

NEGOTIATED RESOLUTION¹

Stephen F. Austin State University – Case No. 01075

May 20, 2020

I. CASE SYNOPSIS

This case concerns the erroneous certification of academic eligibility for 82 student-athletes in nine sports over a six-year period and an agreed upon lack of institutional control. The initial violations were self-detected and reported by the institution, and the parties engaged in a collaborative investigation to determine the scope of the violations.

In June 2018, the institution hired a new athletics director. Shortly after he accepted the position, several individuals announced their planned departure from the athletics department, most notably the then director of compliance (former compliance director), and the then director of academics for athletics (former academics director). Prior to their departure, the new athletics director hired a staff member to serve as assistant athletics director, and to initially work as an athletics academic advisor while preparing to assume the position of director of compliance (compliance director), after the departure of the former compliance director. The compliance director, who had a long tenure in athletics academic advising prior to her arrival at Stephen F. Austin State University (SFA), initially questioned how the institution performed academic certification of eligibility for its student-athletes and learned that all responsibility for academic certification resided with the former academics director. Neither campus academic advising staff nor athletics compliance had any involvement. Although the institution utilized the admissions department in academic certification, that department only double checked the numbers already calculated by the former academics director, and it had no role in determining degree applicability or progress-toward-degree evaluations. At that time, the compliance director was not assigned a role in academic certification, and she did not learn until later that the institution erroneously certified student-athletes.

The former academics director had a strong reputation in the athletics academic advising community. He held a board position on a national membership organization and instructed his staff about the importance of following NCAA rules. Unfortunately, the former academics director's reputation and stature provided individuals within athletics a false sense of security that he applied all academic certification rules correctly. Further complicating the issue, the former compliance director made known his intent to retire after a near 30-year career at the institution, and as part of his transition to retirement, the former compliance director delegated additional compliance responsibilities to the former academics director. In addition to those compliance responsibilities and leading academic services, the former academics director oversaw a moderately sized staff, performed academic certification for all current and prospective student-athletes, awarded and tracked financial

¹ In reviewing this agreement, the hearing panel made editorial revisions pursuant to NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions (COI) Internal Operating Procedure (IOP) 4-9-1-2. These modifications did not affect the substance of the agreement. In addition, pursuant to Bylaw 19.5.12.4, this agreement has no precedential value.

aid for all student-athletes, and taught several classes on campus. Despite this heavy workload, the former academics director did not express any concerns and displayed confidence in his responsibilities. Those involved in compliance and athletics academic services at SFA believed the former academics director capably fulfilled the duties he was assigned.

After the transition of the former academics director to a faculty position and the former compliance director to retirement, the compliance director assumed the position of assistant athletics director for compliance. While in this role, a member of the football staff asked her if a current student-athlete who entered SFA as a nonqualifier could gain an additional year of eligibility by virtue of graduating in four years. The compliance director reviewed the student-athlete's academic file to determine if the NCAA bylaw applied. Through that review, the compliance director learned that not only was the student-athlete not on track to graduate in four years, he also did not meet progress-toward-degree legislation during his tenure at the institution. At or around the same time, the compliance director gave a transcript of a football student-athlete to an intern in her office to use as "practice" for learning academic certification rules. The intern returned to the compliance director and expressed concern that she must not understand NCAA academic eligibility rules because her review showed the student-athlete not meeting NCAA progress-toward-degree legislation. When the compliance director reviewed the intern's work, she found that the intern did the work correctly and the student-athlete did not meet progress-toward-degree rules.

Concerned that the institution had a potential systemic issue concerning academic certification, the compliance director contacted the NCAA enforcement staff in July 2019. The enforcement staff advised her to recertify all current student-athletes to ensure their eligibility to compete in the upcoming 2019-20 academic year. Following the recertification, the institution advised multiple student-athletes to enroll in additional academic credit during the summer to make up for progress-toward-degree deficiencies and sought progress-toward-degree waivers for other student-athletes.

