

CASE SUMMARY

CSUN men's basketball staff members violated academic integrity, benefits rules

School previously agreed to violations and penalties

Violations occurred in the California State University, Northridge men's basketball program when Casey Norris, former director of basketball operations, falsified application materials for a transfer student-athlete and provided an exam answer to another student-athlete. In addition, Norris and former men's basketball assistant coach Jordan Jamestown falsified monetary award documents for six student-athletes to help them secure off-campus housing, according to a decision released by a Division I Committee on Infractions panel. As a result of the violations, men's basketball head coach Andy Newman violated head coach responsibility rules.

The school, which agreed to the violations and penalties, resolved its case in June 2025 and immediately began serving its penalties as the cases for the involved individuals continued. The panel specifically noted its appreciation for CSUN's thoughtfulness and intentionality in processing this case, including agreeing to enhanced penalties as a result of its status as a repeat violator.

Norris violated academic integrity rules when he provided a student-athlete with an answer on a final exam. Around the same time, Norris falsified a letter of recommendation — including another school's logo and an individual's name without their knowledge — which was submitted as part of a graduate transfer's application to CSUN. The violations are Level I.

Additionally, Norris and Jamestown provided impermissible benefits to six student-athletes when they drafted fraudulent monetary award letters for those individuals — specifically, attesting to the provision of “Alston” funds — despite those funds not being approved by the school. Alston payments are financial awards provided directly by schools to student-athletes for academic expenses. The awards can total up to \$5,980 per year.

They drafted the documents in an attempt to secure off-campus housing for the student-athletes, who could not satisfy traditional income verification requirements. In addition to including inaccurate information about the award disbursement, they also falsified the signature of the athletics department compliance director in those letters.

Because he drafted five of the letters, Norris also violated ethical conduct rules. Jamestown also provided a written guarantee to the apartment complex attesting to student-athletes' conduct and timely rent payments. As a result of the violations, three student-athletes competed while ineligible. These violations are Level II.

Finally, Newman agreed he is automatically responsible for the conduct of his staff and thus violated head coach responsibility rules. The panel noted that Newman proactively engaged with compliance officials and asked for additional education. Because Norris' academic integrity violations were Level I, Newman's violation also was required to be Level I. However, the panel took into account Newman's efforts to work with compliance when assessing penalties.

The panel classified the case as Level I-aggravated for Norris, Level II-standard for Jamestown and Level I-mitigated for Newman and prescribed the following penalties:

- A five-year show-cause for Norris, during which any employing NCAA member school shall restrict him from all athletically related activity. Should he become employed during that time, he will be suspended from 100% of the first season of employment.
- A one-year show-cause order for Jamestown, during which any employing NCAA member school shall require him to attend a Regional Rules Seminar at his own expense. Should he become employed during that time, he also will be suspended from 10% of his first season of employment.
- A one-year show-cause order for Newman, during which he will be required to attend the Regional Rules Seminar at his own expense.

Previously agreed-to and, in some cases, already-served penalties for the school include:

- Five years of probation, beginning June 2025.
- A \$40,000 fine plus 4% of the annual men's basketball budget.
- Vacation of individual and team records for any games in which ineligible players competed.
- A reduction in one men's basketball scholarship for the 2025-26 academic year (already applied by the school).
- A prohibition in unofficial and official visits in men's basketball for a total of seven weeks during the 2024-25 academic year (completed by February 2025).
- A three-week prohibition in men's basketball recruiting communications during the 2024-25 academic year (completed by January 2025).
- A six-week prohibition against any off-campus recruiting activities in men's basketball during the 2024-25 academic year (completed by February 2025).
- A reduction by 10 off-campus recruiting person days for the 2024-25 academic year.
- A reduction of two official visits by the end of the 2025-26 academic year (equivalent to a 12% reduction, based on the school's four-year average).
- Disassociation from a former staff member and booster.
- A three game-suspension for Newman, self-imposed by the school and served by Newman in November 2024.

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

- Doug Archie, senior associate athletics director for compliance at Ohio State.
- Norman Bay, attorney in private practice.
- Joshua Gordon, faculty athletics representative at Oregon.
- Jason Leonard, executive director of athletics compliance at Oklahoma and chief hearing officer for the panel.
- Kay Norton, president emerita at Northern Colorado and chair of the Committee on Infractions.
- Jill Redmond, deputy commissioner of the Missouri Valley Conference.
- Maureen Weston, professor of law at Pepperdine.



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE
PUBLIC INFRACTIONS DECISION
May 7, 2026

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 involved violations in the men's basketball program at California State University, Northridge (CSUN). These violations came primarily in two forms: academic misconduct and impermissible benefits. Specifically, former director of basketball operations Casey Norris (Norris) assisted a student-athlete during an exam and later falsified a letter of recommendation. Additionally, Norris and former assistant men's basketball coach Jordan Jamestown (Jamestown) impermissibly assisted student-athletes in obtaining preferred off-campus housing. As a result of the underlying violations, a head coach responsibility violation automatically attached to head men's basketball coach Andy Newman (Newman).

The panel processed the violations for CSUN through a separate negotiated resolution (NR) process, in which CSUN agreed to the facts, violations and penalties. Given CSUN's status as a repeat violator, and this being its third case involving the men's basketball program in the past decade, CSUN agreed to enhanced institutional penalties. The panel appreciates the thoughtfulness and intentionality with which current institutional leadership approached the NR and held the institution accountable. The approved NR can be found at Appendix Two of this decision. Norris, Jamestown and Newman each contested aspects of their alleged violations. Thus, this decision relates solely to their conduct.

This case illustrates the joint need for institutions and staff members—particularly those hired by programs with an infractions history—to prioritize their commitment to rules compliance. The violations in this case occurred on the heels of CSUN's 2022 infractions case, which involved impermissible recruiting activities in the men's basketball program.² CSUN hired Newman as the program's head coach in April 2023, and he added Jamestown and Norris to his staff the following month. The violations began shortly thereafter and continued throughout the summer.

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

² See *California State University, Northridge (CSUN)* (2022). That case was under appeal by the institution when the violations in this case occurred. CSUN also had a 2017 infractions case involving academic misconduct in the men's basketball program. See *California State University, Northridge (CSUN)* (2017). Each case involved violations by different coaching staffs.

Regarding the academic misconduct, Norris sent a men's basketball student-athlete the answer to a question on his Spanish 101 final exam in August 2023. Around the same time, Norris also falsified a letter of recommendation, which was a necessary component of a graduate transfer student-athlete's application to CSUN. More specifically, Norris wrote the letter under another individual's name and added their institution's logo, and the letter was ultimately submitted without that person's knowledge. The academic misconduct violation is Level I.

With regard to the impermissible benefits, Jamestown and Norris drafted fraudulent monetary award letters for six student-athletes. The letters included attestations about the disbursement of the student-athletes' "Alston" payments, which had not been officially approved by CSUN.³ They were also drafted under the name of the associate athletics director for compliance (compliance director). Along with other documentation, the letters were intended to be used for income verification in the student-athletes' applications to an off-campus apartment complex. Relatedly, Jamestown provided a written guarantee to the apartment complex's leasing manager, vouching for the student-athletes' behavior and timely rent payments. Norris' knowing actions constituted unethical conduct, and the benefits caused three student-athletes to compete while ineligible. These violations are Level II.

Newman agreed that, under Bylaw 11.1.1.1, he is automatically responsible for his staff's violations. Consistent with that legislation, the case record contained information about Newman's compliance efforts around the time of the violations, and the panel considered those facts when prescribing his penalties. Specifically, the panel took note of Newman's proactive attempts to engage with and request additional education from the compliance director. Because the level of a head coach responsibility violation derives from the highest-level underlying violation, Newman's head coach responsibility violation is Level I.

The panel classifies the case as Level I-Aggravated for Norris, Level II-Standard for Jamestown and Level I-Mitigated for Newman. Utilizing the NCAA membership's current penalty guidelines, the panel prescribes the following penalties: a five-year show-cause order for Norris; a one-year show-cause order with specific restrictions and 10 percent suspension for Jamestown; and a one-year show-cause order with specific restrictions for Newman. Apart from requiring attendance at the NCAA Regional Rules Seminar, there are no restrictions on Newman's athletically related duties during the show-cause period. Similarly, Jamestown's restrictions are limited to his required attendance at the NCAA Regional Rules Seminar and his suspension.

II. CASE HISTORY

The academic misconduct in this case came to light on August 16, 2023, after a former men's basketball staff member reported that Norris was assisting a student-athlete with summer coursework. The following day, CSUN retained outside counsel to investigate the claim. Shortly thereafter, the institution interviewed its senior athletic academic advisor, who raised additional

³ Alston payments are education-related financial awards provided directly by institutions for academic expenses. The awards can total \$5,980 per year.

concerns with the application materials of a graduate transfer student-athlete. After further investigation, the institution placed Norris and Jamestown on administrative leave and contacted the NCAA enforcement staff on September 11, 2023. CSUN provided a report of its preliminary findings to the enforcement staff on October 10, 2023.

On January 5, 2024, during their collaborative investigation, CSUN informed the enforcement staff that it discovered the falsified Alston payment letters in Jamestown's files. The following month, CSUN provided the enforcement staff with a summary of its findings regarding potential housing-related violations. Over the course of several months, the enforcement staff conducted additional interviews and examined the student-athletes' lease agreements.

In November 2024, the enforcement staff submitted its initial resolution method selection for the parties—an NR for CSUN and a full hearing for the involved individuals. The COI chair approved the resolution selection for the parties on December 11, 2024. However, given the facts of the case and the institution's infractions history, the chair requested that the parties align the issuance of any notices of allegations (NOAs) to prevent future case processing delays. As such, the chair suggested that the enforcement staff withhold the issuance of an NOA for the involved individuals until the panel could consider and approve CSUN's NR.

CSUN and the enforcement staff submitted an NR to the COI on May 14, 2025.⁴ A three-member panel of the COI reviewed and approved the NR on June 20, 2025. On that date, CSUN's case became final and its agreed-upon penalties went into effect.

The enforcement staff issued an NOA to Jamestown, Newman and Norris on August 21, 2025. On November 19, 2025, Jamestown and Newman submitted their responses to the NOA. Norris did not respond. The enforcement staff submitted its written reply on January 20, 2026. The following week, Jamestown submitted a supplemental response containing arguments stemming from previously unavailable documents. At the same time, Jamestown and Newman each requested that additional information be added into the case record. Those requests were granted.

Prior to the hearing, the panel expanded from the three members who originally considered the NR to a full panel of seven. That panel held a virtual hearing on February 24, 2026. Norris did not attend the hearing.

