker as the institution’s head football coach in February 2020. Tucker came to Michigan State with 15 years of NCAA coaching experience, including one season as a head coach at another Division I institution. He also had nearly a decade of NFL coaching experience. In June 2021, Tucker hired Khalif to serve as director of player personnel and oversee the recruiting department. The following year, in an effort to move toward an NFL model, Tucker promoted Khalif to the role of general manager and executive director of player personnel.

In Khalif’s new general manager role, he oversaw the operations side of the program, including all facets of recruiting. Multiple football staff members interviewed by the enforcement staff reported that Khalif was Tucker’s right-hand man and all off-field issues ran through him. This included issues related to official and unofficial visits.

One former assistant coach reported that Tucker was “huge on getting [prospects] to campus” and insisted that prospects come to campus for an unofficial visit before taking an official visit. According to the assistant coach, Tucker told the staff that if they had trouble getting prospects to campus, “don’t panic, go to [Khalif] and he’ll take care of everything.” During an interview with the enforcement staff, Tucker denied saying this.

Regardless of whether Tucker gave this instruction, Khalif was heavily involved in facilitating unofficial visits for prospects. From October 30, 2021, through March 18, 2023, Khalif, and sometimes Jordan, arranged and/or provided unofficial visit expenses for six prospects and the individuals who traveled to East Lansing with them (*i.e.*, friends, family members and trainers). These expenses included airfare and hotel lodging.⁶ Khalif arranged the prospects’ flights through a travel agent, whom he later reimbursed. Regarding hotels, three of the prospects received free hotel lodging for at least one visit, while two prospects received free lodging during two visits.

During four of the prospects’ unofficial visits, members of the football staff transported them to and from the airport, and one staff member provided another one of the prospects with a university-branded jacket. Additionally, Khalif paid one prospect’s trainer \$700 to accompany the prospect on his unofficial visit, and he offered to pay for another prospect and his family to go on vacation to prevent them from visiting other institutions.

⁶ Jordan was involved in arranging flights and transportation from campus to the airport for one of the six prospects and the prospect’s grandfather. Five of the six prospects received unofficial visit expenses prior to January 1, 2023, the date on which the current head coach responsibility legislation, Bylaw 11.1.1.1, went into effect. The sixth prospect received unofficial visit expenses from January 14 through March 18, 2023.

Separate from the conduct surrounding unofficial visits, Khalif also provided air transportation for prospects traveling to Michigan State to enroll. Specifically, in January 2022, Khalif worked with the travel agent to arrange one-way airfare for three prospects and roundtrip airfare for their respective parents. Khalif then reimbursed the travel agent for the flight purchases.

Substantial information in the record confirmed the conduct of Khalif, Jordan and the other members of the football staff. Among other things, this information included interview statements from the prospects and/or their traveling companions, interview statements from the travel agent, flight purchase records, and Khalif’s credit card, bank, email and telephone records.

In his written submission to the COI, Tucker stated that he “acknowledge[d] the credibility of the evidence presented,” and he did not dispute that his staff engaged in this conduct. He maintained, however, that he monitored his staff and promoted an atmosphere of compliance in his program by doing the following: (1) embedding compliance into the core of Michigan State football culture; (2) establishing a clear duty to report; (3) leading by example and making compliance a daily standard; (4) enforcing accountability and turning violations into lessons; and (5) taking steps to proactively identify red flags. In discussing his efforts in each area, Tucker did not cite any information or support in the case record or elsewhere.

1. Embedding Compliance

Tucker emphasized that one of his first actions when he became head coach at Michigan State was to place a compliance officer in the football offices next to the coaches and recruiting staff. The deputy athletics director for compliance (deputy AD) reported that this was an idea Tucker first mentioned when he interviewed for the head coach position, as he had a compliance officer embedded with the football staff at his previous institution.⁷ The deputy AD noted that there were many new coaches on staff at the beginning of Tucker’s tenure, and the compliance office thought it would be a good idea to have someone physically present with the coaches to answer questions.

The compliance officer who was embedded with the football staff discussed her relationship with the program during an interview with the enforcement staff. She stated that football staff members—including Tucker, Khalif and others—would stop by her office to ask questions, with non-coaching staff members being the most frequent visitors. According to the compliance officer, the football staff did not seem to mind her presence in their offices, and their relationship was not adversarial. The compliance officer moved out of the football offices and back to the administration building sometime in mid-2022. The deputy AD explained that the compliance officer was moved because they ran out of room in the football offices and, by that point, compliance had built relationships with the football program such that a daily presence among the staff was no longer necessary.

⁷ In his written submission, Tucker stated his belief that he was the first NCAA coach to integrate compliance into a program in this way. However, the COI has previously encountered programs at other institutions that have embedded compliance officers with the coaching staff. See *Auburn University* (2021) and *Oklahoma State University* (2015).

2. Establishing a Duty to Report

Tucker stated that he established among his staff a clear duty to report, again emphasizing that he encouraged his staff to go to compliance with questions. Tucker did not, however, identify any actions he took to encourage his staff to report concerns or potential violations either to him or to the compliance staff. The deputy AD stated that Tucker’s staff reported violations, especially toward the beginning of Tucker’s tenure when there was “a rash of small [violations] just because, you know, they were used to doing things a little bit differently at other institutions.”

With respect to the specific conduct at issue in this case, the record establishes that several members of Tucker’s staff either had awareness of potential violations or concerns about conduct around unofficial visits but did not report anything to Tucker or the compliance staff. For example, one former assistant coach reported that Khalif once asked him for money for a prospect and his family when they came to campus on an unofficial visit. The assistant coach stated, however, that he did not raise any concerns with Tucker about how unofficial visits were being funded because Tucker “was never just available like that . . . you go through springtime and there were times we didn’t see coach Tucker for two weeks.” He also noted that as a young, first-time coach, he “didn’t want to be the one to go into the head coach’s office and question him.”

Similarly, a former recruiting staff member told the enforcement staff that he believed violations were occurring in relation to the funding of unofficial visits, but he did not report his concerns because he did not want to be labeled a “snitch” and lose his job. Another former assistant coach told the enforcement staff that “[i]t was implied sometimes . . . [to] possibly help out a little bit to help guys [get to campus],” but he did not report this to anyone. A different former assistant coach was copied on an email containing flight documents related to pre-enrollment transportation for a prospect and his parents. Like his colleagues, he did not report it.

3. Leading by Example and Making Compliance a Daily Standard

Tucker claimed that he led by example and held himself to the same high standard he expected of his staff. He stated that he met regularly with compliance and followed a green light/yellow light/red light framework for decision-making. If something was a clear “yes,” it was a green light, and he moved forward. If it was unclear—a yellow light—he stopped and checked with compliance. If it was a clear “no,” it was a red light, and he did not go any further. Tucker stated that he required his staff to follow this same decision-making framework.

None of the football staff members interviewed for this case referenced this green light/yellow light/red light approach. When asked about Tucker’s expectations and philosophy toward compliance, one former assistant coach stated, “I mean, he never – never mentioned it. We never even had like a rules or regulations meeting or anything like that with coach Tucker. He told us to recruit obviously and coach your guys. That’s basically it.” A former defensive analyst responded similarly, stating, “I mean, we never discussed that. I mean, never talked about that.” A former recruiting staff member said that Tucker’s expectation was for staff to “definitely follow the rules,” but “there’s a gray area out there and [Tucker] would like to take advantage of the gray

area.” According to another former assistant coach, Tucker promoted compliance primarily by having the compliance staff come speak to them. He reported that Tucker would tell the football staff, “[If] you all are doing something you ain’t supposed to be doing[, t]hat’s on you all. I’m not going to be able to save you.”

4. Enforcing Accountability and Turning Violations Into Lessons

Tucker stated that he took violations in his program seriously and terminated “multiple” staff members—unrelated to the conduct in this case—for failing to follow the rules. Following each incident, Tucker stated that he and his staff held compliance meetings to discuss what went wrong and how to prevent similar issues in the future. Tucker also claimed that he worked with compliance to study violations at other programs and used them as case studies to stay proactive rather than reactive. None of the football or compliance staff members interviewed for this case referenced these meetings or learning opportunities.