On September 16, 2019, a new president began at the institution and he was briefed on the status of the institution's academic certification matter. Recognizing the seriousness of the matter and based on his background in athletics, compliance and NCAA eligibility rules, the president agreed with the recommendation from athletics to hire and engage outside counsel. In October 2019, outside counsel and the enforcement staff visited campus to conduct interviews and meet with the president and athletics administrators. The enforcement staff visited campus in November and December 2019 to assist with the recertification of a group of student-athletes dating back four years, consistent with the NCAA statute of limitations. As a part of this effort, the institution recertified all football, men's basketball and baseball student-athletes. Further, it recertified select individuals in other sports as a "spot-check." Through that review, it was determined that the primary problem in the former academic certification process was the institution's failure to consider the degree applicability of transfer credits when certifying transfer student-athletes' academic eligibility. Although these transfer

student-athletes largely met NCAA transfer legislation, they failed to meet progress-toward-degree legislation at the institution.

The recertification efforts also discovered two football student-athletes who competed while ineligible in the 2019 fall season. The student-athletes had cured their progress-toward-degree deficiencies prior to the 2018-19 academic year, and thus were not identified in the institution's initial recertification, but had not been reinstated after participating while ineligible during a prior season. The compliance director immediately sought and obtained reinstatement for the two student-athletes.

In their interviews, both the former compliance director and the former academics director reported that they understood progress-toward-degree legislation and that the institution had an effective academic certification system. Neither indicated any concern for the certification system during their tenure and expressed surprise that so many student-athletes competed while academically ineligible. Although the former academics director acknowledged he had a significant workload while in his former position, he did not express to the institution or the enforcement staff any concerns with his ability to perform his duties effectively.

During the investigation, the institution discovered and disclosed to the enforcement staff the results of a 2014 NCAA Academic Performance Plan (APP) data review. That review by the NCAA academic and membership affairs staff did not indicate any specific, systemic problems with the then academic certification process, but the academic and membership affairs staff's final report provided to the institution did note that the institution did not adequately consider degree applicability in its academic certification process in previous years. Academic and membership affairs staff directed the institution to update its policies and procedures to "more clearly define the progress-toward-degree requirements that need to be met and specify the need to use degree applicable versus total hours going into the fifth full time term" and "more clearly identify the individuals involved in the certification process, their roles in the process..." Because any changes made at that time failed to detect or prevent the violations at issue in this case, the institution agreed it did not adequately control this element of its athletics program.

The institution and enforcement staff agreed that this case could be processed through negotiation resolution and agreed that this case should be properly resolved as Level I - Mitigated for the institution. In reaching a "mitigated" classification, the institution and enforcement staff assessed the aggravating and mitigating factors by weight and number. Typically, enforcement cases involving eligibility certification and progress-toward-degree violations are difficult to investigate and process largely because of an institution's inability to provide the enforcement staff with the needed information to determine the scope and origins of the violations. In this case, the initial violations were detected and reported by the institution, and throughout the case the athletics director, the compliance director and others at the institution devoted substantial time and resources to assist the enforcement staff, discover critical information and recertify student-athletes in a timely manner. This case serves as a model for other institutions when faced with multiple progress-toward-degree

violations. Additionally, the institution's last major NCAA infractions case occurred over 18 years ago, and because of the significant lapse of time between cases, the institution and enforcement staff agreed that this aggravating factor carries little weight.