⁴ In addition to the underlying academic misconduct and benefit violations, the NR also included an agreed-upon Level I failure to monitor violation for CSUN, as well as recruiting inducements in the form of cost-free housing. Additionally, the NR included a head coach responsibility violation, which related only to CSUN's accountability for Newman's conduct.

III. FINDINGS OF FACT

CSUN hired Newman as the institution’s head men’s basketball coach in April 2023.⁵ Newman came to CSUN with more than 20 years of collegiate coaching experience across Divisions I and II. Prior to CSUN, Newman was the head coach of a nearby Division II men’s basketball program for five years. During Newman’s hiring process, CSUN’s then-director of athletics (former AD) was an individual who served as director of athletics at that Division II institution until late 2022. Thus, he was familiar with Newman.

During Newman’s hiring process, the former AD emphasized that a commitment to compliance was an important consideration among candidates due to the institution’s recent infractions history. Neither Newman nor the former AD had concerns about Newman’s ability to run a compliant program. Specifically, the former AD stated that “[w]e didn’t have to speculate” with regard to Newman’s character, including his “respect for the rules,” and that was a “huge determin[ing] factor” in CSUN’s hiring decision.

Within a month of being hired, Newman began to build out his staff. He hired Jamestown and Norris in mid-May 2023. Jamestown had 10 years of coaching experience and followed Newman from his previous Division II institution, while Norris came highly recommended by individuals close to Newman. Neither Jamestown nor Norris had prior work experience at the Division I level.

In addition to CSUN’s infractions history, the compliance director noted that Newman and his staff entered into a “hectic and stressful” environment. The men’s basketball program had no returning players for the 2023-24 season. Thus, the men’s basketball staff was tasked with recruiting an entire team between May and the start of the fall semester. In Newman’s words, “We were building a brand-new program...We were moving. We were grinding. We were trying to...sign 13 guys and also to recruit.”

In this fast-paced environment, Newman also acknowledged that his staff members took on new responsibilities with which they had no prior experience. Specifically, Norris oversaw a student-athlete’s academics and aspects of the admissions process, while Jamestown was the staff’s housing and financial aid liaison.

Academic Integrity Issues

Over the summer of 2023, the men’s basketball program worked closely with CSUN’s academic success center—specifically, the senior athletics academic advisor—to ensure that student-athletes were completing assignments and maintaining their eligibility. The student-athletes were divided among the men’s basketball staff members to provide targeted academic oversight.

⁵ During the 2023-24 academic year, CSUN men’s basketball finished with a record of 19-15—its first winning season in 15 years, and it improved upon that record the following year. Newman continues to serve as the head men’s basketball coach at CSUN and has remained at the institution throughout the processing of this case.

Norris was tasked with monitoring the academics of a talented transfer student-athlete (student-athlete 1) who was enrolled in two summer courses, including Spanish 101. Student-athlete 1 had recently withdrawn from other summer courses at CSUN for poor academic performance. He was also in the process of obtaining his Associate's degree shortly before coming to CSUN. After initial concern about the sufficiency of his credit hours, the academic advisor analyzed student-athlete 1's transcript and determined that he would meet progress-toward-degree requirements upon completion of his Associate's degree. According to Newman, student-athlete 1 was enrolled in summer courses at CSUN to meet practice requirements and get ahead for graduation.

Per Newman's instruction, Norris was proactive about checking in on student-athlete 1's academic progress. For at least part of the summer, Norris, like other men's basketball staff members, had access to student-athlete 1's academic portal (Canvas) where he could also monitor assignments and grades. Upon learning of their Canvas access via a report in late July, CSUN's athletics administrators informed the men's basketball staff that accessing student-athletes' accounts was against institutional policy.⁶ At that point, the compliance director also provided the staff with an educational document in the form of a list of "academic dos and don'ts."

Without Canvas access, Newman instructed his staff to pivot and request screenshots of submitted assignments and grades, as necessary. Many of Norris' text messages with student-athlete 1 involved him asking whether the student-athlete submitted assignments and how he performed on exams. On one occasion on August 21, 2023, Norris contacted student-athlete 1 to ask if he submitted his Spanish final exam. In response, student-athlete 1 sent a screenshot of a short-answer exam prompt and said, "Need help on this one." In response, Norris sent student-athlete 1 a paragraph written in Spanish that attempted to answer the prompt.

In his interview with the enforcement staff, Norris also said he "tutored" student-athlete 1 by answering his questions and providing feedback or edits on assignments. Although not expressly requested by Newman, Norris stated that he felt that there was an expectation that he help student-athlete 1 pass his courses. In his interview, student-athlete 1 acknowledged that Norris may have given him "too much help" with his assignments. Despite the text exchange, Norris denied completing coursework for student-athlete 1.

Around the same time, Norris and Jamestown were working with a sought-after graduate transfer student-athlete (student-athlete 2) who committed to CSUN near the start of the fall semester. Norris stated that, due to student-athlete 2's late commitment, as well as his international status, there was a shortened timeframe to submit his application. Therefore, Jamestown and Norris opted to meet with student-athlete 2 to help him compile his materials.

Student-athlete 2's application required him to submit two letters of recommendation. In his interview, Norris acknowledged having previously assisted student-athletes with drafting generic letters of recommendation. In those situations, Norris would pre-draft the letter and provide it to the student-athlete to send to the signer(s). With respect to student-athlete 2, Norris stated that he

⁶ Men's basketball staff members' access to student-athletes' Canvas accounts in violation of institutional policy was a key element of CSUN's 2017 infractions case.

did not personally know the intended signer but was aware that the signer coached student-athlete 2 at his previous institution.

On August 9, 2023, Norris drafted a letter of recommendation under the former coach's name. He also added the coach's institutional logo to the document. The following day, student-athlete 2 contacted his former coach and asked him to serve as a reference but did not mention the letter of recommendation. Norris repeatedly stated that he did not know what happened with the letter after he drafted it (i.e., whether it was sent to the former coach for approval/signature).

Student-athlete 2 ultimately submitted the letter as part of his required application materials, despite the letter never having been reviewed or signed by his former coach. When shown the letter during an interview, the former coach said that its contents were "fairly accurate" and that his reference letter would likely have been similar. However, he was also frustrated by the fraudulent representation and disapproved of Norris' conduct.

Ultimately, CSUN determined that the student-athletes' use of the final exam answer and the letter of recommendation each violated the institution's Student Conduct Code.

Arrangement of Off-Campus Housing

Upon Jamestown's arrival at CSUN, Newman tasked him with coordinating housing for the program's incoming student-athletes. When considering housing options, the men's basketball staff learned that prior student-athletes reported having negative experiences with CSUN's on-campus housing. The compliance director also reported that the housing department was difficult to work with from a compliance standpoint, and he encouraged the men's basketball staff to consider housing the team off campus. He also noted that doing so would permissibly allow the student-athletes to receive larger scholarship stipends.

According to Jamestown, he quickly faced challenges with finding suitable off-campus housing. Specifically, being new to CSUN, he lacked familiarity with the institution and its locale. Jamestown also noted that there were no athletic department protocols or policies to guide student-athletes and/or coaches through the process of securing off-campus housing. In his interview with the enforcement staff, the compliance director confirmed that there were no standard compliance processes in place for this.

In late May 2023, Jamestown connected with Meridian Pointe Apartments (Meridian Pointe)—an apartment complex near CSUN's campus with a more affordable rate than other complexes. Shortly after finding Meridian Pointe, Jamestown began exchanging emails with the leasing manager to inquire about options for the student-athletes who did not meet the typical income and credit requirements. The leasing manager viewed the men's basketball student-athletes as an asset to draw attention to the complex, so she was willing to work with them and be flexible throughout the application process.

Rather than imposing the traditional financial requirements, the leasing manager accepted alternative documents as proof of income. For instance, the compliance director provided Jamestown with scholarship stipend letters on May 23, 2023. Three days later, a men's basketball staff member sent Jamestown a template letter for Pell Grant funds, which the leasing manager was also willing to accept. In fact, she encouraged Jamestown to provide as much documentation of the student-athletes' income as possible, saying the "more the merrier."

On May 29, 2023, Jamestown received an email from Norris containing multiple letters. The letters pertained to student-athletes' Alston payments for the upcoming academic year. Like the scholarship stipend letters, the Alston letters were drafted on CSUN compliance office letterhead under the name of the compliance director. However, the compliance director did not know about the letters. Rather, Norris admitted to drafting them and sending them to Jamestown for housing purposes. Jamestown purportedly thought the letters were legitimate, and admitted to using one as a template to create an Alston letter for another student-athlete.

Each of the letters stated that student-athletes would receive their Alston awards in October 2023 and March 2024. At the time the letters were drafted, CSUN had not determined whether it was going to provide Alston awards during the upcoming academic year. In his interview, Jamestown stated that he was aware of plans to provide Alston awards to student-athletes but did not know the details. When Norris sent him the letters, Jamestown believed that a plan had been finalized. Ultimately, CSUN provided Alston awards, but not until March 2024.

Like the other financial documents, the Alston letters were intended to be used as part of the student-athletes' applications to Meridian Pointe and serve as nontraditional income verification. Jamestown recalled that the letters were either distributed to the student-athletes, another coach or Meridian Pointe, directly. When asked about the impact of the Alston letters, the leasing manager clarified that there was no "cut and dry" approach to assessing the applications of individuals who did not meet traditional income and credit requirements. Due in part to that statement, Jamestown claimed that the apartment complex did not actually rely on the letters when renting to the men's basketball student-athletes. However, an email from the regional manager of the complex suggests that most student-athletes provided scholarship letters and miscellaneous awards/grants.

Around the same time that Jamestown was working to secure housing for the student-athletes, the leasing manager told Jamestown that she needed additional assurances about the student-athletes' payments and behavior. It appeared that her request was prompted by a credit issue with one of the men's basketball student-athletes applying for residence. As a result, Jamestown drafted a letter and sent it to the leasing manager on May 26, 2023. In that letter, Jamestown provided his cell phone number and told the leasing manager to contact him with any issues "payment, behavioral or otherwise." Jamestown went on to assure the leasing manager that "all payment responsibilities [would] be made in a timely manner." The regional manager of the complex stated that Meridian Pointe took Jamestown's letter to mean that he was acting as a cosigner or guarantor.

Although the creation of the Alston letters occurred at generally the same time as Norris' assistance with an exam problem, they were not flagged during CSUN's initial investigative report in October

2023. The documents were available to the enforcement staff via Norris' devices, but the letters were not identified as fraudulent by CSUN and the compliance director until January 2024.