5. Proactively Identifying Red Flags

Tucker claimed that although his compliance system was designed to detect red flags early and prevent violations, Khalif and Jordan operated outside that system, committing “blatant, ‘red light’ infractions” that they chose to conceal. Tucker stated that, to his eye, nothing appeared out of the ordinary about the unofficial visits at issue in this case. He acknowledged that some prospects traveled long distances to visit Michigan State multiple times but said this did not raise any red flags for him with respect to how they funded these visits because he knew that prospects’ trainers often paid for unofficial visits. Tucker further claimed that questioning the prospects about how they funded the visits would have been inappropriate because it could be seen as “racial and socioeconomic profiling.” He stated that he did question his coaching and recruiting staff “religiously” regarding unofficial visits. None of the coaching or recruiting staff members interviewed for this case referenced Tucker questioning them about unofficial visits.

When asked during his interview how he monitored Khalif and other staff members as it related to unofficial visits, Tucker did not provide any examples other than his general direction to the staff that they needed to make sure they were following the rules. The enforcement staff asked a former recruiting staff member what Tucker was doing to monitor the recruiting staff from a rules standpoint, and the staff member responded, “Not much. I mean, I would say that was more on [Khalif’s] shoulder[s] and then I would have that same answer of also not much.”

IV. ANALYSIS

The violation in the contested portion of this case involved Tucker’s failure to meet his responsibilities as a head coach by promoting an atmosphere of compliance and monitoring his staff. Tucker’s head coach responsibility violation is Level I.

A. HEAD COACH RESPONSIBILITY [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaw 11.1.1.1 (2021-22 through 2022-23)]

Tucker is presumed responsible for the violations that occurred in his program from October 2021 through December 2022, and he did not rebut the presumption of responsibility. Specifically, Tucker did not demonstrate that he promoted an atmosphere of compliance in his program and monitored his staff. Additionally, Tucker is automatically responsible for the violations that occurred in his program from January through March 2023.⁸ Accordingly, Tucker violated NCAA head coach responsibility legislation. The violation is Level I.

1. NCAA legislation relating to head coach responsibility.⁹

Prior to January 1, 2023, Bylaw 11.1.1.1 established two affirmative duties for head coaches: (1) to promote an atmosphere of rules compliance and (2) to monitor those individuals in their programs who report to them either directly or indirectly. The bylaw presumed that head coaches are responsible for the actions of those who report to them. Head coaches could rebut the presumption of responsibility by demonstrating that they promoted an atmosphere of compliance and monitored the activities of their staff members. Effective January 1, 2023, however, Bylaw 11.1.1.1 holds coaches automatically responsible for any violations that occur within their programs, regardless of their efforts to promote compliance or monitor their staff members.

2. Tucker violated NCAA head coach responsibility legislation when he did not adequately monitor his staff's recruiting activities and failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance.

For more than a year and a half, Tucker's staff regularly violated NCAA recruiting legislation by impermissibly funding prospects' unofficial visits, providing or offering them other recruiting inducements, engaging in off-campus recruiting contact and providing impermissible transportation for enrollment. Tucker did not dispute that these violations occurred. He claimed, however, that he should not be held responsible for them—or, at most, should be held responsible only for a Level III violation—because he promoted compliance and monitored his staff. In making these arguments to the panel, Tucker said all the right things: that he encouraged his staff to go to compliance with questions, proactively looked for red flags, established a duty to report, made compliance a daily standard and led by example. But the factual record tells a different story of a head coach who over-relied on the people around him—particularly his general manager—while largely taking a hands-off approach to rules compliance.

In arguing that he promoted an atmosphere of compliance, Tucker relied heavily on his action of embedding a compliance officer within the football offices. To Tucker's credit, this was a positive

⁸ Because Tucker was not a party to the underlying recruiting allegations, they were not before the panel as part of Tucker's case. Yet, as discussed above, the panel still assessed the record information and concluded that credible and sufficient information demonstrated that the underlying recruiting violations occurred and were Level I. *See* Bylaw 19.7.2.

⁹ The full text of all bylaws cited in this case can be found at Appendix One.

preliminary step that provided a helpful resource for his staff. It did not, however, create a shield of immunity around Tucker for the ensuing violations that occurred in his program. As the NCAA Constitution makes clear, and as the COI has repeatedly emphasized, compliance is a shared responsibility. Thus, as the head coach, Tucker remained responsible for ensuring that his staff members were regularly consulting with compliance and following the rules.

To that end, Tucker frequently referenced the “red light/yellow light/green light” decision-making system he implemented in his program. But it appears his staff members were either unaware of this system or generally disregarded it. None of the staff members interviewed for this case referenced it, with some reporting that Tucker simply never mentioned or discussed rules compliance. It appears that the duty of promoting compliance was largely left to the compliance staff.

Simply put, there is very little in the record to support that Tucker was doing all the things he claimed to be doing to promote compliance. There is no documentation of the meetings he claimed he had with the compliance staff and his staff to discuss compliance issues. And the testimony of his staff members indicates that he was mostly uninvolved in specific day-to-day compliance issues.

Evidence of Tucker’s efforts to monitor his staff is similarly scant. Multiple staff members reported that, at Tucker’s direction, all off-field issues ran through Khalif in an NFL-style model. Multiple staff members also told the enforcement staff that they were not comfortable bringing concerns directly to Tucker, with one stating that Tucker “was never just available like that.” These staff members reported that they did not want to question the head coach or be viewed as a “snitch.” Thus, they did not go to Tucker with their concerns about Khalif’s arrangement of unofficial visits.¹⁰

Nor did Tucker proactively identify red flags surrounding these visits. He claimed that he “religiously” questioned his staff about unofficial visits, but nothing in the record supports this. Rather, the record demonstrates that Khalif oversaw all aspects of these visits with little to no involvement by Tucker. Although Tucker was aware that some of the prospects traveled great distances to visit campus multiple times, he did not inquire with the coaching staff, the prospects themselves, or the prospects’ families or trainers regarding the logistics of these visits.¹¹ In short, Tucker over-relied on Khalif when it came to recruiting and did not sufficiently monitor by asking follow-up questions or identifying potential areas of concern.

¹⁰ Although the deputy AD noted that Tucker’s staff reported “small” (*i.e.*, Level III) violations, the record indicates that they had substantial reservations when it came to reporting more significant violations.

¹¹ The panel is sensitive to the racial and socioeconomic concerns identified by Tucker. However, as head coach, he was ultimately responsible for the actions of his staff members and their involvement in bringing prospects to campus. If Tucker did not want to directly ask the prospects or those accompanying them how they got to campus, there were any number of ways he could have sought indirect confirmation that the logistics of their visits complied with NCAA rules (*e.g.*, check-in or end-of-visit reconciliation forms, etc.). In other words, simply not asking the question does not absolve a head coach of responsibility for the actions of his staff. *See University of Louisville* (2017).

Tucker’s actions and inaction align with the type of conduct that has supported head coach responsibility violations in past cases. For example, the COI has previously concluded that head coach responsibility violations occurred when head coaches delegated too much responsibility to their staff members without appropriate oversight. *See University of Oregon (2018)* (concluding the head men’s basketball coach over-relied on and failed to monitor his director of operations, who knowingly engaged in coaching activity violations while the head coach was away from campus on recruiting trips). Other head coach responsibility violations have occurred when head coaches did not look for red flags or ask probing questions of their staff. *See Auburn University (2021)* (concluding the head men’s basketball coach failed to monitor his associate head coach when he did not ask reasonable and pertinent questions once he became aware of a preexisting relationship between the associate head coach and a student-athlete and his mother). And in other cases, the COI has concluded that head coach responsibility violations occurred when head coaches created environments where staff members felt comfortable committing violations and uncomfortable reporting them. *See University of Tennessee, Knoxville (2023)* (concluding the head football coach failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance and monitor his staff when at least a dozen staff members were involved in over 200 recruiting violations and no one from the football staff reported any concerns or violations).