II. PARTIES' AGREEMENTS

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

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b), 14.4.3.1-(c) and 14.4.3.2 (2013-14 through 2018-19); 14.10.1 (2013-14); 16.8.1 (2013-14 through 2019-20); 12.11.1 (2014-15 through 2019-20); 14.4.3.1.6 (2014-15 and 2015-16); 14.4.3.2.3.1 (2014-15 through 2018-19); 12.1.1.1.3 (2015-16 through 2018-19); 14.5.4.2.1-(b) and 15.01.5 (2016-17 and 2018-19); 14.2.1 and 14.2.2 (2017-18); 14.4.3.1-(a) (2017-18 and 2018-19); 14.5.4.2.1-(d) (2018-19)] (Level I)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that beginning in the 2013-14 academic year and continuing through the fall of 2019, the institution improperly certified as eligible for practice and/or competition 82 student-athletes on 172 occurrences in nine sports including football, men's basketball, baseball, men's track and field, women's track and field, softball, women's volleyball, women's golf and men's cross country.² As a result, 82 student-athletes competed and received actual and necessary expenses while ineligible. Additionally, the institution failed to withhold 36 student-athletes from competition during subsequent academic years before their eligibility was reinstated. Specifically:

- a. Beginning in the 2015-16 academic year and continuing through the 2018-19 academic year, two football student-athletes, four baseball student-athletes and one women's volleyball student-athlete practiced and competed outside of the temporary certification period and prior to having their amateurism certified. [NCAA Bylaw 12.1.1.1.3 (2015-16 through 2018-19)]
- b. In the spring of 2018, one men's track and field student-athlete and one women's track and field student-athlete practiced and competed without enrolling in a full-time program of studies. [NCAA Bylaws 14.2.1 and 14.2.2 (2017-18)]
- c. In the 2017-18 academic year, one men's cross country and track and field student-athlete, and in the fall of 2018, one women's golf student-athlete, competed without satisfactory completion of at least 24 semester hours of academic credit prior to the start of the student-

²The statute of limitations began when the institution discovered the violations in June 2019, and the majority of the certification violations cited fell within the four-year period prior to that date. A limited number of certification violations predate the beginning of the four-year period; however, ineligible competition resulting from those violations occurred during the four-year period; thus, the institution and enforcement staff agreed that the underlying certification violations should be included.

athletes' second year of collegiate enrollment. [NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.1-(a) (2017-18 and 2018-19)]

- d. Beginning in the 2013-14 academic year and continuing through the 2018-19 academic year, seven football student-athletes, one women's track and field student-athlete, four men's basketball student-athletes and two baseball student-athletes, on a total of 15 different occurrences, competed without satisfactory completion of at least 18 semester hours of academic credit during the certifying institution's preceding regular two semesters. [NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.1-(b) (2013-14 through 2018-19)]
- e. Beginning in the 2013-14 academic year and continuing through the 2018-19 academic year, five football student-athletes, one baseball student-athlete and one men's basketball student-athlete, on eight total occurrences, competed without satisfactory completion of at least six semester hours of academic credit during the certifying institution's preceding regular semester. [NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.1-(c) (2013-14 through 2018-19)]
- f. In the 2014-15 and 2015-16 academic years, two football student-athletes competed in the first four contests of the season without satisfactory completion of at least nine semester hours during the previous fall term. [NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.1.6 (2014-15 and 2015-16)]
- g. Beginning in the 2013-14 academic year and continuing through the 2018-19 academic year, 12 men's basketball student-athletes, 16 baseball student-athletes, 39 football student-athletes, one men's cross country student-athlete, one softball student-athlete, and two women's track and field student-athletes, on 105 different total occurrences, competed without successfully completing their required percentage-of-degree requirements. [NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.2 (2013-14 through 2018-19)]
- h. Beginning in the 2014-15 academic year and continuing through the 2018-19 academic year, 13 baseball student-athletes, on 20 different occasions, competed in the spring semester even though those student-athletes had failed to meet the percentage-of-degree requirements at the outset of the previous fall semester. [NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.2.3.1 (2014-15 through 2018-19)]
- i. During the spring of 2017, the institution improperly certified as eligible a two-year nonqualifier transfer baseball student-athlete who did not have the required 48 transferable hours. The institution also impermissibly awarded the student-athlete athletics aid. [NCAA Bylaws 14.5.4.2.1-(b) and 15.01.5 (2016-17)]
- j. During the fall of 2018, the institution improperly certified as eligible for athletics aid a two-year nonqualifier transfer football student-athlete who did not have the required cumulative grade-point average of 2.500. [NCAA Bylaws 14.5.4.2.1-(d) and 15.01.5 (2018-19)]

This serves as part of the basis for the lack of institutional control in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 2.

2. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 2.1.1, 2.8.1 and 6.01.1 (2013-14 through 2018-19)]
(Level I)

The institution and enforcement staff agree that the scope and nature of the violations set forth in Agreed-Upon Finding of Fact No. 1 demonstrate that from the 2013-14 through 2018-19 academic years, the institution failed to exercise institutional control and to monitor the conduct and administration of the athletics program. Specifically, the institution failed to adequately monitor and control the athletics eligibility certification process, failed to properly apply academic certification legislation, failed to sufficiently involve institutional staff members from departments outside of athletics in the certification process, failed to withhold ineligible student-athletes from team travel and competition and failed to promptly or contemporaneously detect and report the certification violations to the NCAA.

B. Agreed-upon aggravating and mitigating factors.

Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.5.12.1.3-(e), the parties agree that the aggravating and mitigating factors identified below are applicable. The parties assessed the factors by weight and number and agree that this case should be properly resolved as Level I – Mitigated.

Institution:

1. Aggravating factors (Bylaw 19.9.3).
 - a. Multiple Level I violations by the institution [Bylaw 19.9.3-(a)].
 - b. A history of Level I, Level II or major violations by the institution [Bylaw 19.9.3-(b)].
 - c. Lack of institutional control [Bylaw 19.9.3-(c)].
2. Mitigating factors (Bylaw 19.9.4).
 - a. Prompt acknowledgement of the violations, acceptance of responsibility and imposition of meaningful corrective measures [Bylaw 19.9.4-(b)].
 - b. Affirmative steps to expedite final resolution of the matter [Bylaw 19.9.4-(c)].
 - c. Exemplary cooperation [Bylaw 19.9.4-(f)].

III. OTHER VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION SUBSTANTIATED; NOT ALLEGED

None.

IV. REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES

None.

V. PARTIES' AGREED-UPON PENALTIES

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 19.5.12.1.3-(e), the parties agree to the following penalties:

Core Penalties for Level I – Mitigated Violations (Bylaw 19.9.5)³

1. Probation: Three years of probation from May 20, 2020, through May 19, 2023.
2. Financial penalty: \$5,000 plus one-half of one percent of the budgets for the football and baseball programs, as calculated pursuant to the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions Internal Operating Procedures (IOP) 5-15-4 and 5-15-4-1. That amount is equivalent to \$18,390 for football and \$4,271 for baseball.

Additionally, pursuant to Committee on Infractions IOP 5-15-4 and 5-15-4-3, the institution will return 50 percent of its share of unit(s) awarded based on the participation of its men's basketball team in the 2015-16 NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Championship. The total fine amount of \$66,546 accounts for all future units to be paid on a rolling distribution schedule for Stephen F. Austin's participation

³ The parties agreed that recruiting restrictions were not appropriate in this case after evaluating case precedent for Level I and II certification cases and weighing the impact that penalties in other areas have on recruiting (i.e., an extended probationary period, financial penalties and vacation of records). Further, the parties also agreed that a postseason penalty was also not appropriate. The parties noted that the institution's football, baseball and men's basketball teams likely face postseason penalties through the APP process when the NCAA Division I Academic Progress Rate scores of those programs are recalibrated based upon the findings in the infractions process. While the parties acknowledge that postseason penalties imposed by the Committee on Academics through the APP process operate independent and supplemental to penalties prescribed in an infractions case, that factor was weighed in the overall evaluation of penalties.

in the involved tournament years.⁴ Given the substantial sum forfeited for the men's basketball program's participation in the Men's Basketball Championship, the parties agreed that an additional financial penalty based upon the budget of the men's basketball program would not be imposed.

Financial penalties were not imposed on the other sports programs due to the limited number of student-athletes who were not properly certified in those sports.