Relationship with Compliance Staff

When asked about his interactions with the men's basketball staff, the compliance director indicated that they had a good working relationship. The compliance director was involved in aspects of the housing process and met with the men's basketball staff roughly every two weeks to answer questions and provide education. However, as the only full-time compliance staff member, the compliance director was tasked with supporting 19 sports and had a heavy workload.

The compliance director also said that, because the men's basketball program was a priority, he was willing to give them more attention than other programs. He felt that he was as responsive to the men's basketball staff as possible and, overall, was complimentary of their time working together.

At the hearing, Newman stated that he expected his staff to be committed to compliance. Specifically, he recalled telling his staff "Make sure you talk to [the compliance director]" and that "[e]verything is out in the open." Newman also stated that his goal with compliance was to go "above and beyond." Thus, Newman claimed that he repeatedly requested more compliance meetings and education to the point that he was "begging for more involvement from compliance." Given his mindset, Newman also emphasized frustrations with the compliance director's ability to meet and answer questions as frequently and quickly as Newman desired. After a meeting in the summer of 2023, Newman realized that these frustrations largely stemmed from the compliance director's workload due to the staffing shortage in the compliance department.

In terms of his individual compliance efforts, Newman recalled engaging in a number of educational and monitoring practices. For instance, he had standing weekly timeslots for rules-related conversations with his staff, requested targeted compliance meetings and educational documents for the compliance director, and arranged a meeting between compliance, academics and his staff. Further, Newman frequently went to the compliance director with questions and encouraged his staff to do the same. Lastly, Newman required his staff to download mobile copies of the NCAA Division I Manual and made them sign weekly compliance attestations.

IV. ANALYSIS

The violations in the case involved academic misconduct, impermissible benefits and head coach responsibility. The academic misconduct violation and Newman's head coach responsibility violation are Level I. The impermissible benefits are Level II.

A. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 14.9.4.2-(b) and 14.9.4.3-(a) (2022-23 and 2023-24) and 14.9.3-(a) (2023-24)]

During the summer of 2023, Norris engaged in academic misconduct when he assisted a student-athlete with a final exam question and drafted a fraudulent letter of recommendation for an incoming graduate transfer student-athlete. This violation is Level I.

1. NCAA legislation relating to academic misconduct.⁷

Bylaw 14.9 governs academic integrity related to prospective and enrolled student-athletes. Under Bylaw 14.9.3-(a), institutional staff members are prohibited from arranging a false or inaccurate academic record (e.g., courses, grades, credits, transcripts or test scores) for a prospect. Similarly, staff members and student-athletes are prohibited from violating institutional policy regarding academic honesty or integrity. *See* Bylaws 14.9.4.2-(b) and 14.9.4.3-(a).

2. Norris engaged in misconduct when he assisted a student-athlete during an exam and forged a letter of recommendation.

On at least two occasions during the summer of 2023, Norris engaged in academic misconduct. Specifically, Norris provided an enrolled student-athlete with the answer to a question on his Spanish 101 final exam. Norris also falsified a letter of recommendation for an incoming graduate transfer student-athlete. Both instances violated CSUN’s academic integrity policy. As such, Norris’ conduct constitutes a Level I violation of Bylaw 14.

Although Norris did not provide his formal position on the allegation, information in the case record directly supports that academic misconduct occurred.⁸ During his interview with the enforcement staff, Norris referred to himself as a “tutor” who was expected to help student-athlete 1 pass his summer courses. Although Norris denied completing coursework for student-athlete 1, his statement is contradicted by an August 21, 2023, text exchange in which student-athlete 1 asked for help with a final exam problem and Norris responded with an answer written in Spanish.

Norris also admitted to forging a letter of recommendation under the name of student-athlete 2’s former coach. In addition to falsifying the contents of the letter, Norris added the logo of the coach’s employing institution to make the document look official. Although Norris claimed he did not know what happened to the letter after drafting it, it was ultimately submitted as part of student-athlete 2’s application materials.

While Newman agreed that Norris’ actions constituted academic misconduct, he attempted to diminish their severity, claiming the violation should be designated as Level II. In doing so, Newman primarily focused on the scope and impact of Norris’ conduct. Specifically, he argued

⁷ The full text of all bylaws cited in this case can be found at Appendix One.

⁸ In accordance with Bylaw 19.8.4.1, Norris’ failure to submit a response to the NOA may be viewed by the panel as an admission that the violations occurred.

that the single exam question did not affect student-athlete 1's overall grade in the course and that passing the course was not necessary for student-athlete 1 to maintain eligibility. Further, Newman noted that student-athlete 2's former coach agreed to serve as a reference and likely would have produced a substantively similar letter of recommendation. The panel is not persuaded.

Bylaw 19.1.2 defines Level I violations as those that seriously undermine or threaten the integrity of the NCAA Collegiate Model, including any violation that provides or is intended to provide a substantial or extensive advantage or benefit. That bylaw expressly lists examples of Level I conduct, including academic integrity issues and intentional violations or indifference to NCAA bylaws. *See* Bylaw 19.1.2-(b) and (h). Conversely, a Level II violation is defined as conduct that provides or is intended to provide more than a minimal but less than a substantial or extensive advantage or benefit. *See* Bylaw 19.1.3.

Consistent with Bylaw 19.1.2, the COI often concludes that academic misconduct violations are Level I. *See University of Missouri, Columbia* (2019) (concluding that Level I violations occurred when a tutor completed various levels of coursework on behalf of 12 student-athletes ranging from individual assignments to an entire course); *University of Louisiana at Monroe* (2018) (concluding via summary disposition with an expedited hearing that Level I violations occurred when an assistant men's basketball coach completed online courses for two men's basketball student-athletes); and *University of the Pacific* (2017) (concluding that Level I violations occurred when a head men's basketball coach provided four prospects with completed coursework and directed them to submit it as their own). Notably, similar academic misconduct violations previously occurred within CSUN's men's basketball program. *See CSUN* (2016) (concluding that Level I violations occurred when a director of basketball operations completed varying degrees of coursework for 10 men's basketball student-athletes using the student-athletes' academic account usernames and passwords).

When academic misconduct is Level II, the violations have traditionally been limited in scope and/or committed by individuals with no touchpoint on the athletics department. *See University of Houston* (2019) (concluding via summary disposition that more limited Level II academic misconduct violations occurred when a tutor wrote a total of four papers for two football student-athletes in exchange for money with no influence by athletics staff) and *University of Oregon* (2018) (concluding that Level II academic misconduct occurred when an adjunct professor arranged for a women's track and field student-athlete to receive unearned credit in order to maintain her eligibility).

In concluding that this violation is Level I, the panel considered case-specific facts, including the scope of Norris' conduct and his role as director of operations. The panel recognizes that Norris' actions are not the most egregious examples of academic misconduct to come before the COI. That said, Norris engaged in two distinct instances of academic misconduct with two different student-athletes. Stated differently, his conduct was not a one-time error in judgment or a mistake. These instances also occurred at a critical time—in the staff's first months on campus and while urgently trying to develop a roster for the upcoming season. As a men's basketball staff member, Norris' actions were intentional and aimed at ensuring the student-athletes' eligibility for the 2023-

24 men’s basketball season. Norris’ specific job duties also placed him in an oversight position with regard to the academics of certain student-athletes. Importantly, Norris’ conduct occurred shortly after being reminded of academic “dos and don’ts” by the compliance staff.

Academic integrity is a fundamental principle of the NCAA. *See* NCAA Constitution, Article 1. The COI takes academic misconduct seriously, even when it occurs on a more limited scale. Consistent with case guidance and Bylaw 19.1.2, the panel concludes that a Level I violation occurred.

B. IMPERMISSIBLE BENEFITS & UNETHICAL CONDUCT [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 10.01.1, 10.1, 10.1-(a) and 16.11.2.1 (2022-23 and 2023-24) and 12.11.1 (2023-24)]

During the summer of 2023, Norris and Jamestown provided impermissible benefits to six student-athletes. Specifically, they created fraudulent monetary award letters for the purpose of helping the student-athletes obtain housing. Because Norris knew that the letters were fraudulent, he also violated ethical conduct legislation. Further, Jamestown provided another benefit in the form of a guarantee to the leasing manager. As a result of the impermissible benefits, three student-athletes participated in 34 contests while ineligible. This violation is Level II.

1. NCAA legislation relating to impermissible benefits.

Bylaw 10 governs ethical conduct. Bylaw 10.01.1 requires individuals employed by member institutions to act with honesty and sportsmanship. Bylaw 10.1 defines unethical conduct and provides a non-exhaustive list of behaviors expressly identified as unethical, including the knowing provision of extra benefits to prospects and student-athletes. *See* Bylaw 10.1-(a).

Benefits and expenses for enrolled student-athletes are governed by Bylaw 16, with Bylaw 16.11.2.1 providing the general rule that a student-athlete shall not receive any extra benefit. The bylaw defines "extra benefit" as any special arrangement by an institutional employee to provide a student-athlete with a benefit not expressly authorized by NCAA legislation. Institutions must also withhold ineligible student-athletes from competition under Bylaw 12.11.1.

2. Norris and Jamestown provided impermissible benefits to six student-athletes when they drafted fraudulent monetary award letters.

In May and August 2023, Norris and Jamestown collectively drafted six fraudulent letters containing inaccurate or unverified information regarding student-athletes’ potential Alston payments. Those letters were drafted under the name of the compliance director for the purpose of helping the student-athletes meet Meridian Pointe’s financial requirements. During his ongoing conversations with the apartment complex, Jamestown also emailed the leasing manager to vouch for the student-athletes’ timely rent payments. The impermissible benefits rendered three student-athletes ineligible, and CSUN failed to withhold them from competition prior to seeking

reinstatement. The student-athletes subsequently competed in 34 contests while ineligible. This conduct constitutes a Level II violation of Bylaws 10, 12 and 16.

The parties do not dispute their conduct. Although Norris did not participate in the processing of this case, he acknowledged in his interview that he created the original Alston award letters and that he likely sent them to Jamestown while assisting with the housing process. Of the six total letters, Jamestown admitted to drafting one of them, which he did by updating the applicable student-athlete's name on one of the letters he received from Norris. Jamestown also sent the other letters to other individuals (i.e., the leasing manager or the student-athletes), presumably to be used at their discretion. Jamestown also admitted sending a letter with assurances to the leasing manager.

While Jamestown expressed regret for not handling the situation differently, he consistently disagreed that he provided any benefits. Specifically, Jamestown claimed that the apartment complex did not actually rely on the letters when renting to the men's basketball student-athletes. Jamestown also stated that the student-athletes did not receive special treatment, discounts or rent assistance. Additionally, he claimed that the "guarantee" he provided to the leasing manager was simply an informal promise. If any benefits occurred, Jamestown argued they were Level III due to their limited nature. Finally, Jamestown asserted that he did not engage in unethical conduct because he did not intend to violate NCAA legislation or attempt to conceal his actions.

