

CASE SUMMARY

LIU failed to monitor its eligibility certification process

Eligibility certification violations occurred at Long Island University across 33 sports over four academic years, according to an agreement approved by the Division I Committee on Infractions. Due to the extensive nature of the violations, the school was found to have failed to monitor its eligibility certification process.

In total, initial eligibility certifications for 240 student-athletes were not completed before they practiced. Of those, 176 competed impermissibly and/or received actual and necessary expenses while ineligible or not certified. An additional 658 student-athletes competed and 111 practiced without having required forms completed.

The violations occurred largely for four reasons:

- In 2020-21, Long Island University-Brooklyn merged with LIU-Post (a DII school). Following that merger, one compliance staff member was responsible for managing eligibility certification for 35 sports.
- The athletics department was split between two locations, with half at the Brooklyn campus and half at the Post location, resulting in communications inefficiencies between coaches and compliance staff about team rosters.
- The school did not have a formal process in place to certify initial eligibility to ensure that certifications were accurate.
- There were no checks and balances on eligibility certifications because no university departments outside of athletics were involved in verifying student-athletes' eligibility statuses.

The school and NCAA enforcement staff agreed that the school failed to monitor its eligibility certification process.

The parties agreed that the case should be classified as Level I-Mitigated for the school.

The agreed-upon penalties include:

- Three years of probation, during which staff members with certification responsibilities will attend NCAA Regional Rules Seminars.
- Vacation of team and individual records in sports in which ineligible players competed over the four-year period, including baseball, football, men's basketball, women's basketball, men's golf, men's soccer, softball, men's indoor and outfield track and field, women's indoor and outdoor track and field, and women's volleyball.
- A \$30,000 fine, plus 3% of the budgets for the four highest-budgeted sports programs involved in violations.
- A two-week ban on all recruiting activities for each sport during the first year of probation.

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 in private practice and chief hearing officer for the panel.
- Jason Leonard, executive director of athletics compliance at Oklahoma.
- Steve Waterfield, athletics director at Oakland.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION¹

Long Island University – Case No. 020370

May 4, 2026

I. CASE SYNOPSIS

Long Island University (LIU) and the NCAA enforcement staff agree with the violations and penalties detailed below.

In June 2024, the institution notified the enforcement staff of potential eligibility certification violations within its athletics department. The issues were detected following the departure of previous compliance officers, and during the eligibility certification process for spring sports in the fall of 2023. Initially, the institution identified numerous student-athletes who had not received either final amateurism or academic certification through the NCAA Eligibility Center prior to competition. Shortly thereafter, the institution retained outside counsel to review the eligibility certification deficiencies. The institution then immediately informed the enforcement staff of the potential violations and that the institution would submit a self-report of its findings once it completed its initial investigation.

In July 2024, the institution submitted its self-report to the enforcement staff. The report detailed numerous violations related to initial eligibility certification during the 2023-24 academic year. After reviewing the report, the enforcement staff identified multiple student-athletes who appeared to need eligibility reinstatement and requested the institution conduct spot checks of previous academic years to determine if similar potential violations had occurred. Specifically, the enforcement staff requested that if potential violations were identified, the institution would go back three additional years to fully identify the entire cohort of violations. The institution subsequently discovered additional initial eligibility certification violations for student-athletes from 2020 through 2023, as well as violations of student-athletes practicing and competing without completing their respective NCAA required forms (e.g., student-athlete statement and drug Testing consent forms). In early October 2024, the enforcement staff provided the institution with a formal notice of inquiry.

Over the next several months, the enforcement staff worked with the institution to fully audit the possible certification violations. In total, the investigation discovered 240 student-athletes who did not have their initial eligibility certifications completed prior to the 45-day period or competing. Additionally, 658 student-athletes competed and another 111 practiced without having required forms completed.

The investigation identified multiple factors that led to the violations. First, during the 2019-20 academic year, the institution merged its two athletics departments (Long Island University-Brooklyn, which was Division I and Long Island University-Post, which was Division II) into one

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.

Division I athletics department. This merger led to one compliance officer certifying numerous additional student-athletes and teams. In fact, a single compliance staff member was responsible for a 35 sport program athletics department. Second, the athletics department was separated in that a portion of the teams were at the Brooklyn campus while others were at the Post campus. This led to communication inefficiencies between coaching staffs and compliance related to which student-athletes were on each squad. Third, the institution did not have a formal process established to certify initial eligibility or check that certifications were accurate. Lastly, there were no areas outside of athletics that were included in verifying the initial eligibility status of student-athletes, so there was no system of checks and balances to verify that student-athletes had received their initial eligibility certifications.