As in these cases, Tucker did not rebut the presumption of responsibility for the violations that occurred in his program prior to January 1, 2023. Although it is a high bar, head coaches have rebutted their presumed responsibility in limited circumstances where they identified potential red flags and took action to prevent violations from occurring and/or the violations occurred in unique, once-in-a-career circumstances. *See University of the Pacific (2017)* (concluding the head baseball coach rebutted the presumption by demonstrating that he sought input and approval from compliance before acting, and the violation resulted from a legitimate misunderstanding between the head coach and compliance) and *Wichita State University (2015)* (concluding that the head baseball coach’s one-time failure to ask follow-up questions regarding his administrative assistant’s impermissible benefit violation “d[id] not negate decades of monitoring his assistant and setting the proper atmosphere of compliance in his program”).

Here, by contrast, the violations were not limited and were not the result of a one-time lapse in judgment or a misunderstanding. Rather, the underlying violations occurred for more than a year and a half, included multiple members of Tucker’s staff, and involved intentional conduct by Khalif and Jordan. Likewise, there is no information that suggests Tucker identified the potential issue and brought it directly to Khalif or compliance prior to the violations occurring. The culture established by Tucker—which paid lip service to compliance without demonstrable action to back it up—allowed these violations to occur, and his lack of monitoring allowed them to continue. Under these circumstances, Tucker cannot rebut the presumption of responsibility for the violations that occurred prior to January 1, 2023. For the violations that occurred after that date, he is automatically responsible.

Pursuant to Bylaws 19.1.2-(e) and 19.1.3-(e), the level of a head coach responsibility violation is determined by the level of the underlying violations. Tucker’s head coach responsibility violation derives from underlying Level I conduct—specifically, impermissible unofficial visit expenses

and recruiting inducements and impermissible transportation for enrollment. Thus, consistent with Bylaw 19.1.2, the panel concludes that a Level I head coach responsibility violation occurred.

V. PENALTIES

For the reasons set forth in Sections III and IV of this decision, the panel concludes that Tucker's case involved a Level I violation of NCAA legislation. The panel determined the below-listed aggravating and mitigating factors applied and assessed the factors by weight and number. Unless otherwise noted, the panel applied the factors with traditional weight (*i.e.*, the panel did not afford the factors additional or less weight). Based on its assessment, the panel classifies Tucker's case as Level I-Standard.

Aggravating Factor

Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(d): Persons of authority condoned, participated in or negligently disregarded the violation or wrongful conduct.

Tucker contested the application of this factor, arguing that he set clear expectations for compliance within his program, actively looked for red flags and monitored his staff. As discussed above, however, Tucker did not demonstrate that he did any of these things. Rather, he ran all operations through Khalif and assumed—without verifying—that Khalif was following the rules. As it relates to unofficial visits, Tucker did not ask questions of his staff or the visiting prospects, and he did not identify any red flags when prospects made multiple long-distance trips to visit the institution. In short, Tucker, the ultimate person of authority within his program, disregarded the potential for violations.

The COI has previously applied this factor and its predecessor, Bylaw 19.9.3-(h), to head coaches who did not look for red flags, ask pertinent questions or follow up on potential areas of concern. *See Southern Illinois University at Carbondale* (2018) (applying the factor to the head swimming and diving coach, who was aware that his assistant coach was providing “fee-for-lesson” diving instruction to two international student-athletes but did not consult with compliance to determine whether this conduct was permissible); *University of Tennessee at Chattanooga* (2018) (applying the factor to the head men's tennis coach, who did not identify potential areas of concern or seek guidance from compliance regarding his student-athletes' off-campus living arrangements with a booster); and *Prairie View A&M University* (2017) (applying the factor to the head men's basketball coach, who ignored warning signs and failed to ask questions of his staff member regarding arrangements and payment for an online course a student-athlete needed for eligibility). Consistent with these cases, the factor applies to Tucker.

Mitigating Factor

Bylaw 19.12.4.2-(e): The absence of prior conclusions of Level I, Level II, or major violations by the involved individual.

Tucker agreed with the one mitigating factor identified by the enforcement staff, Bylaw 19.12.4.2-(e). The panel agrees that Bylaw 19.12.4.2-(e) applies, as this is Tucker’s first Level I, Level II or major violation.

Tucker also asked the panel to apply additional mitigation based on the following facts: (1) his lack of involvement in or knowledge of the underlying violations and (2) his voluntary participation in an interview with the enforcement staff.¹² The panel determines that these circumstances do not warrant additional mitigation.

First, with respect to Tucker’s lack of involvement in the violations, the COI has frequently considered and decided cases in which head coaches are not named in the underlying violations and are found responsible only for a Bylaw 11.1.1.1 head coach responsibility violation. The bylaw—both the current and former version—is intended to work in this way to hold head coaches accountable for the conduct that occurs in their programs regardless of whether they were directly involved in or aware of the violations.

Second, regarding Tucker’s participation in an interview, Bylaw 19.2.1 establishes an affirmative obligation for current and former institutional staff members to cooperate fully with and assist the enforcement staff to further the objectives of the Association and its infractions program. This obligation includes timely participation in interviews. *See* Bylaw 19.2.1-(d). Thus, Tucker met but did not exceed his legislated responsibility. The COI has never awarded mitigation based on lack of involvement in the underlying violations or fulfilling the obligation to cooperate and declines to do so here.

Penalties for Level I-Standard Violation

1. **Show-Cause Order:** Tucker is responsible for the violations that occurred in his program for over a year and a half, and he did not rebut the presumption of responsibility. Specifically, he failed to demonstrate that he promoted an atmosphere of compliance and monitored his staff. Accordingly, Tucker shall be subject to a three-year show-cause order from **November 12, 2025**, through **November 11, 2028**. In accordance with Bylaw 19.12.6.4 and COI Internal Operating Procedure (IOP) 5-16-1, any institution employing Tucker during the three-year show-cause period shall restrict him from all athletically related activities. Any NCAA member institution employing Tucker during the three-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:** Should Tucker become employed in an athletically related position at an NCAA member institution during the three-year show-cause period, the employing institution shall suspend him from 30 percent of the first season of his employment. Because the show-cause order restricts Tucker from all athletically related activity, the

¹² Although Tucker did not specifically reference a legislated mitigating factor, presumably he intended the panel to consider these facts under Bylaw 19.12.4.2-(g), *Other facts warranting a lower penalty range*.

suspension is subsumed within the show-cause order. The provisions of this suspension require that Tucker not be present in the facility where the contests occur and have no contact or communication with football coaching staff members or student-athletes during the suspension period. The prohibition includes all coaching activities for the period of time that begins at 12:01 a.m. on the day of the first contest and ends at 11:59 p.m. on the day of the last contest. During that period, Tucker may not participate in any coaching activities, including, but not limited to team travel, practice, video study, recruiting and team meetings. The results of those contests from which Tucker is suspended shall not count toward his career coaching record.¹³

The COI advises Tucker to take every precaution to ensure that he or any employing institution observes the terms of the show-cause order and suspension. The COI will monitor Tucker during the effective period. Any action by Tucker contrary to the terms of the penalties or any additional violations will cause the COI to consider prescribing more severe penalties or may result in additional allegations and violations.

NCAA DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS

Norman Bay
Bryan Blair
Jody Conradt
Richard Ensor, chief hearing officer
Jeremy Jordan
Kay Norton
Amy Parsons

¹³ In January 2024, the membership adopted individual accountability reforms that, among other things, expanded how and to whom show-cause orders and suspensions apply. Prior to the adoption of these reforms, head coaches who were not involved in underlying violations were subject only to suspensions. Thus, case guidance is limited as it relates to penalties for Tucker's violation. The panel applies the Figure 19-1 penalty guidelines consistent with the Level I-Standard classification of Tucker's case.

APPENDIX ONE
Bylaw Citations

Division I Manual 2021-2022

11.1.1.1 Responsibility of Head Coach. An institution's head coach is presumed to be responsible for the actions of all institutional staff members who report, directly or indirectly, to the head coach. An institution's head coach shall promote an atmosphere of compliance within the program and shall monitor the activities of all institutional staff members involved with the program who report, directly or indirectly, to the coach.