Although not the type of "benefits" typically seen by the COI, the panel determines that the staff members provided impermissible benefits. The letters were drafted with the intent to be submitted as part of the student-athletes' financial verification process for Meridian Pointe. Whether Meridian Pointe viewed the Alston letters as a necessary component of the application materials is unclear. However, an email from the regional manager suggested that most student-athletes provided scholarship stipend letters, as well as miscellaneous awards/grants in order to be approved. Alston awards appear to fall into the latter category. More importantly, whether or not Meridian Pointe actually relied upon the letters is irrelevant. Norris and Jamestown fabricated documents for the sole purpose of giving student-athletes the best chance to secure housing at the complex. Further, another email from the regional manager states that, based on his letter, Meridian Pointe viewed Jamestown as a cosigner or guarantor for the student-athletes.

Moreover, with regard to the unethical conduct, Norris and Jamestown falsified documents to give the impression that student-athletes had more money than they actually did. CSUN had not officially decided to disburse Alston awards for the upcoming academic year and had only begun preliminary conversations at the time Norris drafted the first batch of letters. Further, the letters were inaccurate, as disbursements did not begin until roughly 10 months after the student-athletes began living in the apartments. Although they both participated in the conduct, Jamestown claimed that he did not know the original letters were fraudulent or inaccurate. At the hearing, he asserted that he trusted Norris' email and regretted not asking further questions. As a result, the panel determines that Jamestown's conduct, while an impermissible benefit, did not violate the principles of ethical conduct. Therefore, the Bylaw 10 violation relates to Norris' conduct only.

The COI commonly concludes that impermissible inducements and benefits that occur in the institution's locale prior to student-athletes' full-time enrollment are Level II. *See Mercer University* (2021) (concluding that Level II violations occurred when, prior to a prospect's enrollment, an assistant cross country coach and the head coach provided cost-free housing, travel, gear, tickets to football games and lodging at an away contests and the coaches also permitted her to practice with the team) and *Grambling State University* (2017) (concluding, among other Level II violations, that Level II recruiting inducement violations occurred when an assistant track coach permitted an incoming prospect to live with him cost-free for two months and provided her with free meals and transportation during that time).

Other recent cases have also involved Level II inducement and benefit violations. *See High Point University* (2025) (concluding via summary disposition that Level II violations occurred when a head women's volleyball coach arranged for prospects and student-athletes to receive cost-free housing and admission to an athletics facility) and *The Ohio State University* (2022) (concluding, in part, that Level II impermissible benefits occurred when a head fencing coach provided free access to a local sports club and an associate head women's basketball coach paid for two student-athletes' various expenses).

The violations in *Mercer* and *Grambling State*, as well as the head fencing coach's violations in *Ohio State*, also resulted in unethical conduct. *See also The University of Hawaii at Manoa* (2015) (concluding that an assistant men's basketball coach engaged in unethical conduct when he altered a financial form on behalf of a prospect to make it appear that the prospect had the requisite financial resources to be admitted to the institution). Consistent with these cases, the panel determines that Norris and Jamestown provided impermissible benefits to the student-athletes and Norris' involvement violated ethical conduct legislation. The violation is Level II.

C. HEAD COACH RESPONSIBILITY [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaw 11.1.1.1 (2022-23 and 2023-24)]

As head coach of the men's basketball program, Newman is responsible for the underlying academic misconduct, benefits and unethical conduct violations by his then staff members, Jamestown and Norris. This violation is Level I.

1. NCAA legislation relating to head coach responsibility.

Previously, 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 also presumed that head coaches were responsible for the actions of those who report to them. Head coaches could rebut this presumption by demonstrating that they promoted an atmosphere of compliance within their program and monitored their staff.

Effective January 1, 2023, Bylaw 11.1.1.1 holds head coaches automatically responsible for any violations committed by their staff members, regardless of the head coach's promotion of

compliance or monitoring efforts. Rather, those actions are considered during penalty deliberations.

2. Newman is responsible for Jamestown's and Norris' violations.

Under Bylaw 11.1.1.1, Newman is automatically responsible for the violations of his direct and indirect reports. As such, he is responsible for the underlying academic misconduct, impermissible benefit and unethical conduct violations in this case. Because the academic misconduct violation is Level I, Newman's head coach responsibility violation is also Level I.

Newman agreed that, because his staff's violations occurred after January 1, 2023, he violated head coach responsibility legislation. In accordance with the legislation, Newman outlined his purported compliance and monitoring efforts for consideration by the panel. While such facts are relevant to the panel's consideration of Newman's penalties, Newman also asserted that he should be rewarded for his compliance efforts and requests for additional support by lowering the level of this violation below that of the underlying conduct. In other words, he argued that the Level I academic misconduct violation should result in only a Level II head coach responsibility violation. That argument is contrary to the legislated standard and case precedent. In fact, there are no cases that support Newman's argument.

The level of a head coach responsibility violation is consistently determined by the level of the underlying violations. *See* Bylaws 19.1.2-(e) and 19.1.3-(e). The COI has concluded that Level I head coach responsibility violations occur when the head coach's staff members commit Level I violations, even when the head coach was not involved in the underlying conduct. *See Auburn University* (2022) (concluding that a Level I head coach responsibility violation occurred when the head men's basketball coach failed to promote an atmosphere for compliance and failed to monitor an associate head coach who committed inducement and benefit violations) and *University of Mississippi* (2017) (concluding that a Level I violation occurred when a head football coach failed to monitor aspects of his staff's recruiting activities). As with those cases, a Level I head coach responsibility violation occurred.

V. PENALTIES

A. Classification

For the reasons set forth in Sections III and IV of this decision, the panel concludes this case involved Level I and Level II violations 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 case is Level I-Aggravated for Norris, Level II-Standard for Jamestown and Level I-Mitigated for Newman.

Aggravating Factors for Norris

Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(a): Multiple Level I and/or Level II violations.

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

Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(e): One or more violations caused ineligible competition.

Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(f): Conduct or circumstances demonstrating an abuse of a position of trust.

Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(i): Intentional, willful or blatant disregard for NCAA bylaws.

The enforcement staff identified five aggravating factors for Norris. Norris did not participate in the processing of this case, meaning the factors are uncontested. The panel applies all five of the factors.

First, Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(a), *Multiple Level I and/or Level II violations*, applies because Norris is responsible for both a Level I and Level II violation.

With respect to Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(d), *Persons of authority condoned participated in or negligently disregarded the violation or related wrongful conduct*, Norris engaged in fraudulent activities in the form of academic misconduct and falsified Alston letters. The COI has often applied this factor (and its predecessor, Bylaw 19.9.3-(h)) to assistant coaches and noncoaching staff members when they have some level of authority within the program and are directly involved in violations. *See University of Michigan (2025)* (applying the factor to an assistant coach, assistant director of player personnel and noncoaching staff member due to their direct involvement in violations) and *Louisiana State University (LSU) (2022)* (applying the factor to an assistant football coach who was directly involved in recruiting violations during the COVID-19 recruiting dead period). Newman assigned Norris specific program-related responsibilities. In that way, he was a person of authority within the men's basketball program. Norris had oversight of specific student-athletes' academics and assisted with admissions and housing. Thus, the factor applies.

Further, Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(e), *One or more violations caused ineligible competition*, applies because Norris' involvement in providing impermissible benefits resulted in student-athletes competing while ineligible. The COI has routinely applied this factor to involved individuals when their violations directly resulted in a student-athlete's ineligibility. *See Arizona State University (2024)* (applying the factor to an associate head coach who provided recruiting inducements, causing eight student-athletes to compete in 19 contests while ineligible) and *University of Tennessee, Knoxville (2023)* (applying the factor to a head coach when his provision of inducements to two prospects resulted in them competing in 46 contests while ineligible). In light of the ineligible competition in this case, the panel applies this factor.

With regard to Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(f), *Conduct or circumstances demonstrating an abuse of a position of trust*, prospects and student-athletes deferred to Norris on academics, admissions and housing and did not realize that violations were occurring. The COI has applied the factor when an individual in a position of trust directly involves a prospect or student-athlete in violations. *See Michigan* (applying the factor to a noncoaching staff member who involved interns and student-

athletes in an impermissible scouting scheme) and *CSUN (2022)* (applying the factor to a head men's basketball coach, who involved coaches, staff, prospects, and prospects' family members in recruiting violations during the COVID-19 recruiting dead period). As in those cases, the panel applies this factor to Norris.

Lastly, with respect to Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(i), *Intentional, willful or blatant disregard for NCAA bylaws*, Norris engaged in academic misconduct and drafted fraudulent documents. The COI has regularly applied this factor to individuals who violate NCAA legislation knowingly (or, when they should have known that their conduct was a violation). *See Michigan* (applying the factor to a noncoaching staff member who violated the longstanding prohibition on in-person scouting) and *Arizona State* (applying the factor to an associate head coach who disregarded fundamental recruiting rules during the COVID-19 recruiting dead period). This factor has also been applied to an individual who did not consult with compliance before engaging in conduct. *See Missouri State University (2021)* (applying the factor to a head coach who did not consult with compliance when she had questions on rules). The panel applies this factor to Norris.

Mitigating Factor for Norris

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

The enforcement staff identified one mitigating factor for Norris. Again, Norris did not participate in the processing of this case, meaning he did not provide his position or propose additional factors. The panel determines that Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(e) applies because Norris has not been found to have any prior Level I, Level II or major violations during his career.

Aggravating Factors for Jamestown

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

Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(e), One or more violations caused ineligible competition.

The enforcement staff proposed three aggravating factors for Jamestown. Jamestown agreed with two of the factors but argued that they should receive less weight and disagreed with the remaining factor. The panel applies two factors to Jamestown.

With respect to Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(d), *Persons of authority condoned participated in or negligently disregarded the violation or related wrongful conduct*, the enforcement staff identified the factor due to his involvement in providing impermissible benefits. Jamestown agreed with the application of this factor but argued it should receive less weight because his violations were unintentional. As stated previously, the COI has often applied this factor to assistant coaches when they are directly involved in violations with prospects or student-athletes. *See Michigan* and *LSU*. Further, the panel determines that Jamestown negligently disregarded NCAA rules due to his failure to confirm the accuracy and authenticity of the Alston letters. Moreover, he admitted to

creating one of the letters by changing the applicable student-athlete's name. The panel applies this factor with traditional weight.