II. PARTIES' AGREEMENTS

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

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 12.1.1.1.3, 12.1.1.1.3.1, 12.7.2.1, 12.7.3.1, 12.11.1, 14.3.1, 14.3.1.1 and 16.8.1 (2020-21 through 2023-24)²] (Level I)

During the 2020-21 through 2023-24 academic years, the institution improperly certified 240 student-athletes in 33 sports as eligible for practice and/or competition. As a result, 240 student-athletes practiced impermissibly beyond the 45-day period, and 176 of those student-athletes competed impermissibly and received actual and necessary expenses while ineligible or not certified. Thirty-one student-athletes continued to compete in subsequent years without having their academic eligibility certified or being reinstated. Additionally, the institution permitted 769 student-athletes to practice and/or compete without completing required NCAA forms. Specifically:

- a. One hundred two student-athletes across 26 sports practiced beyond the 45-day period, and 71 of those student-athletes also competed prior to receiving final amateurism and academic certification from the Eligibility Center. Eight of the student-athletes continued to compete in subsequent years without having their academic eligibility certified or being reinstated. [NCAA Bylaws 12.1.1.1.3, 12.1.1.1.3.1, 12.11.1 and 14.3.1 (2020-21 through 2023-24)]
- b. Seventy-four student-athletes across 25 sports practiced beyond the 45-day period, and 50 of those student-athletes also competed prior to receiving final amateurism certification through the Eligibility Center. [NCAA Bylaws 12.1.1.1.3 and 12.1.1.1.3.1 (2020-21 through 2023-24)]

² NCAA Bylaw 16.8.1 changed effective August 3, 2022, allowing student-athletes who are eligible for practice to receive actual and necessary expenses.

- c. Sixty-four student-athletes across 24 sports practiced beyond the 45-day period, and 32 of those student-athletes also competed without being certified as meeting the academic requirements as certified by the Eligibility Center. Twenty-three of those student-athletes competed as non-qualifiers and competed in subsequent years without being reinstated. [NCAA Bylaws 12.11.1, 14.3.1 and 14.3.1.1 (2020-21 through 2023-24)]
 - d. Six hundred fifty-eight student-athletes across 35 sports practiced and competed prior to completing NCAA required student-athlete statement and drug-testing consent forms. Additionally, another 111 student-athletes practiced prior to completing those NCAA required forms. [NCAA Bylaws 12.7.2.1 and 12.7.3.1 (2020-21 through 2023-24)]
2. [NCAA Division I Manual Constitution 2.8.1 (2020-21 and 2021-22) and Bylaw 8.01.3 (2022-23 and 2023-24)] (Level I)

During the 2020-21 through 2023-24 academic years, the scope and nature of the violations detailed in Agreed-Upon Findings of Fact No. 1 demonstrate that the institution failed to adequately monitor its student-athlete initial-eligibility and forms processes to ensure compliance with NCAA eligibility legislation. Specifically, the institution did not have a process in place to conduct initial eligibility certification, did not provide the necessary supervision of its NCAA certification process to verify the accuracy of student-athlete certification for practice and competition and did not have an adequate system of checks and balances in place to verify the initial eligibility status of its student-athletes.

B. Agreed-upon aggravating and mitigating factors.

Pursuant to NCAA 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.

Institution:

a. Aggravating factors. [NCAA Bylaw 19.12.3.1]

- (1) Multiple Level I and/or Level II violations for which the institution is responsible.
- (2) One or more violations caused ineligible competition.

b. Mitigating factors. [NCAA Bylaw 19.12.4.1]

- (1) Prompt acknowledgement and acceptance of responsibility for the violations.
- (2) Institution self-imposed meaningful corrective measures and/or penalties.
- (3) The absence of prior conclusions of Level I, Level II or major violations within the past ten years.

III. OTHER VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION SUBSTANTIATED; NOT ALLEGED

None.