3. Scholarship reductions: A five percent reduction in grants-in-aid (equivalencies) in the baseball program in either the 2020-21 or 2021-22 academic year; a reduction by one to the number of total counters in men's basketball during either the 2020-21 or 2021-22 academic year; and a two-and-a-half percent reduction in grants-in-aid (equivalencies) in the football program in the 2020-21 and 2021-22 academic years. Because of scholarship commitments already made by the institution and the timing of the submittal of the negotiated resolution, the institution and enforcement staff agreed on the options (baseball and men's basketball) and staggering (football) of the scholarship reductions.

Scholarship reductions were not imposed on the other sports programs due to the limited number of student-athletes who were not properly certified in those sports.

Additional Penalties for Level I – Mitigated Violations (Bylaw 19.9.7)

4. Public reprimand and censure.
5. Vacation of records: The institution will vacate all regular season and conference tournament wins, records and participation in which the ineligible student-athletes in this case competed from the time they became ineligible through the time they were reinstated as eligible for competition.

This vacation includes all regular season competition and conference tournaments. Further, if the ineligible student-athletes participated in NCAA postseason

⁴ Stephen F. Austin's men's basketball team also represented the Southland Conference in the 2014-15 and 2017-18 Men's Basketball Championships. However, unit distributions for the opening round of the tournament ("base distributions") are retained in full by the conference for its operating budget and the underwriting fees associated with televising basketball games. No portion of the base distribution is awarded to the institution representing the conference in the tournament or any of the remaining 13 members. If the conference representative wins its opening round contest – as Stephen F. Austin did in 2015-16 – 50 percent of the revenue distribution in excess of the base distribution is provided to the representative institution for the first fiscal year. The remaining 50 percent from the first-year distribution and the entire additional distribution amount during the remaining years is shared equally with each conference institution (with one share allotted for the conference office). Each eligible member institution and the conference office receive an equal share of any "supplemental distribution" to the men's basketball fund base amount. The penalty was therefore calculated using the value of unit(s) awarded to Stephen F. Austin "based on its participation" in the Men's Basketball Championship: \$133,092 (Stephen F. Austin's distribution in the first year following the 2015-16 tournament win).

competition at any time while they were ineligible, the institution's participation in the postseason contests in which the ineligible competition occurred shall be vacated. The individual finishes and any awards for all eligible student-athletes shall be retained. Further, the institution's records regarding its affected programs, as well as the records of the head coaches, shall reflect the vacated records and shall be recorded in all publications in which such records are reported including, but not limited to, institutional media guides, recruiting material, electronic and digital media plus institutional, conference and NCAA media archives. Any institution that may subsequently hire the affected head coaches shall similarly reflect the vacated wins in their career records documented in media guides and other publications cited above. Head coaches with vacated wins on their records may not count the vacated wins toward specific honors or victory "milestones" such as 100th, 200th or 500th career victories.

Any public reference to the vacated contests 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 programs shall be returned to the Association. Finally, to ensure that all institutional and student-athlete vacations, statistics and records are accurately reflected 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 document will be maintained in the permanent files of the media coordination and statistics office. This written report must be delivered to the office no later than 14 days following the release of this decision. The sports information director (or designee) must also inform the Office of the Committees on Infractions (OCOI) of this submission to the media coordination and statistics office.

6. Other penalties to include: Prior to the conclusion of the probationary period, the institution will submit to a data review with APP staff. The result of that review will be included in the final compliance report due to the Committee on Infractions pursuant to probationary period requirement 7-c below.
7. During this period of probation, the institution shall:
 - a. Continue to develop and implement a comprehensive compliance and educational program on NCAA legislation to instruct coaches, the faculty athletics representative, all athletics department personnel and all institutional staff members with responsibility for NCAA academic certification legislation;