The panel also applies Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(e), *One or more violations caused ineligible competition*, because Jamestown's provision of the impermissible benefits resulted in student-athletes competing while ineligible. Jamestown agreed with the application of this factor but believed it should receive less weight due to investigative delays. Specifically, Jamestown argued that investigators had access to the Alston letters and relevant documents before the ineligible competition occurred and, therefore, could have prevented it if the violations were discovered sooner. Again, the COI has routinely applied this factor to involved individuals when their violations result in a student-athlete's ineligibility. *See Arizona State* and *Tennessee*. In the same way that ignorance of a rule is not a defense against a conclusion that a violation occurred, ignorance of the *impact* of that violation is not a reasonable argument for the non-application or reduced weight for this factor.⁹ The panel applies this factor with traditional weight.

The panel declines to apply Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(i), *Intentional, willful or blatant disregard for NCAA bylaws*. In proposing this factor, the enforcement staff argued it should apply due to Jamestown's knowing provision of fraudulent monetary award letters. Jamestown disagreed, stating that he did not intentionally violate rules or disregard a well-known application of benefits legislation. The panel agrees. The COI traditionally applies this factor to individuals who knew or should have known they were violating NCAA legislation. *See Michigan, Arizona State* and *Missouri State*. Although the panel concluded that impermissible benefits occurred, it recognizes that the benefits in this case are unique, and not something that all coaches would immediately recognize as an impermissible benefit—particularly when another staff member provided the initial fraudulent document. This factor does not apply.

Mitigating Factor for Jamestown

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

The enforcement staff proposed one mitigating factor for Jamestown, with which he agreed. Jamestown also proposed two additional factors, which the panel declines to apply.

First, the panel determines that Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(e), *The absence of prior conclusions of Level I, Level II or major violations*, applies because Jamestown has not been found to have any prior violations during his career.

Additionally, Jamestown proposed that Bylaw 19.12.4.2-(b), *Prompt acknowledgement of and acceptance of responsibility for the violations*, should apply due to his cooperation with the

⁹ To be clear, there may be other aggravating factors where ignorance could be material to the factor's weight and application. For example, Bylaw 19.12.3.2-(i), *Intentional, willful or blatant disregard for NCAA bylaws*, requires a specific mindset associated with the conduct. That is not to say a claim of ignorance would automatically render that aggravating factor inapplicable or result in less than traditional weight. However, it may be a material consideration for the COI given the case specific circumstances.

investigation, in which he acknowledged his *mistakes*. The enforcement staff disagreed that Jamestown took sufficient responsibility for his conduct, as he contested the occurrence and level of the violation throughout the processing of this case. Historically, this factor has applied when individuals acknowledge their *violations* during the investigation and take responsibility for their conduct. *See LSU* (applying the factor to an assistant recruiting director who immediately admitted to his conduct when questioned by enforcement staff, but declining to apply the factor to an assistant coach who denied his conduct until eventually admitting to it during a second interview) and *Ohio State* (applying the factor to a head women's golf coach who acknowledged her responsibility for violations throughout her NOA response and at the hearing). The panel appreciates that Jamestown regrets his conduct. However, he consistently rejected the notion that he provided impermissible benefits and placed the bulk of the blame on Norris. Stated directly, he never fully owned the conduct. While the panel takes no issue with Jamestown's advocacy, it does not believe this factor is warranted.

Finally, Jamestown proposed that Bylaw 19.12.4.2-(d), *Affirmative steps to expedite final resolution of the matter*, should apply due to his participation in the investigation and his production of records. The full text of the mitigating factor expressly notes the use of procedural options specifically intended to accelerate case processing (*e.g.*, negotiated resolution, summary disposition or accelerated hearing). In line with the plain text of the bylaw, this factor typically applies when individuals expedite the resolution of a case via their case processing selection. The COI has also applied this factor when parties have *attempted* to expedite the process. *See Mercer University (2021)* (applying the factor to an assistant coach who acknowledged his wrongdoing, accepted responsibility throughout the case and attempted to process the case via NR). To be clear, there are likely opportunities for individuals to expedite the resolution of the matter in the investigative phase through efforts that reduce the work of the NCAA enforcement staff. However, those efforts are not present here. Jamestown followed the traditional process and did not utilize any of the expedited processing options. This factor does not apply.

Mitigating Factor for Newman¹⁰

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

The enforcement staff identified one mitigating factor for Newman, with which he agreed. The panel determines that Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(e) applies because Newman has not been found to have any prior Level I, Level II or major violations during his career.

B. Penalties

After reviewing aggravating and mitigating factors to classify the case for each party, the panel then used the current penalty guidelines (Figure 19-1) and Bylaw 19.12.7 to prescribe penalties. In prescribing penalties for Newman, the panel also considered his compliance and monitoring

¹⁰ The enforcement staff did not identify, and the COI did not determine, that any aggravating factors should apply to Newman.

efforts. *See* Bylaw 11.1.1.1. Namely, the panel was persuaded by his proactive requests for additional compliance education for his staff, as well as his regular communication with the compliance director. Although these efforts did not lower the level of Newman’s head coach responsibility violation, the panel took them into account when prescribing his penalty.

In addition to individual penalties, the panel took note of Newman’s concerns with the vacation of records penalty in this case. As part of the NR, CSUN agreed to vacate the records for 34 contests in which three student-athletes competed while ineligible. Consistent with standard application of the legislation, that penalty included a vacation of wins counted towards Newman’s head coaching record. *See* Bylaw 19.12.9-(g)(2).

In his NOA response and at the hearing, Newman objected to the vacation of his head coaching records. In doing so, Newman raised two arguments: (1) the student-athletes received a minimal benefit or advantage due to the Alston letters, so vacating an entire season of wins was excessive; and (2) investigators failed to discover the eligibility-impacting violations in a timely manner (*i.e.*, before the 2023-24 season), which permitted them to compete while ineligible. While the panel appreciates the personal impact that the penalty has on Newman, the panel disagrees with the substance of his arguments, and those arguments do not support deviating from consistent historical application of the vacation of records penalty.

To begin, vacation of records is an *institutional* penalty that includes team, coaching and individual student-athlete records. The panel understands Newman’s frustrations given the program’s recent success under his leadership. Historically, individuals have not had standing to challenge the collateral impact of the vacation of records penalty on their career win/loss record. Similarly, the COI has a longstanding history of accepting and respecting institutions’ self-imposed penalties and corrective actions in an infractions case. To be sure, it is not uncommon for the COI to add additional penalties to those that were self-imposed, but the panel is not immediately aware of any earlier circumstance where the COI rejected an institutional penalty. The facts of this case do not support deviating from historical practice and application.

More importantly, vacation of records is not an excessive penalty in this case. The COI has regularly utilized the vacation of records penalty to address the competitive advantage gained from ineligible competition. *See University of Iowa* (2026) (prescribing vacation of records when two coaches had impermissible contact with a prospective football student-athlete, who later enrolled and competed in five contests while ineligible) and *High Point* (prescribing vacation of records when a head women’s volleyball coach provided impermissible benefits and recruiting inducements, resulting in 10 student-athletes competing in 62 contests while ineligible). The same competitive advantage occurred here. The fact that three ineligible men’s basketball student-athletes were able to compete provided an inherent advantage over compliant programs. Vacation of records is an appropriate penalty to address that violation.

Moreover, the fact that CSUN’s outside counsel or the enforcement staff did not immediately identify the Alston letters as providing impermissible benefits—particularly, when they were fraudulently drafted under the name of the compliance director—does not make them responsible

for the ineligible competition that occurred. Consistent with the nomenclature of Bylaw 11.1.1.1, which Newman acknowledges he violated, the responsibility to maintain a compliant program rests with the head coach. In that way, any violations that occur in the program—including the consequences associated with those violations—also rest with the head coach.

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

1. Show-Cause Order: On two occasions, Norris engaged in academic misconduct with two student-athletes. Norris also engaged in unethical conduct when he drafted fraudulent monetary award letters, resulting in impermissible benefits and causing three student-athletes to compete while ineligible. Accordingly, Norris shall be subject to a five-year show-cause order from **May 7, 2026, through May 6, 2031**. In accordance with Bylaw 19.12.6.4 and COI Internal Operating Procedure (IOP) 5-16-1, any institution employing Norris during the five-year show-cause period shall restrict him from all athletically related activities. Any NCAA member institution employing Norris 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.
2. Suspension: Should Norris become employed in an athletically related position at an NCAA member institution during the five-year show-cause period, the employing institution shall suspend him from 100 percent of the first season of his employment. Because the show-cause order restricts Norris from all athletically related activity, the suspension is subsumed within the show-cause order. The provisions of this suspension require that Norris not be present in the facility where the contests occur and have no contact or communication with men's basketball 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, Norris 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 Norris is suspended shall not count toward his career coaching record.

Although each case is unique, Level I cases involving academic misconduct typically result in lengthy penalties for involved individuals. *See Missouri* (prescribing a 10-year show-cause order and disassociation to a tutor who completed coursework for 12 student-athletes for over a year); *Louisiana at Monroe* (prescribing a six-year show-cause order to an assistant coach who completed a significant amount of coursework in two student-athletes' summer courses, failed to cooperate and engaged in unethical conduct); and *Pacific* (prescribing an 8-year show-cause order and 50 percent suspension to a head coach who engaged in academic misconduct, provided inducements and failed to cooperate). In prescribing Norris' penalty, the panel considered the scope of his academic misconduct, coupled with his impermissible benefit violations, and determined that a five-year show-cause order accounted for the severity of his conduct.

Core Penalties for Level II-Standard Violation (Bylaw 19.12.7)

1. Show-Cause Order: Jamestown was involved in providing impermissible benefits to six student-athletes in the form of fraudulent monetary award letters. The benefits resulted in three student-athletes competing while ineligible. Accordingly, Jamestown shall be subject to a one-year show-cause order **from May 7, 2026, through May 6, 2027**. In accordance with Bylaw 19.12.6.4 and COI Internal Operating Procedure (IOP) 5-16-1, any institution employing Jamestown during the one-year show-cause period shall require Jamestown to attend the annual NCAA Regional Rules Seminar at his own expense. Any NCAA member institution employing Jamestown during the one-year show-cause period shall abide by the terms of the show-cause order unless it contacts the (OCO) to make arrangements to show cause why the terms of the order should not apply.
2. Suspension: Should Jamestown become employed in an athletically related position at an NCAA member institution during the one-year show-cause period, the employing institution shall suspend him from 10 percent of the first season of his employment. The provisions of this suspension require that Jamestown not be present in the facility where the contests occur and have no contact or communication with men's basketball 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, Jamestown 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 Jamestown is suspended shall not count toward his career coaching record.

Apart from his required attendance at the NCAA Regional Rules Seminar and his suspension, Jamestown is not otherwise prohibited from any athletically related activities during the one-year show-cause period.