Division I Manual 2022-2023

11.1.1.1 Responsibility of Head Coach (pre-January 1, 2023). An institution's head coach is presumed to be responsible for the actions of all institutional staff members who report, directly or indirectly, to the head coach. An institution's head coach shall promote an atmosphere of compliance within the program and shall monitor the activities of all institutional staff members involved with the program who report, directly or indirectly, to the coach.

11.1.1.1 Responsibility of Head Coach (effective January 1, 2023). An institution's head coach shall be held responsible for the head coach's actions and the actions of all institutional staff members who report, directly or indirectly, to the head coach. In order to assist the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions in penalty deliberations, the enforcement staff will gather information regarding whether the head coach promoted an atmosphere of compliance within the program and monitored the activities of all institutional staff members involved with the program who report, directly or indirectly, to the coach.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION¹

Michigan State University – Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

I. CASE SYNOPSIS

Michigan State University (Michigan State) and the NCAA enforcement staff agree with the violations and penalties detailed below. Brandon Jordan (Jordan), former assistant football coach, and Saeed Khalif (Khalif), former football general manager/executive director of player personnel and recruiting, are nonparticipating parties. The parties also agree that this case should be resolved as Level I-Mitigated for the institution. The enforcement staff believes this case should be resolved as Level I-Aggravated for Jordan and Khalif.

This case originated in July 2023 when the institution self-reported a violation related to Khalif providing impermissible hotel lodging to a football prospective student-athlete, his father and trainer while on an unofficial visit to the institution's campus in January 2023. In late August 2023, the enforcement staff received information involving potential impermissible recruiting activities by the Michigan State football program related to other prospective student-athletes that were similar in nature to the violation initially self-reported. At the time, the institution and enforcement staff began a collaborative investigation.

The investigation substantiated the self-reported violation and developed facts that verified additional violations within the football program during the 2021-22 and 2022-23 academic years. The additional violations included: (a) impermissible recruiting inducements and unofficial visit expenses to, and impermissible contacts with, at least six then football prospective student-athletes and their respective family members, friends and/or individuals associated with the prospective student-athletes (IAWP); and (b) impermissible airfare transportation to enroll at the institution for three football student-athletes and their parents.

Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact Nos. 1 and 2 identify the substantive violations of Jordan's, Khalif's and other staff member's arrangement and/or provision of impermissible inducements and benefits to various prospective student-athletes and their parents, family members or trainers to visit the institution's campus or enroll at the institution. Beyond the underlying violations, Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact Nos. 3 through 5 include: (a) Khalif's unethical conduct violation for his knowing provision of the impermissible inducements and benefits; (b) head coach responsibility violation for Mel Tucker (Tucker), then head football coach; and (c) the institution's failure to monitor violation. Lastly, there are two post-separation violations for Jordan's and Khalif's failure to cooperate with the investigation.

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.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Michigan State University - Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

Page No. 2

Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 1.

From October 2021 through March 2023, Khalif, and at times Jordan and other football staff members, arranged for and/or provided impermissible unofficial visit expenses for and/or inducements to six then football prospective student-athletes. The inducements primarily consisted of airfare that Khalif arranged through a travel agent, whom he later reimbursed for the purchase, and hotel lodging for the prospects and/or their companions. Flight, hotel, bank and telephone records and individual reports from the prospects, their family members and the travel agent confirm the impermissible inducements.

Five of the prospects and their companions received impermissible airfare, and all of the prospects received impermissible hotel lodging for their unofficial visits. Two of the prospects received free lodging during two visits.

Additionally, Khalif and the football program provided additional inducements to prospects. Khalif offered to pay for a prospect's family vacations so that prospect would not go on official visits to other institutions and paid a prospect's trainer \$700 to attend a visit with the prospect. Another prospect received university-branded merchandise from a football staff member.

Finally, five of the visits resulted in impermissible off-campus contact by staff members who picked the visitors up at the airport and transported them to East Lansing, Michigan.

Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 2.

In January 2022, Khalif also arranged for and/or provided airfare transportation for three prospective student-athletes to enroll at Michigan State for the spring semester. Two of the prospects were transferring from other member institutions and the third was entering as a freshman. Khalif arranged for a travel agent to book one-way airfare for each prospect and roundtrip airfare for the respective prospect's parent(s). He then reimbursed the travel agent for the flight purchases. Flight, bank, email and telephone records and individual reports from a prospect, his father and the travel agent confirm the impermissible benefits.

Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 3 and Khalif's Post-Separation Finding of Fact No. 1.

Between October 2021 and March 2022, Khalif violated ethical conduct legislation when he knowingly arranged for and/or provided numerous impermissible recruiting inducements and benefits to at least nine prospective student-athletes, as detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact Nos. 1 and 2. The provision of inducements and benefits was intentional, substantial, repetitive and intended to gain a significant advantage.

Additionally, Khalif failed to cooperate with the enforcement staff's investigation by not participating in an interview and failing to make a full and complete disclosure of relevant information. Specifically, in May 2024, the enforcement staff first requested an interview with

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Michigan State University - Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

Page No. 3

Khalif. After multiple attempts to schedule an interview, Khalif declined the interview request on July 24. Additionally, in December 2024, the enforcement staff requested relevant materials from Khalif; however, he failed to produce his unredacted bank records as requested.

Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 4.²

From October 2021 through December 2022, Tucker, then head football coach, did not demonstrate that he promoted an atmosphere for compliance within the football program. Numerous members of Tucker's football staff were involved in multiple violations over a two-year period. Additionally, many other staff members knew or believed that impermissible activity was occurring, but no member of Tucker's staff notified any administrator at Michigan State of potential violations. This shows Tucker failed to demonstrate that compliance was a shared responsibility, set clear expectations that all football staff members comply with NCAA rules and establish a program that included immediate reporting of actual and potential issues.

Additionally, Tucker failed to demonstrate he effectively monitored the football staff as multiple staff members committed numerous recruiting violations involving high-profile prospective student-athletes' unofficial visits. Tucker did not actively look for red flags or ask questions of his staff, the prospective student-athletes or their companions related to how the respective unofficial visits were paid for or arranged.

Lastly, Tucker is responsible for the violations detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 1-f that occurred in January and March 2023.

Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 5.

From October 2021 through March 2023, the institution failed to adequately monitor the football program's arrangement of the unofficial visits in its football program to ensure compliance with NCAA recruiting legislation. The institution's monitoring processes did not deter or detect the identified violations in the football program that occurred over two academic years. The institution did not obtain documentation relating to who provided or paid for transportation and/or lodging for the unofficial visits. Additionally, multiple football staff members were either involved in the violations or had reason to believe that impermissible activity was occurring, and none of those football staff members reported any potential issues to compliance staff or other administrators.

Jordan's Post-Separation Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 1.

Jordan failed to cooperate with the enforcement staff's investigation by not participating in an interview and by failing to make a disclosure of relevant requested materials. In April 2024, the enforcement staff requested relevant materials and an interview with Jordan. The enforcement staff

² Tucker is processing his case through written record hearing and the enforcement staff issued a notice of allegations April 29, 2025.

made multiple subsequent attempts by email, text message and telephone to schedule the requested interview and follow-up on the records request; however, Jordan never responded to the staff's requests.