IV. REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES

The enforcement staff considered whether a lack of institutional control versus a failure to monitor charge related to the underlying eligibility certification violations was more appropriate in this matter. Ultimately, the enforcement staff decided that failure to monitor was more appropriate based on multiple factors. First, the eligibility certification deficiencies were all within one area – initial eligibility – whereas, in prior cases that have included a lack of institutional control, the eligibility certification deficiencies were spread across numerous eligibility certification areas (e.g., initial, continuing, transfer, full-time status, etc.). Additionally, the institution completed external audits of its eligibility certification systems every three years. While the audit process did not identify the issues during its previous cycle, it is the mechanism that identified the initial eligibility certification issues in 2024. Finally, the unique contributing factors that exacerbated the violations in the merging of two campus’ athletics departments followed so closely in time by the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic led to staffing shortages that hurt the eligibility certification process. As a result, the enforcement staff determined that a failure to monitor was a more appropriate charge than a lack of institutional control.

V. PARTIES' AGREED-UPON PENALTIES³

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

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

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

1. Three years of probation from May 4, 2026, through May 3, 2029.
2. The institution shall pay a fine of \$30,000 plus 3% of the budgets for the four highest budgeted sport programs involved in violations.⁴
3. The institution shall prohibit all recruiting activities (e.g., official visits, unofficial visits, recruiting communications, off-campus contact and evaluations) in each sport program involved in violations for a period of two weeks during the first year of probation.

Additional Penalties for Level I – Mitigated Violations (Bylaw 19.12.9)

4. All staff members that have athletics eligibility certification responsibilities will attend the NCAA regional rules seminar during each year of the probationary period.
5. At least once during the probationary period, the institution will volunteer for an NCAA Academic Performance Program (APP) data review.⁵
6. Public reprimand and censure through the release of the negotiated resolution agreement.
7. Vacation of team and individual records: Ineligible participation in the athletics department occurred over four years as a result of violations in this case. Therefore,

³ 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 NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions aware of the impossibility and must complete the penalty at the next available opportunity.

⁴ The fine from the athletic departments budget must be calculated in accordance with Committee on Infractions Internal Operating Procedures 5-15-6 and 5-15-6-1.

⁵ If Long Island is not selected to complete an APP data review, or if that service is otherwise unavailable during the period of probation, the institution will have a full audit completed of its compliance operations by an external entity with specific emphasis placed on reviewing the institution's eligibility certification process.

pursuant to Bylaws 19.12.9-(g) and 31.2.2.3 and NCAA Committee on Infractions Internal Operating Procedure 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. The individual records of the ineligible student-athletes shall also be vacated. However, the individual finishes and any awards for all eligible student-athletes shall be retained. Further, the institution's records regarding the affected sport programs, as well as the records of the head coaches, 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 coaches shall similarly reflect the vacated wins in their 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 programs shall be returned to the Association.

Finally, to aid in accurately reflecting all institutional and student-athlete 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 office of the Committees on Infractions at the same time.

8. 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 eligibility certification legislation.

- b. Submit a preliminary report to the Office of the Committees on Infractions (OCOI) by June 30, 2026, 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 March 1st during each year of probation. Particular emphasis shall be placed on rules education and monitoring related to eligibility certification.
 - d. Inform prospects in the athletics department 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, at a minimum, a statement to include the types of violations and the affected sport programs and a direct, conspicuous link to the public infractions decision located on the athletics department's main website "landing page" and in the media guides for the sports programs. 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: (1) clearly describe the infractions; (2) include the length of the probationary period associated with the case; and (3) 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.
9. 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. OTHER AGREEMENTS

The parties agree that this case will be processed through the NCAA negotiated resolution process as outlined in Bylaw 19.10, and a hearing panel comprised of members of the Committee on Infractions will review the negotiated resolution. The parties acknowledge that the negotiated

resolution contains agreed-upon findings of fact of NCAA violations and agreed-upon aggravating and mitigating factors based on information available at this time. Nothing in this resolution precludes the enforcement staff from investigating additional information about potential rules violations. The parties agree that, pursuant to Bylaw 19.1.2, the violations identified in this agreement occurred and should be classified as Level I – Mitigated.

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 office of the Committees on Infractions will monitor the penalties during their effective periods. Any action by the institution contrary to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations 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.

VII. DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS APPROVAL

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

The COI advises LIU that it should take every precaution to ensure that LIU observes the terms of its penalties. The COI will monitor LIU during the effective period. Any action by LIU contrary

to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations shall be considered grounds for prescribing more severe penalties and/or may result in additional allegations and violations.

NCAA COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS PANEL

Norman Bay, chief hearing officer

Jason Leonard

Steve Waterfield