Recent case guidance for Level II impermissible benefits or inducements is limited, but violations traditionally result in one to two-year show-cause orders and/or limited suspensions. *See University of Arizona* (2019) (prescribing a one-year show-cause order to a diving coach who provided impermissible inducements and conducted tryouts with a prospect, resulting in Level II-Standard violations); *Monmouth University* (2017) (prescribing a one-year show-cause order and 30 percent suspension to a head men's tennis coach who engaged in inducement and practice violations with a prospect, resulting in Level II-Standard violations); and *Grambling State* (prescribing a two-year show-cause order with specific restrictions and a two game suspension to an assistant coach who engaged in Level II-Aggravated recruiting violations).

Core Penalties for Level I-Mitigated Violation (Bylaw 19.12.7)

1. Show-Cause Order: Newman is responsible for the violations that occurred in his program from May to August of 2023. Accordingly, Newman shall be subject to a one-year show-cause order from **May 7, 2026, through May 6, 2027**. In accordance with Bylaw 19.12.6.4

and COI Internal Operating Procedure (IOP) 5-16-1, any institution employing Newman during the one-year show-cause period shall require Newman to attend the annual NCAA Regional Rules Seminar at his own expense. Apart from this restriction, Newman is not otherwise prohibited from any athletically related activities during the one-year show-cause period. Any NCAA member institution employing Newman during the one-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.

2. Suspension: From November 25 through 30, 2024, CSUN prohibited Newman from any involvement in coaching activities, which included three men’s basketball games. (Self-imposed)¹¹

The COI has prescribed similar show-cause orders and/or suspensions to head coaches who are responsible for violations, regardless of whether they were involved in the underlying violations. *See Auburn* (prescribing, in a Level I-Mitigated case, a two-game suspension for a head coach who failed to adequately monitor his direct reports); *Mississippi* (same); and *Mercer* (prescribing, in a Level II-Standard case a one-year show-cause order and 30 percent suspension to a head coach who was presumed responsible for his assistant coach’s inducement violations).¹²

¹¹ In lieu of prescribing an additional suspension, the panel adopts CSUN’s self-imposed penalty. Under Figure 19-1, Level I-Mitigated cases require a suspension ranging from 10 to 30 percent of a season. During the 2024-25 season, CSUN played a total of 33 games. Therefore, the self-imposed three-game suspension falls just short of the legislated range for Newman’s classification. Rather than requiring Newman to be suspended from an additional game, the panel opted to deviate from the penalty ranges in accordance with Bylaw 19.12.8.

¹² 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 Newman’s violation. The panel applies the Figure 19-1 penalty guidelines consistent with the Level I-Mitigated classification of Newman’s case.

The COI advises Norris, Jamestown and Newman that they should take every precaution to ensure they observe the terms of their penalties. The COI will monitor them during the effective period. Any action by Norris, Jamestown or Newman contrary to the terms of any 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

Douglas Archie

Norman Bay

Joshua Gordon

Jason Leonard, chief hearing officer

Kay Norton

Jill Redmond

Maureen Weston

APPENDIX ONE
Bylaw Citations

Division I 2022-23 Manual

10.01.1 Honesty and Sportsmanship. Individuals employed by (or associated with) a member institution to administer, conduct or coach intercollegiate athletics and all participating student-athletes shall act with honesty and sportsmanship at all times so that intercollegiate athletics as a whole, their institutions and they, as individuals, shall represent the honor and dignity of fair play and the generally recognized high standards associated with wholesome competitive sports.

10.1 Unethical Conduct. Unethical conduct by a prospective student-athlete or student-athlete or a current or former institutional staff member, which includes any individual who performs work for the institution or the athletics department even if the individual does not receive compensation for such work, may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- (a) Refusal to furnish information relevant to an investigation of a possible violation of an NCAA regulation when requested to do so by the NCAA or the individual's institution.

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.

14.9.4.2 Prohibited Conduct -- Student-Athlete. A student-athlete shall not be involved in a violation or breach of an institutional policy regarding academic honesty or integrity:

- (b) Involving a current or former institutional staff member or representative of an institution's athletics interests.

14.9.4.3 Prohibited Conduct -- Institutional Staff Member or Representative of Athletics Interests. A current or former institutional staff member or a representative of an institution's athletics interests shall not be involved (with or without the knowledge of the student-athlete) in:

- (a) A violation or breach of an institutional policy regarding academic honesty or integrity related to a student-athlete.

16.11.2.1 General Rule. [A] The student-athlete shall not receive any extra benefit. The term "extra benefit" refers to any special arrangement by an institutional employee or representative of the institution's athletics interests to provide the student-athlete or the student-athlete's family members or friends with a benefit not expressly authorized by NCAA legislation.

Division I 2023-24 Manual

10.01.1 Honesty and Sportsmanship. Individuals employed by (or associated with) a member institution to administer, conduct or coach intercollegiate athletics and all participating student-athletes shall act with honesty and sportsmanship at all times so that intercollegiate athletics as a whole, their institutions and they, as individuals, shall represent the honor and dignity of fair play and the generally recognized high standards associated with wholesome competitive sports.

10.1 Unethical Conduct. Unethical conduct by a prospective student-athlete or student-athlete or a current or former institutional staff member, which includes any individual who performs work for the institution or the athletics department even if the individual does not receive compensation for such work, may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- (a) Knowing involvement in offering or providing a prospective or an enrolled student-athlete an improper inducement or extra benefit or improper financial aid;

11.1.1.1 Responsibility of Head Coach. 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.

12.11.1 Obligation of Member Institution to Withhold Student-Athlete From Competition. If a student-athlete is ineligible under the provisions of the constitution, bylaws or other regulations of the Association, the institution shall be obligated to apply immediately the applicable rule and to withhold the student-athlete from all intercollegiate competition. The institution may appeal to the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement for restoration of the student-athlete's eligibility as provided in Bylaw 12.12 if it concludes that the circumstances warrant restoration.

14.9.4.2 Prohibited Conduct -- Student-Athlete. A student-athlete shall not be involved in a violation or breach of an institutional policy regarding academic honesty or integrity:

- (b) Involving a current or former institutional staff member or representative of an institution's athletics interests.

14.9.3 Pre-Enrollment Academic Integrity. A prospective student-athlete, student-athlete, representative of an institution's athletics interests or a current or former institutional staff member shall not:

- (a) Arrange for a false or inaccurate academic record (e.g., courses, grades, credits, transcripts, test scores) for a prospective student-athlete.

14.9.4.3 Prohibited Conduct -- Institutional Staff Member or Representative of Athletics Interests. A current or former institutional staff member or a representative of an institution's athletics interests shall not be involved (with or without the knowledge of the student-athlete) in:

- (a) A violation or breach of an institutional policy regarding academic honesty or integrity related to a student-athlete.

16.11.2.1 General Rule. [A] The student-athlete shall not receive any extra benefit. The term "extra benefit" refers to any special arrangement by an institutional employee or representative of the institution's athletics interests to provide the student-athlete or the student-athlete's family members or friends with a benefit not expressly authorized by NCAA legislation.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION¹

California State University, Northridge – Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

I. CASE SYNOPSIS

California State University, Northridge (CSUN) and the NCAA enforcement staff agree with the violations and penalties detailed below. The parties agree that the case should be resolved as Level I – Mitigated for the institution.²

On August 16, 2023, the institution’s then associate director of athletics for compliance received information from John Van Houten (Van Houten), former assistant men’s basketball director of operations and representative of the institution’s athletics interests, who reported while visiting his home, a men’s basketball student-athlete (Student-Athlete 1) received a message from a member of the men’s basketball staff asking him to provide the two-factor identification code for Student-Athlete 1’s Canvas account.³ Shortly before receiving this information, the institution’s athletics compliance office also learned that the men’s basketball staff had access to the usernames and passwords for all the men’s basketball student-athletes’ Canvas accounts. These concerns caused the institution to hire outside counsel to investigate the issue.

The institution immediately imaged the phone and institutional computer of Casey Norris (Norris), then director of basketball operations, who supervised then Student-Athlete 1’s academics. Additionally, it took all necessary steps to preserve digital information and devices for all of the men’s basketball program and preserve digital information for the whole men’s basketball team. The imaging revealed several text messages where Norris mentioned “working on some Spanish” and the IP address data showed Norris logging into Student-Athlete 1’s student account at or around the time the Spanish assignments were submitted. Additionally, the imaging produced several documents written by Norris. These documents included a fraudulent letter of recommendation for the graduate school application of another then men’s basketball student-athlete (Student-Athlete 2), who at the time was a men’s basketball prospective student-athlete. Student-Athlete 2 submitted one of the letters of recommendation drafted by Norris, which purported to be from a basketball coach at an institution Student-Athlete 2 previously attended. Student-Athlete 2’s former coach did not write the letter, did not talk to Norris about providing a recommendation and was not aware anyone wrote a letter under his signature. The institution submitted both the information concerning Student-Athlete 1’s Spanish class and the fraudulent

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

² The parties agree that, although the application of the agreed-upon aggravating and mitigating factors best situate this case as Level I – Standard, pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.2.1.1, the institution’s exemplary cooperation shall reduce the party’s case classification by one to Level I – Mitigated. However, the parties also recognize the institution’s status as a repeat violator and therefore, as discussed in more detail below, have agreed to core penalties that deviate upward from the mitigated classification.

³ Canvas is an online academic portal where students can register for classes, check grades and submit coursework. The institution’s IT policy prohibits students from sharing their username and password for Canvas and other on-line academic platforms.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

California State University, Northridge - Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

Page No. 2

letter for Student-Athlete 2 to the institution's academic misconduct body. The institution found both issues violated its policy.

Subsequently, during its collaborative investigation with the institution, the remaining men's basketball staff's phones were imaged. In review of the imaged phones and additional data recovered from the men's basketball staff's email accounts, the institution discovered and notified the enforcement staff of several "Alston" award letters on devices utilized by Jordan Jamestown (Jamestown), then assistant men's basketball coach. Jamestown served as the housing liaison for the men's basketball team. Andy Newman (Newman), head men's basketball coach, wanted all men's basketball student-athletes to live in the same apartment building off-campus and instructed Jamestown to find the appropriate housing. Jamestown identified Meridian Pointe apartments, located directly across the street from the men's basketball gym, as a possible location for the team. Meridian Pointe, however, had a requirement that all lease applicants demonstrate a means of income two- and one-half times the rental rate. The men's basketball scholarship amounts did not meet this income criteria. As support for the men's basketball student-athletes housing applications, Norris drafted fraudulent letters indicating the men's basketball student-athletes would receive monetary awards. Based on digital records, Norris drafted the award letters under compliance office letterhead he created and forged the signature of the associate director of athletics for compliance on the letters. Meridian Pointe confirmed receipt of award letters in the men's basketball student-athletes files and that they were relied on for the proof of income analysis. At this same time, the athletics department had discussed possible Alston payments for the men's basketball team in the future, but such payments had not yet been approved by the institution or received by any men's basketball student-athletes.⁴ Further, in addition to the fraudulent Alston award letters, Jamestown submitted a letter to Meridian Pointe in which he agreed to monitor the men's basketball team's behavior and ensure they paid their rent on time, which Meridian Pointe considered akin to a guarantee.