II. PARTIES' AGREEMENTS

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

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 13.2.1.1-(b) (2021-22); 13.02.5.2, 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.2.1.1-(h), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.3.1, 13.7.3.1.4 and 13.7.5 (2021-22 and 2022-23); and 13.8.1 (2022-23)] (Level I)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that from October 30, 2021, through at least March 18, 2023, Jordan, Khalif and/or other members of the football staff offered, arranged for and/or provided approximately \$10,764 in impermissible recruiting inducements and unofficial visit expenses to and had impermissible contacts with at least six football prospective student-athletes and their respective family members, friends and/or IAWPs.³ Specifically:

- a. From October 30, 2021, through December 6, 2022, Khalif and/or other members of the football staff knowingly offered, arranged for and/or provided \$1,752 in impermissible inducements to then football prospective student-athlete (Prospect 1) and/or his family and friends in the form of unofficial visit expenses and offers of family vacations. Specifically:
 - (1) On or about October 30, 2021, Khalif knowingly arranged for and/or provided impermissible hotel lodging for Prospect 1 and his father for an October 30 and 31, 2021, unofficial visit to the institution. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(h) and 13.7.3.1 (2021-22)]
 - (2) During the spring/summer of 2022 after Prospect 1 verbally committed to Michigan State, Khalif offered to pay for Prospect 1's family vacations in lieu of Prospect 1 going on official visits to other collegiate institutions. [NCAA Bylaw 13.2.1 (2021-22)]
 - (3) On or about September 28, 2022, Khalif knowingly arranged for and paid a travel agent to book impermissible roundtrip airfare for Prospect 1 and two friends from Houston, Texas, to Grand Rapids, Michigan, for an October 8 and 9 unofficial visit. On October 8 and 9, Prospect 1 and his two friends took the purchased flights. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.3.1 and 13.7.3.1.4 (2022-23)]

³ Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.10.2.1, the enforcement staff shall include the violations and penalties related to any party not participating in the case.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Michigan State University - Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

Page No. 5

- (4) On October 8 and 9, 2022, during an evaluation period, a member of the football staff had impermissible off-campus contact outside of one mile of campus boundaries and provided impermissible roundtrip transportation to Prospect 1 and his two friends between Gerald R. Ford International Airport in Grand Rapids and the institution's campus for Prospect 1's unofficial visit. [NCAA Bylaws 13.02.5.2, 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.3.1, 13.7.3.1.4 and 13.7.5 (2022-23)]
 - (5) On October 8, 2022, Khalif knowingly arranged for and/or provided Prospect 1 and his two friends one night of impermissible lodging for two rooms at a hotel in East Lansing for Prospect 1's October 8 and 9 unofficial visit. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(h) and 13.7.3.1 (2022-23)]
- b. For an April 15 through 17, 2022, unofficial visit for then football prospective student-athlete (Prospect 2), Khalif and/or other members of the football staff knowingly arranged for and/or provided approximately \$2,477 in impermissible recruiting inducements to Prospect 2 and his father in the form of unofficial visit expenses. Additionally, Khalif provided Prospect 2's trainer, who also visited the institution at that time, with \$700. Specifically:
- (1) On or about April 6, Khalif knowingly arranged for and paid a travel agent to book impermissible airfare, including preferred zone seating, for Prospect 2 and his father to fly from Houston, Texas, to Grand Rapids, Michigan, for Prospect 2's unofficial visit. On April 15, Prospect 2 and his father took the purchased flights. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.3.1 and 13.7.3.1.4 (2021-22)]
 - (2) On or about April 15, Khalif knowingly arranged for and/or provided two nights of impermissible lodging for two rooms, including the presidential suite, at a hotel in East Lansing for Prospect 2 and his father for Prospect 2's unofficial visit. One night of hotel rooms was paid in cash on April 15 and the other night was paid in cash on April 30. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(h) and 13.7.3.1 (2021-22)]
 - (3) On April 15, during an evaluation period, a member of the football staff had impermissible off-campus contact outside of one mile of campus boundaries when the staff member provided impermissible transportation to Prospect 2 and his father from Gerald R. Ford International Airport in Grand Rapids to the Marriott East Lansing for Prospect 2's unofficial visit. [NCAA Bylaws 13.02.5.2, 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.2.1, 13.7.3.1.4 and 13.7.5 (2021-22)]

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Michigan State University - Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

Page No. 6

- (4) On or about April 16, Khalif knowingly arranged for and paid a travel agent to book impermissible airfare, including preferred zone seating, for Prospect 2 and his father to fly from Detroit, Michigan, to Houston to conclude Prospect 2's unofficial visit. On April 17, Prospect 2 and his father took the purchased flights. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.3.1 and 13.7.3.1.4 (2021-22)]
 - (5) On or about April 18, Khalif provided Prospect 2's trainer impermissible material benefits in the form of \$700 via a mobile payment app. [NCAA Bylaws 13.8.1 and 13.8.2 (2021-22)]
- c. For an April 15 through 17, 2022, unofficial visit for then football prospective student-athlete (Prospect 3), Khalif and/or Jordan, knowingly arranged for and/or provided approximately \$1,750 in impermissible recruiting inducements to Prospect 3 and his grandfather in the form of unofficial visit expenses. Additionally, during the visit, a member of the football staff provided Prospect 3 university-branded merchandise. Specifically:
- (1) On or about April 6, Jordan and Khalif arranged for and paid a travel agent to book impermissible departure airfare, including preferred zone seating, for Prospect 3 and his grandfather to fly from Houston, Texas, to Grand Rapids, Michigan, for Prospect 3's unofficial visit. On April 11, Jordan provided Prospect 3 the one-way flight ticketing information. On April 15, Prospect 3 and his grandfather took the purchased flights. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.3.1 and 13.7.3.1.4 (2021-22)]
 - (2) On or about April 16, a member of the football staff provided Prospect 3 with a university-branded jacket. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1 and 13.2.1.1-(b) (2021-22)]
 - (3) On or about April 16, Jordan arranged for impermissible transportation from East Lansing to Gerald R. Ford International Airport in Grand Rapids for Prospect 3 and his grandfather to take their one-way return flight on April 17 to conclude Prospect 3's unofficial visit. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.2.1 and 13.7.3.1.4 (2021-22)]
 - (4) On or about April 16, Jordan and Khalif arranged for and paid a travel agent to book impermissible return airfare for Prospect 3 and his grandfather to fly from Grand Rapids to Houston to conclude Prospect 3's unofficial visit. Additionally, Jordan provided Prospect 3 the one-way flight ticketing information. On April 17, Prospect 3 and his grandfather took the purchased flights. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.3.1 and 13.7.3.1.4 (2021-22)]

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Michigan State University - Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

Page No. 7

- d. For an October 8 and 9, 2022, unofficial visit for then football prospective student-athlete (Prospect 4), Khalif and/or other members of the football staff knowingly arranged for and/or provided approximately \$735 in impermissible recruiting inducements to Prospect 4 in the form of unofficial visit expenses. Specifically:
- (1) On or about October 3, Khalif arranged for and paid a travel agent to book impermissible roundtrip airfare for Prospect 4 to fly from Houston, Texas, to Grand Rapids, Michigan, for Prospect 4's unofficial visit. On October 8 and 9, Prospect 4 took the purchased flights. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.3.1 and 13.7.3.1.4 (2022-23)]
 - (2) On October 8 and 9, 2022, during an evaluation period, a member of the football staff had impermissible off-campus contact outside of one mile of campus boundaries and provided impermissible roundtrip transportation to Prospect 4 between Gerald R. Ford International Airport in Grand Rapids and the institution's campus for Prospect 4's unofficial visit. [NCAA Bylaws 13.02.5.2, 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.3.1, 13.7.3.1.4 and 13.7.5 (2022-23)]
 - (3) On October 8, 2022, Khalif knowingly arranged for and/or provided Prospect 4 one night of impermissible lodging at a hotel in East Lansing for Prospect 4's unofficial visit.⁴ [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(h) and 13.7.3.1 (2022-23)]
- e. For an October 15 and 16, 2022, unofficial visit for then football prospective student-athlete (Prospect 5), Khalif and/or other members of the football staff knowingly arranged for and/or provided approximately \$1,813 in impermissible recruiting inducements to Prospect 5 and his mother in the form of unofficial visit expenses. Specifically:
- (1) On or about October 11, Khalif arranged for and paid a travel agent to book impermissible airfare for Prospect 5 and his mother to fly from Dallas, Texas, to Detroit, Michigan, for Prospect 5's unofficial visit. On October 15 and 16, Prospect 5 and his mother took the purchased flights. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.3.1 and 13.7.3.1.4 (2022-23)]
 - (2) On October 15 and 16, during an evaluation period, a member of the football staff had impermissible off-campus contact outside of one mile of campus boundaries and provided impermissible roundtrip transportation to Prospect 5 and his mother between Detroit Wayne County Airport and the institution's campus during Prospect 5's unofficial visit. [NCAA Bylaws 13.02.5.2, 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(g), 13.5.1, 13.5.3, 13.7.3.1, 13.7.3.1.4 and 13.7.5 (2022-23)]

⁴ As Prospect 4 was the fourth occupant for the two rooms identified in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 1-a-(5).