Finally, when the institution began its investigation in August 2023, it interviewed the men's basketball student-athletes who were at Van Houten's home the night he witnessed the dual factor authentication request. One of these then men's basketball student-athletes (Student-Athlete 3) reported that, before he enrolled at the institution, he lived rent-free with Van Houten for a short period of time and received cost-free training from him. Student-Athlete 3 had no previous association to Van Houten and was introduced to him by a family friend. Because of Van Houten's status as a representative of the institution's athletics interests, providing these benefits violated NCAA rules. While the men's basketball staff was not involved in arranging these benefits, they were aware that Student-Athlete 3 was training with Van Houten after seeing both individuals together in the institution's men's basketball facility.

⁴ The fraudulent Alston letters were dated May 29, 2023, and August 10, 2023. Subsequently, some members of the men's basketball team received half of a legitimate Alston payment in March or April 2024 and a second half in May or June 2024.

II. PARTIES' AGREEMENTS

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

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 14.9.4.2-(b) and 14.9.4.3-(a) (2022-23 and 2023-24) and 14.9.3-(a) (2023-24)] (Level I)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that during the summer of 2023, Norris committed pre-enrollment and post-enrollment academic integrity violations. Specifically:

- a. Between late July and August 2023, Norris committed a post-enrollment academic violation when he assisted Student-Athlete 1 on his Spanish 101 final exam. [NCAA Bylaws 14.9.4.2-(b) and 14.9.4.3-(a) (2022-23 and 2023-24)]
- b. On or around August 9, 2023, Norris committed a pre-enrollment academic violation when he drafted a fraudulent letter of recommendation for Student-Athlete 2, a then men's basketball prospective student-athlete. Norris created a letter purporting to originate from one of Student-Athlete 2's former basketball coaches; however, the former coach did not draft or have any knowledge of the letter. Norris then provided the letter to Student-Athlete 2 and Student-Athlete 2 submitted the letter as part of his graduate school admissions to the institution. [NCAA Bylaw 14.9.3-(a) (2023-24)]

This agreed upon finding of fact serves as part of the basis for Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact Nos. 4 and 5.

2. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 10.01.1, 10.1, 10.1-(a) and 16.11.2.1 (2022-23 and 2023-24) and 12.11.1 (2023-24)] (Level II)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that between May 2023 and August 2023, Jamestown and Norris violated the NCAA principles of ethical conduct when they knowingly provided impermissible benefits by creating and providing fraudulent monetary award letters for the purposes of securing housing for six men's basketball student-athletes. Specifically, when six men's basketball student-athletes could not demonstrate the necessary income threshold to secure their preferred off-campus housing, Jamestown and Norris provided fraudulent Alston award letters indicating each student-athlete would receive \$5,980 in monetary benefits related to education when, in fact, the institution had not approved the disbursement of such funds to the student-athletes. Further, Jamestown provided a guarantee to the leasing agent stating he assured on-time payment by the men's basketball student-athletes, which the leasing agent also relied upon when allowing the men's basketball student-athletes to obtain leases without meeting the required financial criteria. As a result of the impermissible benefits, three men's basketball student-athletes competed in 34 contests while ineligible.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

California State University, Northridge - Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

Page No. 4

This agreed upon finding of fact serves as part of the basis for Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 4.

3. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaw 13.2.1 (2022-23)] (Level II)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that in June 2023, Van Houten provided approximately \$1,675 in impermissible recruiting inducements to Student-Athlete 3, a then men's basketball prospective student-athlete. Specifically, Van Houten provided two weeks of free housing at his home and approximately 10 hours of free personal basketball training.

This agreed upon finding of fact serves as part of the basis for Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact Nos. 4 and 5.

4. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaw 11.1.1.1 (2022-23 and 2023-24)] (Level I)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that from May through August 2023, Newman is responsible for the violations detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact Nos. 1 and 2.

5. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaw 8.01.3 (2022-23 and 2023-24)] (Level I)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that from June 2023 through August 2023, the scope and nature of the violations set forth in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact Nos. 1 and 3 demonstrate that the institution failed to monitor the conduct and administration of its men's basketball program. Specifically, the institution violated its own policy when it permitted and encouraged the men's basketball coaching staff to have access to the men's basketball student-athletes' online academic accounts, which contributed to the violations detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 1. Additionally, the institution did not adequately monitor access to institutional facilities and the coaching staff did not question individuals associated with prospects or notify compliance when they saw the individuals, which contributed to the violations detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 3. Finally, each of the violations detailed in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact Nos. 1 and 3 occurred while the institution's previous NCAA infractions case involving the men's basketball program, Case No. 01279, was under appeal.

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 the following three mitigating factors should be given significant or more than standard weight:

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

California State University, Northridge - Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

Page No. 5

Prompt self-disclosure of the violations [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(a)].

The violations occurred over a short period of time during the summer of 2023 and were detected and reported immediately. This prompt detection and disclosure ensured that digital records could be preserved, device imaging could be conducted immediately and initial interviews could be conducted. Each of these steps resulted in information relevant to the violations.

Prompt acknowledgement and acceptance of responsibility for the violations [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(b)].

At every step in the investigation and processing, the institution acknowledged the violations, contributed significantly to developing the information that substantiated the violations and accepted full responsibility.

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)].

The institution's efforts secured the cooperation of two leasing agents, including one leasing agent no longer at the property, who substantiated the violations in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 2. Securing these individuals' cooperation included efforts from compliance and other institutional representatives.

The parties also considered the institution's exemplary cooperation under Bylaw 19.2.1.1 and agree that this case should be properly resolved as Level I – Mitigated. Regarding exemplary cooperation, the institution provided the enforcement staff with extensive assistance throughout the course of the investigation. First, it volunteered all pertinent institutional information it obtained during its initial investigation. The institution provided an extensive self-report that identified all possible violations, including information obtained during phone imaging, interview transcripts and digital recordings of all individuals interviewed and provided significant amounts of digital information such as IP address that informed Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 1. This information provided a roadmap for the investigation and prevented the need for substantial document requests from the enforcement staff. The institution submitted a supplemental report when the issues relating to Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 2 were discovered with all relevant data and information. Second, the institution identified individuals to be interviewed by the enforcement staff. This included two leasing agents described above whose participation provided the enforcement staff with the information needed to determine if violations occurred and inform upon the leveling of those violations. Third, the institution expended significant time and resources to expedite the investigation. Both outside counsel and the institution's compliance officer spent a substantial amount of time obtaining information presented in its self-reports. Throughout the investigation, the institution consistently sought the truth and asked difficult questions of individuals, even when it was likely that the information obtained would not align with the institution's interests. Without the initial investigation and the help of counsel and compliance, the

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

California State University, Northridge - Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

Page No. 6

investigation would have taken significantly longer and may not have resulted in a complete record of information.

As noted below, the institution is also a repeat violator. Because of the institution's infractions history, the parties have agreed to core penalties which depart upward from Level I – Mitigated violations in certain areas. For further details regarding the institution's repeat violator status, see Section IV below.

Institution:

1. Aggravating factors (Bylaw 19.12.3.1).
 - a. Multiple Level I and/or Level II violations for which the institution is responsible [Bylaw 19.12.3.1-(a)].
 - b. Persons of authority condoned, participated in or negligently disregarded the violations [Bylaw 19.12.3.1-(e)].
 - c. One or more violations caused ineligible competition [Bylaw 19.12.3.1-(f)].
 - d. A pattern of noncompliance within the involved sport program [Bylaw 19.12.3.1-(g)].
 - e. Intentional, willful or blatant disregard for NCAA bylaws by a person with institutionally derived authority [Bylaw 19.12.3.1-(i)].
 - f. Involvement by a representative of the institution's athletics interests in violations [Bylaw 19.12.3.1-(k)].
2. Mitigating factors (Bylaw 19.12.4.1).
 - a. Prompt self-disclosure of the violations [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(a)].
 - b. Prompt acknowledgment and acceptance of responsibility for the violations [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(b)].
 - c. Institution self-imposed meaningful corrective measures and/or penalties [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(c)].
 - d. 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)].

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

California State University, Northridge - Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

Page No. 7

- e. An established history of self-reporting Level III or secondary violations [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(e)].⁵
- 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)].

III. OTHER VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION SUBSTANTIATED; NOT ALLEGED

None.

IV. REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES

On December 7, 2016, and December 22, 2022, a hearing panel of the Division I Committee on Infractions found violations within the men's basketball program. The December 2016 case, decided via hearing, involved Level I academic misconduct violations. The December 2022 case, decided via summary disposition, involved Level II recruiting violations. Therefore, the mitigating factor "absence of prior conclusions of Level I, Level II or major violations within the past 10 years" [Bylaw 19.12.4.1-(g)] does not apply, and the institution is considered a repeat violator pursuant to Bylaw 19.12.6.

Due to the institution's status as a repeat violator, the parties agreed to depart upward from certain core penalties identified in Figure 19-1. Specifically, the parties deviated upward from the cell appropriate for Level I – Mitigated violations when agreeing to a financial penalty, the period of probation and unofficial visit restrictions for the men's basketball program. In each instance, the agreed-upon penalty is elevated beyond any overlap zone and wholly outside the corresponding Level I – Mitigated cell. Regarding each of these penalties:

- The agreed-upon financial penalty (\$40,000 plus 4% of the men's basketball budget) is beyond the Level I – Mitigated maximum and sits at the midpoint of the Level I – Standard cell.
- The agreed-upon probation period (five years) is beyond the Level I – Mitigated maximum and sits in the upper half of the Level I – Standard cell.
- The agreed-upon unofficial visit probation (seven weeks) is one week beyond the Level I – Mitigated maximum and at the bottom of the Level I – Standard cell.