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Michigan State University - Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

Page No. 8

- (3) On October 15, 2022, Khalif arranged for and/or provided Prospect 5 and his mother one night of impermissible lodging at a hotel in East Lansing during Prospect 5's unofficial visit. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(h) and 13.7.3.1 (2022-23)]
- f. From January 14 through March 18, 2023, Khalif knowingly arranged for and/or provided then football prospective student-athlete (Prospect 6) approximately \$2,237 in impermissible recruiting inducements in the form of unofficial visit expenses. Specifically:
 - (1) On or about January 14, Khalif arranged for and provided impermissible lodging for Prospect 6, his father and his trainer at a hotel in East Lansing for Prospect 6's January 14 and 15 unofficial visit to the institution. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(h), 13.7.3.1 and 13.8.1 (2022-23)]
 - (2) On March 15, Khalif arranged for and provided two nights of impermissible lodging for two rooms for Prospect 6 and his father at a hotel in East Lansing for Prospect 6's March 16 through 18 unofficial visit to the institution. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(h) and 13.7.3.1 (2022-23)]
2. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 13.5.2.6 and 13.5.4 (2021-22) and 12.11.1 (2022-23 through 2024-25)] (Level I)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that from January 3 through 6, 2022, Khalif knowingly arranged for and/or provided approximately \$3,075 in impermissible recruiting benefits in the form of one-way air transportation to enroll at the institution to three football prospective student-athletes and roundtrip air transportation to their respective family members. As a result of the impermissible benefits, three student-athletes competed in 26 contests while ineligible. Specifically:

- a. On or about January 3, 2022, Khalif knowingly arranged for a travel agent to purchase a one-way flight for then transfer football prospective student-athlete (Prospect 7) and a roundtrip flight for Prospect 7's mother to enroll Prospect 7 at the institution for the spring of 2022 semester. The value of the impermissible transportation expenses was approximately \$580. Khalif reimbursed the travel agent for the flight purchases. [NCAA Bylaws 13.5.2.6 and 13.5.4 (2021-22)]
- b. On or about January 3, 2022, Khalif knowingly arranged for a travel agent to purchase a one-way flight for then transfer football prospective student-athlete (Prospect 8) and roundtrip flights for Prospect 8's parents to enroll Prospect 8 at the institution for the spring

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Michigan State University - Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

Page No. 9

of 2022 semester. The value of the impermissible transportation expenses was approximately \$1,348. Khalif reimbursed the travel agent for the flight purchases. [NCAA Bylaws 13.5.2.6 and 13.5.4 (2021-22)]

- c. On or about January 6, 2022, Khalif knowingly arranged for a travel agent to purchase a one-way flight for then football prospective student-athlete (Prospect 9) and roundtrip flights for Prospect 9's parents to enroll Prospect 9 at the institution for the spring of 2022 semester. The value of the impermissible transportation expenses was approximately \$1,147. Khalif reimbursed the travel agent for the flight purchases. [NCAA Bylaws 13.5.2.6 and 13.5.4 (2021-22)]
3. [NCAA Division I Bylaws 10.01.1, 10.1 and 10.1-(b) (2021-22 through 2022-23) and 10.1-(a) (as of January 2023)] (Level I)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that from October 2021 through March 2023, Khalif violated the NCAA principles of ethical conduct when he knowingly offered, arranged for and/or provided multiple football prospective student-athletes with impermissible recruiting inducements or benefits in the form of airfare, hotel lodging and/or transportation for their respective unofficial visits and/or to enroll at the institution, as detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact Nos. 1 and 2.

4. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaw 11.1.1.1 (2021-22 through 2022-23)]⁵ (Level I)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that from October 2021 through December 2022, Tucker is presumed responsible for the violations detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact Nos. 1-a through 1-e and 2 and did not rebut the presumption of responsibility. Specifically, Tucker did not demonstrate that he monitored his staff or promoted an atmosphere of compliance within the football program when multiple football staff members were involved in numerous violations of NCAA legislation over a multiple year time period, as detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact Nos. 1 and 2. Tucker failed to demonstrate that compliance was a shared responsibility, set clear expectations that all football staff members comply with NCAA rules and establish a program that included immediate reporting of actual and potential issues to the compliance staff. Further, Tucker failed to actively look for red flags and/or ask questions of his staff, prospective student-athletes or their companions related to how the respective unofficial visits were paid for or arranged. Additionally, from January 2023 through March 2023, Tucker is responsible for the violations detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 1-f.

⁵ Effective for NCAA violations occurring on or after January 1, 2023, Bylaw 11.1.1.1 was amended to remove the rebuttable presumption from head coach responsibility, making whether the head coach promoted compliance and/ or monitored the program relevant to penalty determinations only. Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 1 involves violations that occurred prior to and after January 1, 2023.

5. [NCAA Division I Manual Constitution 2.8.1 (2021-22) and Bylaw 8.01.3 (2022-23)] (Level II)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that from October 2021 through March 2023, the scope and nature of the violations detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact Nos. 1 and 2 demonstrate that the institution failed to adequately monitor the football program's arrangement of unofficial visits to ensure compliance with NCAA recruiting legislation. Specifically, during the period of the violations, there was not a culture of compliance created within the football program to deter then football staff members from committing numerous recruiting violations, or empower staff members to immediately report actual and/or potential violations to the compliance staff. Further, the institution did not obtain documentation related to who provided or paid for transportation and/or lodging for the identified unofficial visits within the football program. Additionally, although the initial unofficial visit violation concerning Khalif was detected and self-reported, the institution's monitoring processes did not deter or detect the additional violations in a timely manner.

B. Post-separation findings of fact, violations of NCAA legislation and violation levels.⁶ [Jordan]

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 19.2.1, 19.2.1-(d), 19.2.1-(e), 19.2.2, 19.2.2-(a) and 19.2.2-(b) (2023-24 and 2024-25)] (Level I)

It is uncontested that from April 2, 2024, and continuing to the present, after his employment with Michigan State ended, Jordan failed to cooperate with the enforcement staff when he refused to participate in an interview and provide information relevant to an investigation of potential violations despite multiple attempts to secure his participation. Specifically, on April 2, 2024, the enforcement staff requested to interview Jordan through his then employer (another member institution) and informed him that a records request would be forthcoming. On April 11, the enforcement staff provided Jordan a records request for relevant materials with a deadline of April 24. Shortly after the initial requests, Jordan ceased employment at the other member institution. On May 9 via a telephone call, the enforcement staff again requested that Jordan participate in an interview and produce the requested records. Additionally, the enforcement staff made multiple subsequent attempts by email, text message and telephone to schedule the requested interview and follow-up on the April 11 records request; however, Jordan never responded to the enforcement staff's requests.

⁶ The post-separation violations occurred while Jordan, who is not participating in the case, was not employed at the institution and do not attach to the institution.

C. Post-separation findings of fact, violations of NCAA legislation and violation levels.⁷ [Khalif]

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 19.2.1, 19.2.1-(d), 19.2.1-(e), 19.2.2, 19.2.2-(a) and 19.2.2-(b) (2023-24 and 2024-25)] (Level I)

It is uncontested that from May 28, 2024, and continuing to the present, after his employment with Michigan State ended, Khalif failed to cooperate with the enforcement staff when he refused to participate in an interview and provide information relevant to an investigation of potential violations despite multiple attempts to secure his participation. Specifically, during a May 28, 2024, telephone call, the enforcement staff requested to interview Khalif. After multiple follow-ups by the enforcement staff to schedule the requested interview, on July 24, 2024, Khalif declined to be interviewed. On December 10, 2024, the enforcement staff provided Khalif a records request for relevant materials with a deadline of January 3, 2025. On December 30, 2024, Khalif requested additional time to obtain the requested records, and the enforcement staff extended the deadline to January 17, 2025. On January 31, 2025, Khalif produced a portion of the requested documents, and the enforcement staff reiterated its request for any outstanding records. To date, Khalif has not produced unredacted copies of his bank records.

D. 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 I – Mitigated for the institution and Level I – Aggravated for Jordan and Khalif.

In reaching a mitigated classification for the institution, the parties acknowledged the institution investigated and reported the initial violation in the case and worked collaboratively with the enforcement staff to identify other similar violations that occurred over a broader time period, including encouraging parties with no obligation under NCAA rules to participate in the process and provide relevant records allowing for a thorough and complete investigation. Further, it proposed and accepted meaningful penalties that reflect its acceptance of responsibility for the violations.

⁷ The post-separation violations occurred while Khalif, who is not participating in the case, was not employed at the institution and do not attach to the institution.

Institution:

1. Aggravating factors (Bylaw 19.12.3.1).⁸
 - a. Multiple Level I and/or Level II violations for which the institution is responsible [Bylaw 19.12.3.1-(a)].
 - b. Violations were premeditated, deliberate or committed after substantial planning [Bylaw 19.12.3.1-(d)].
 - c. Persons of authority condoned, participated in or negligently disregarded the violations or related wrongful conduct [Bylaw 19.12.3.1-(e)].
 - d. Intentional, willful or blatant disregard for NCAA bylaws by a person with institutionally derived authority [Bylaw 19.12.3.1-(i)].
2. Mitigating factors (Bylaw 19.12.4.1).
 - a. Prompt self-disclosure of the violations [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(a)].
 - b. Prompt acknowledgement and acceptance of responsibility for the violations [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(b)].
 - c. Affirmative steps to expedite final resolution of the matter, including timely submission of a negotiated resolution pursuant to Bylaw 19.10 [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(d)].
 - d. An established history of self-reporting Level III or secondary violations [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(e)].⁹
 - e. The absence of prior conclusions of Level I, Level II or major violations within the past 10 years [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(g)].
 - f. Securing the meaningful cooperation of an individual who does not have an affirmative obligation to cooperate under Bylaw 19.2.1 [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(h)].

⁸ Despite the parties' agreement that the violations in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 2 resulted in ineligible competition, the COI hearing panel notes that the parties did not identify Bylaw 19.12.3.1-(f), *One or more violations caused ineligible competition*, as an aggravating factor for the institution. Historically, Bylaw 19.12.3.1-(f) applies when ineligible competition occurs. Due to the weight and number of the institution's agreed-upon aggravating and mitigating factors, it does not appear that the addition of this factor would have a material impact on the institution's classification or penalties—including the vacation of records penalty, which Michigan State agreed is appropriate. Thus, the panel defers to the parties' agreement. In future cases involving ineligible competition, however, the COI anticipates that any NR will either include this factor or provide an explanation as to why it should not apply.

⁹ The institution reported 42 Level III or secondary violations from 2020 to 2025, approximately eight violations each year.

Involved Individual (Jordan):

1. Aggravating factors (Bylaw 19.12.3.2).
 - a. Multiple Level I and/or Level II violations [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(a)].
 - b. Failing or refusing to take all appropriate steps outlined in Bylaw 19.2.1 to advance resolution of the matter, including steps that hinder or thwart the institution and/or enforcement staff's investigation [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(b)].
 - c. Violations were premeditated, deliberate or committed after substantial planning [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(c)].
 - d. Persons of authority condoned, participated in or negligently disregarded the violations or related wrongful conduct [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(d)].
 - e. Conduct or circumstances demonstrating an abuse of a position of trust [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(f)].
 - f. Intentional, willful or blatant disregard for NCAA bylaws [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(i)].
2. Mitigating factor (Bylaw 19.12.4.2).

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

Involved Individual (Khalif):

1. Aggravating factors (Bylaw 19.12.3.2).¹⁰
 - a. Multiple Level I and/or Level II violations [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(a)].
 - b. Failing or refusing to take all appropriate steps outlined in Bylaw 19.2.1 to advance resolution of the matter, including steps that hinder or thwart the institution and/or enforcement staff's investigation [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(b)].

¹⁰ Despite the parties' agreement that the violations in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 2 resulted in ineligible competition, the COI hearing panel notes that the NCAA enforcement staff did not identify Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(e), *One or more violations caused ineligible competition*, as an aggravating factor for Khalif. Historically, Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(e) applies when ineligible competition occurs. Due to the weight and number of Khalif's aggravating and mitigating factors, it does not appear that the addition of this factor would have a material impact on the classification of his case or corresponding penalties. Thus, the panel defers to the NR. In future cases involving ineligible competition, however, the COI anticipates that any NR will either include this factor or provide an explanation as to why it should not apply.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Michigan State University - Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

Page No. 14

- c. Violations were premeditated, deliberate or committed after substantial planning [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(c)].
 - d. Persons of authority condoned, participated in or negligently disregarded the violations or related wrongful conduct [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(d)].
 - e. A pattern of noncompliance within the sport program involved [NCAA Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(g)].
 - f. Intentional, willful or blatant disregard for NCAA bylaws [Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(i)].
2. Mitigating factor (Bylaw 19.12.4.2).

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

III. OTHER VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLTATION SUBSTANTIATED; NOT ALLEGED

None.

IV. REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES

None.

V. PARTIES' AGREED-UPON PENALTIES¹¹

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.

¹¹ 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 COI aware of the impossibility and must complete the penalty at the next available opportunity.

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

Core Penalties for Level I – Mitigated Violations (Bylaw 19.12.7)

1. Probation: Three years of probation from **September 25, 2025**, through **September 24, 2028**.
2. Financial Penalty: The institution shall pay a fine of \$30,000 plus 1.5% of the budget for the football program.¹²
3. Recruiting Restrictions (Official Visits): The institution shall prohibit official paid visits in football for two home games during the 2025 football season and one home game during each of the 2026 and 2027 football seasons. This is an approximate reduction of 16 official visits, or 10%, during the time period based on the previously permitted 56 annual official visits.
4. Recruiting Restrictions (Unofficial Visits): The institution shall prohibit unofficial visits in football during the 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28 academic years by a total of 12 weeks. Two weeks will be prohibited during each academic year with the remainder to be implemented at the institution's discretion. At least one week each year shall coincide with a home game. (The institution shall be credited for its self-imposed two-week restriction on unofficial visits in the spring of 2025.)
5. Recruiting Restrictions (Communications): The institution shall prohibit recruiting communications in football for a total of six weeks during the 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28 academic years, to be implemented at the institution's discretion.
6. Recruiting Restrictions (Off-Campus): The institution shall reduce the number of permissible recruiting person days in football during the 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28 academic years by a total of 30 over the three-year period. (The institution shall be credited for its self-imposed reduction of recruiting person days in spring 2025 by five days.) Additionally, the institution shall prohibit off-campus recruiting contacts and evaluations in football for one week during each of the 2025-26, 2026-27 and 2027-28 academic years.

Core Penalties for Level I – Aggravated Violations (Bylaw 19.12.7)

7. Show-cause: Jordan violated well-known NCAA recruiting legislation when he arranged for impermissible inducements for prospective student-athletes to visit the institution and failed to satisfy his responsibility to cooperate when he refused to interview with, or provide requested materials to, the enforcement staff. Therefore,

¹² The fine from the program budget must be calculated in accordance with COI Internal Operating Procedures Nos. 5-15-6 and 5-15-6-1.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Michigan State University - Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

Page No. 16

Jordan shall be subject to a five-year show-cause order from **September 25, 2025**, through **September 24, 2030**. In accordance with Bylaw 19.12.7.4 and Committee on Infractions Internal Operating Procedure (IOP) 5-15-5, any employing member institution shall restrict Jordan from all athletically related activity during the show-cause period. Any member institution that employs Jordan in an athletically related position during the five-year show-cause period, shall abide by the terms of the show-cause order unless it contacts the Office of the Committees on Infractions (OCOI) to make arrangements to show cause why the terms of the order should not apply.