⁵ The institution reported 25 Level III violations between 2019-20 and 2023-24, approximately five violations each year.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

California State University, Northridge - Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

Page No. 8

Additionally, since the time of the institution's previous infractions cases, it has implemented and has planned or has in progress several measures designed to enhance the effectiveness of the institution's monitoring systems generally and for the men's basketball program specifically. As a result of this case, the institution has identified even more enhancements. These past and current enhancements include hiring a director of athletics who previously worked in compliance in Division I; maintaining a dual reporting line from compliance to both the director of athletics and vice president for administration and finance; designating the head of compliance as the men's basketball liaison; increasing the size of the compliance office to be at the top of the Big West in terms of size; compliance traveling with men's basketball to certain away events; implementing additional education regarding academic integrity; individualized and tailored education for men's basketball; and maintaining compliance being physically located in the same building as men's basketball (the only sport in that building). After its prior infractions case involving academic integrity, CSUN implemented significant corrective measures, which are still in place today and assisted in the detection of these violations. These included policies prohibiting some of the actions that occurred in this case and led to the institution quickly discovering them. The institution is in the process of expanding personnel in its compliance office and conducting intensive training and education on academic integrity. It has invested in measures to allow the compliance liaison for men's basketball to dedicate significant time to the program, including compliance traveling with the team. It is engaging with two outside entities to conduct an academic and comprehensive compliance assessment. For additional information regarding the institution's efforts to build and sustain a culture of compliance, please see the appendix detailing additional corrective actions.

V. PARTIES' AGREED-UPON PENALTIES⁶

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. Probation: Five years of probation from **June 20, 2025, through June 19, 2030.**
2. Financial penalty: The institution shall pay a fine of \$40,000 plus 4% of the annual men's basketball budget to the NCAA.⁷

⁶ All penalties must be completed during the time periods identified in this decision. If completion of a penalty is impossible during the prescribed period, the institution shall make the Committee on Infractions aware of the impossibility and must complete the penalty at the next available opportunity.

⁷ The fine from the men's basketball budget must be calculated in accordance with Committee on Infractions Internal Operating Procedures 5-15-6 and 5-15-6-1.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

California State University, Northridge - Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

Page No. 9

3. Scholarship reductions: The institution shall reduce overall men's basketball grants-in-aid by a total of one full equivalency during the 2025-26 academic year.
4. Recruiting restrictions:
 - a. The institution has prohibited unofficial and official visits to campus for men's basketball prospective student-athletes for a total of seven weeks during the 2024-25 academic year. As of February 1, 2025, the institution has served this penalty.
 - b. The institution has prohibited all recruiting communication in men's basketball for a total of three weeks during the 2024-25 academic year. As of January 18, 2025, the institution has served this penalty.
 - c. The institution has prohibited the men's basketball staff from engaging in off-campus recruiting activities for a total of six weeks during the 2024-25 academic year. As of February 1, 2025, the institution has served this penalty.
 - d. The institution shall reduce by 10 the number of permissible off-campus recruiting person days during the 2024-25 recruiting cycle.
 - e. A reduction of two official visits by the end of the 2025-26 academic year, which represents a 12% reduction based on the four-year average.

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

5. Public reprimand and censure through the release of the negotiated resolution agreement.
6. Vacation of team and individual records: Three men's basketball student-athletes competed while ineligible as a result of the impermissible benefits provided by the men's basketball program. Therefore, pursuant to Bylaws 19.12.9-(g) and 31.2.2.3 and 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 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

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

California State University, Northridge - Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

Page No. 10

material, electronic and digital media plus institutional, conference and NCAA archives. Any institution that may subsequently hire the affected head coach shall 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 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.

7. Coaching staff prohibition: The institution prohibited the head men’s basketball coach from involvement, directly or indirectly, in any coaching activities at the institution from November 25 through November 30, 2024. This period included three away men’s basketball games.
8. Disassociation: The institution shall permanently disassociate Van Houten beginning with the approval of this negotiated resolution on June 20, 2025. Pursuant to Bylaw 19.12.9-(i), the disassociation shall include:
 - a. Refraining from accepting any assistance from the representative of an institution’s athletics interests and his business interests that would aid in the recruitment of prospective student-athletes or the support of enrolled student-athletes;
 - b. Refusing financial assistance or contributions to the institution’s athletics program from the representative of an institution’s athletics interests or his business interests;
 - c. Prohibiting the representative of an institution’s athletics interests presence at or access to institutional athletics facilities or events;

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

California State University, Northridge - Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

Page No. 11

- d. Prohibiting the institution from offering the representative of an institution's athletics interests the option to purchase tickets to athletics events;
 - e. Ensuring that no athletics benefit, or privilege is provided to the representative of an institution's athletics interests and his business interests, either directly or indirectly, that is not available to the general public; and
 - f. Taking such other actions that the institution determines to be within its authority to eliminate the involvement of the representative of an institution's athletics interests in the institution's athletics program.
9. 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 academic integrity, recruiting and extra benefit legislation.
 - b. Submit a preliminary report to the OCOI by **October 1, 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 **May 1st** during each year of probation. Particular emphasis shall be placed on rules education and monitoring related to academic integrity, recruiting and extra benefit legislation.
 - d. Inform prospects in the men's basketball program in writing that the institution is on probation for five 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 men's basketball 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:

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

California State University, Northridge - Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

Page No. 12

(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.

- f. Conduct an N4A Academic Integrity Assessment.
 - g. Engage an outside entity with experience in NCAA compliance to conduct a comprehensive assessment regarding the institution's compliance practices, policies, and procedures.
 - h. Actively collaborate with Committee on Infractions, through the Office of the Committee on Infractions, regarding best practices and education and training opportunities for the institution's athletics department and to discuss and report on institution's progress on corrective measures and probation conditions.
10. 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.

CSUN.

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

Jamestown, Newman and Norris.

VII. OTHER AGREEMENTS

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

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

California State University, Northridge - Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

Page No. 13

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 it 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 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.

VIII. DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS APPROVAL

Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.10.1, the panel approves the parties' negotiated resolution agreement. The panel's review of this agreement is limited. Panels may only reject a negotiated resolution agreement if the agreement is not in the best interests of the Association or if the agreed-upon penalties are manifestly unreasonable. *See* Bylaw 19.10.4. In this case, the panel determines the agreed-upon facts, violations, aggravating and mitigating factors, and classifications are appropriate for this process. Further, the parties classified this case as Level I-Mitigated for CSUN. Unless an agreed-upon deviation under Bylaw 19.12.8, 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 CSUN that it should take every precaution to ensure that CSUN observes the terms of its penalties. The COI will monitor CSUN during the effective period. Any action by CSUN contrary to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations shall be considered

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

California State University, Northridge - Case No. 020303

June 20, 2025

Page No. 14

grounds for prescribing more severe penalties and/or may result in additional allegations and violations.

NCAA COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS PANEL

Norman Bay

Jason Leonard, chief hearing officer

Maureen Weston

APPENDIX

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE'S, CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

1. CSUN placed Norris and Jamestown on administrative leave during the pendency of the investigation and did not renew their employment.
2. CSUN will continue to conduct department-wide education with added emphasis on bylaw areas impacted in this case, specifically, housing, academic integrity, extra benefits and pre-enrollment benefits and activity.
3. CSUN will conduct specific education with men's basketball on housing, including best practices and policies for coaches and student-athletes working with compliance and outside entities on housing.
4. CSUN has completed the process of evaluating and retraining all student-athletes, coaches, staff and academic personnel on existing academic policies regarding prohibitions on sharing logins, using coaches' devices, or doing academic work in coaches' offices. This education will be ongoing and regular across the department.
5. CSUN has implemented a policy on the role of appropriate institutional personnel in assisting prospective student-athletes with enrollment to CSUN.
6. CSUN will conduct annual education and training on these academic integrity policies with the entire athletics department.
7. CSUN compliance, the men's basketball program, and the Matador Achievement Center (MAC) will conduct annual meetings and training to ensure clear expectations regarding the role of coaches and the MAC in student-athlete academics and pre-enrollment activities.
8. CSUN men's basketball staff members have been required to sign annual attestations regarding compliance with academic rules, policies, and expectations each year since being hired and beginning in 2025, all coaching staff members will be required to sign the annual attestation.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

APPENDIX

Case No. 020303

Date mailed

Page No. 2

9. CSUN compliance and the MAC will jointly conduct bi-annual education with student-athletes on academic integrity and policies around roles of coaches and the MAC and appropriate use of electronic devices, and prohibition on sharing login information. For any incoming student-athlete, the institution will require this education prior to clearing them to participate.
10. CSUN will require student-athletes to change their logins at least two times per year.
11. CSUN has implemented changes to its learning management system that provides observer only access to the MAC to assist with real-time oversight of deadlines for student-athletes.
12. CSUN has begun the process to construct a transformational new facility that will house, among other groups, the MAC and athletics. The intent of this development is to unite space and collaboration to ensure student academic success and bolster CSUN's commitment to equity, belonging and inclusion while maintaining independence and reporting lines necessary for academic integrity. The MAC and all of its employees report to and through the Division of Academic Affairs, distinct and independent of athletics. Bringing the MAC and athletics together in physical proximity is essential to CSUN's embodiment of the model within the CSU and Big West for commitment to the wholistic approach to student success, well-being and academic achievement. The MAC and athletics in the same physical environment allows the institution to reinforce the prominent role that the MAC plays in the lives of its diverse population of student-athletes. It will also allow for more seamless collaboration between athletics and the MAC to better serve its student-athletes and allow for more utilization and greater access by student-athletes of the MAC, all while maintaining that necessary independence.
13. CSUN has implemented measures to monitor and limit gym access, to the extent possible given athletics does not own or control the space and the campus is open to the community. Specifically, compliance conducts periodic check-ins in the gym to monitor users. Athletics has conducted training around appropriate gym users and access to cultivate awareness amongst the department to allow for reporting of any concerns. Athletics has made changes to its security process to ensure access is limited to appropriate users. Athletics has posted signage regarding permissible and impermissible use around the facility.
14. CSUN deployed campus security to conduct frequent checks of the facilities after-hours.
15. Athletics will continue to work with facilities and campus police to update relevant policies, procedures, staffing, and coordination.

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION

APPENDIX

Case No. 020303

Date mailed

Page No. 3

16. Athletics sent an immediate cease-and-desist to the representative involved to prohibit use of institution's facilities and implemented monitoring protocols to ensure the representative's compliance with the cease-and-desist.
17. CSUN is reviewing and updating compliance housing procedures, including that student-athletes living off-campus provide leases and related information to compliance.
18. CSUN is creating a robust on-boarding and training program for new athletics employees regarding NCAA rules compliance.
19. CSUN is in the process of adding additional personnel and support to the compliance office.
20. Compliance is traveling with men's basketball to some away competitions to build and strengthen the relationship and to provide additional monitoring opportunities.
21. CSUN will engage an external entity to conduct a comprehensive compliance review on all compliance functions.
22. CSUN is implementing a presidential compliance monitoring program to even further enhance oversight of athletics, the director of athletics, and men's basketball.