8. Suspension: Bylaw 19.12.7.5 and Figure 19-1 penalty guidelines contemplate suspensions. Therefore, any member institution that employs Jordan in an athletically related position shall suspend Jordan from 100% of the football regular season contests during the first season of employment within the show-cause period. This suspension corresponds with 12 regular season contests. The provisions of this suspension apply to all athletically related duties and require that Jordan not be present with or have contact or communication with football coaching staff members or student-athletes during the suspension period. The suspension begins on the date of the first scheduled contest of the championship segment. The prohibition includes all coaching activities for the suspension period that begins at 12:01 a.m. on the day of the first contest and ends at 11:59 p.m. on the day of the last contest. During the suspension period, Jordan may not participate in any coaching activities, including, but not limited to, team travel, practice, video study, recruiting and team meetings. Any employing institution may not utilize Bylaw 11.02.2.1 to replace Jordan on a temporary basis during the period of suspension. The results of those contests from which Jordan 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.
9. Show-cause: Khalif violated well-known NCAA recruiting legislation when he arranged for impermissible inducements for prospective student-athletes to visit the institution and failed to satisfy his responsibility to cooperate when he refused to interview with, or provide requested materials to, the enforcement staff. Therefore, Khalif shall be subject to a six-year show-cause order from **September 25, 2025**, through **September 24, 2031**. In accordance with Bylaw 19.12.7.4 and Committee on Infractions IOP 5-15-5, any employing member institution shall restrict Khalif from all athletically related activity during the show-cause period. Any member institution that employs Khalif in an athletically related position during the six-year show-cause period, shall abide by the terms of the show-cause order unless it contacts the OCOI to make arrangements to show cause why the terms of the order should not apply.

10. Suspension: Bylaw 19.12.7.5 and Figure 19-1 penalty guidelines contemplate suspensions. Therefore, any member institution that employes Khalif in an athletically related position shall suspend Khalif from 100% of the football regular season contests during the first season of employment within the show-cause period. This suspension corresponds with 12 regular season contests. The provisions of this suspension apply to all athletically related duties and require that Khalif not be present with or have contact or communication with football coaching staff members or student-athletes during the suspension period. The suspension begins on the date of the first scheduled contest of the championship segment. The prohibition includes all coaching activities for the suspension period that begins at 12:01 a.m. on the day of the first contest and ends at 11:59 p.m. on the day of the last contest. During the suspension period, Khalif may not participate in any coaching activities, including, but not limited to, team travel, practice, video study, recruiting and team meetings. Any employing institution may not utilize Bylaw 11.02.2.1 to replace Khalif on a temporary basis during the period of suspension. The results of those contests from which Khalif 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 I – Mitigated Violations (Bylaw 19.12.9)

11. Public reprimand and censure through the release of the negotiated resolution agreement.
12. Vacation of team records:¹³ Ineligible participation in the football program occurred over a three-year time period as a result of violations in this case. Therefore, pursuant to Bylaws 19.12.9-(g) and 31.2.2.3 and Committee on Infractions IOP 5-15-9, the institution shall vacate all regular season and conference tournament wins, records and participation in which the ineligible student-athletes competed from the time they became ineligible through the time they were reinstated as eligible for competition. Further, if the ineligible student-athletes participated in NCAA postseason competition at any time they were ineligible, the institution's participation in the postseason contests in which the ineligible competition occurred shall be vacated. Further, the institution's records regarding the affected sport program, as well as the records of the head coach, shall reflect the vacated records and be recorded in all publications in which such records are reported, including, but not limited to, institutional media guides, recruiting material, electronic and digital media plus institutional, conference and NCAA archives. Any institution that may subsequently hire the affected head coach shall

¹³ The parties agreed that extenuating circumstances warranted relief from the vacation of individual student-athlete records. Specifically, pursuant to Committee on Infractions IOP 5-15-9-2, the three student-athletes identified in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 2 were not culpable for nor aware of the violation and received no more than a minimal benefit in travel expenses for an accompanying family member.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Michigan State University - Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

Page No. 18

similarly reflect the vacated wins in his career records documented in media guides and other publications cited above. Head coaches with vacated wins on their records may not count the vacated wins toward specific honors or victory "milestones" such as 100th, 200th or 500th career victories. Any public reference to the vacated records shall be removed from the athletics department stationery, banners displayed in public areas and any other forum in which they may appear. Any trophies awarded by the NCAA in the affected sport program shall be returned to the Association.

Finally, to aid in accurately reflecting all institutional vacations, statistics and records in official NCAA publications and archives, the sports information director (or other designee as assigned by the director of athletics) must contact the NCAA media coordination and statistics office and appropriate conference officials to identify the specific student-athletes and contests impacted by the penalties. In addition, the institution must provide the media coordination and statistics office with a written report detailing those discussions. This written report will be maintained in the permanent files of the media coordination and statistics office. The written report must be delivered to the office no later than 14 days following the release of this decision or, if the institution appeals the vacation penalty, at the conclusion of the appeals process. A copy of the written report shall also be delivered to the OCOI at the same time.

13. During this period of probation, the institution shall:

- a. Continue to develop and implement a comprehensive educational program on NCAA legislation to instruct coaches, the faculty athletics representative, all athletics department personnel and all institutional staff members with responsibility for recruiting legislation.
- b. Submit a preliminary report to the OCOI by **November 15, 2025**, setting forth a schedule for establishing this compliance and educational program.
- c. File with the OCOI annual compliance reports indicating the progress made with this program by **July 15th** during each year of probation. Particular emphasis shall be placed on rules education and monitoring related to recruiting.
- d. Inform prospects in the football program in writing that the institution is on probation for three years and detail the violations committed. If a prospect takes an official paid visit, the information regarding violations, penalties and terms of probation must be provided in advance of the visit. Otherwise, the information must be provided before a prospect signs the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid.

- e. Publicize specific and understandable information concerning the nature of the infractions by providing a direct, conspicuous link to the case summary and public infractions decision located on the athletics department's main website "landing page" and in the media guides for the football program. Permissible website posting locations include the main navigation menu or a sidebar menu. The link may not be housed under a drop-down menu. Further, the link to the posting (i.e., the icon or the text) must be titled "NCAA Infractions Case." With regard to the content of the posting, the institution's statement must: (i) clearly describe the infractions; (ii) include the length of the probationary period associated with the case; and (iii) give members of the general public a clear indication of what happened in the case to allow the public (particularly prospects and their families) to make informed, knowledgeable decisions. A statement that refers only to the probationary period with nothing more is not sufficient.

14. Following the receipt of the final compliance report and prior to the conclusion of probation, the institution's president shall provide a letter to the Committee on Infractions affirming that the institution's current athletics policies and practices conform to all requirements of NCAA regulations.

VI. PARTIES TO THE CASE

A. Party to negotiated resolution.

Michigan State.

B. Not party to the negotiated resolution (pursuing separate resolution method).

Tucker.

C. Not participating in the case.

Jordan and Khalif.

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

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Michigan State University - Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

Page No. 20

precludes the enforcement staff from investigating additional information about potential rules violations. The parties agree that, pursuant to Bylaw 19.1.2, the violations identified in this agreement occurred and should be classified as Level I-Mitigated for the institution and Level I-Aggravated for Jordan and Khalif.

If a hearing panel approves the negotiated resolution, the institution agrees that they will take every precaution to ensure that the terms of the penalties are observed. The institution 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 OCOI will monitor the penalties during their effective periods. Any action by the institution or Jordan or Khalif 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.

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' resolution. 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 I-Mitigated for Michigan State and Level I-Aggravated for Jordan and Khalif. The agreed-upon penalties align with the ranges identified for core penalties for Level I-Mitigated and Level I-Aggravated 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.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

Michigan State University - Case No. 020290

September 25, 2025

Page No. 21

The COI advises Michigan State, Jordan and Khalif that they should take every precaution to ensure that they observe the terms of the penalties. The COI will monitor the institution while it is on probation to ensure compliance with the penalties and terms of probation and may extend the probationary period, among other action, if the institution does not comply or commits additional violations. Likewise, any action by the institution, Jordan or Khalif 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 DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS

Norman Bay
Bryan Blair
Jody Conradt
Richard Ensor, chief hearing officer
Jeremy Jordan
Kay Norton
Amy Parsons

APPENDIX

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY'S CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

1. Enhanced and increased compliance rules education for the football program concerning unofficial and official visits.