- b. Submit a preliminary report to the OCOI by July 15, 2020, 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 April 15th during each year of probation. Particular emphasis shall be placed on the institution's compliance measures taken to ensure adherence with NCAA progress-toward-degree legislation and related rules education and;
 - d. Inform prospects in all affected sports programs in writing that the institution is on probation for three years and detail the violations committed. If a prospect takes an official paid visit, the information regarding violations, penalties and terms of probation must be provided in advance of the visit. Otherwise, the information must be provided before a prospect signs a National Letter of Intent; and
 - e. Publicize specific and understandable information concerning the nature of the violations by providing, at a minimum, a statement to include the types of violations and the involved sports program(s) and a direct, conspicuous link to the public infractions decision located on the athletics department's main webpage "landing page" and in the media guides of the involved sports program(s) for the entire term of probation. The institution's statement must: (i) clearly describe the violations; (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.
10. Following the receipt of the compliance report and prior to the conclusion of probation, the institution's president shall provide a letter to the Committee on Infractions affirming that the institution's current athletics policies and practices conform to all requirements of NCAA regulations.

VI. OTHER AGREEMENTS

The parties agree that this case will be processed through the negotiated resolution process as outlined in Bylaw 19.5, and a hearing panel comprised of members of the Committee on Infractions will review the negotiated resolution. The parties acknowledge that the negotiated resolution contains agreed-upon findings of fact of NCAA violations and agreed-upon aggravating and mitigating factors based on information available at this time. Nothing in this resolution precludes the enforcement staff from investigating additional information about potential rules violations. The parties agree that, pursuant to Bylaw 19.1.1, the violations identified in this agreement should be classified as Level I – Mitigated for the institution.

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 it has or will impose and follow the penalties contained within the negotiated resolution, and these penalties are in accordance with those prescribed in Bylaws 19.9.5, 19.9.6, 19.9.7 and 19.9.8. 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 COI 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. Additionally, the parties acknowledge that this negotiated resolution will not be binding if the case is referred to the independent accountability resolution process (Bylaw 19.11).

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 case may be submitted through a summary disposition report (Bylaw 19.6) or notice of allegations (Bylaw 19.7) and prior agreed-upon terms of the rejected negotiated resolution will not be binding.

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

VII. DIVISION I COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS APPROVAL

Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.5.12, 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 19.5.12.2. 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 Stephen F. Austin University. The agreed-upon penalties align with the ranges identified for core penalties for Level I cases in Figure 19-1 and Bylaw 19.9.5 and the additional penalties available under Bylaw 19.9.7. Pursuant to Bylaw 19.5.12.4, this negotiated resolution has no precedential value.

The COI advises Stephen F. Austin that it should take every precaution to ensure that they observe the terms of the penalties. The COI will monitor the institution while it is on probation to ensure compliance with the penalties and terms of probation and may extend the probationary period, among other action, if the institution does not comply or commits additional violations. Likewise, any action by the institution contrary to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations shall be considered grounds for prescribing more severe penalties and/or may result in additional allegations and violations.

NCAA COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS PANEL

Bobby Cremins

Thomas Hill, Chief Hearing Officer

E. Thomas Sullivan

APPENDIX

STEPHEN F. AUSTIN STATE UNIVERSITY'S CORRECTIVE ACTIONS

1. Upon learning of the case, the institution's president authorized the hiring of an assistant university registrar/athletics certification officer who assumed primary certification responsibility and responsibility for verifying student data for athletes including enrollment status, registration, dates of attendance, etc. Additionally, the president overhauled the intercollegiate athletics council, strengthened its bylaws, formed subcommittees that include academic progress, integrity and compliance and added additional members from various campus constituent groups.
2. The institution's athletics academic advisors have been notified of and educated on their responsibility for tracking eligibility of their assigned student-athletes and bringing issues to the attention of those in the certification meetings.
3. The institution restructured the academic certification process for continuing eligibility. Meetings are now comprised of the following individuals: athletics compliance, athletics academic support and the institution's certifying official.
4. The institution created a "Determination of Eligibility" form for each type of transfer to guide athletics academics services staff through evaluating transfer eligibility for certification.
5. The institution enhanced rules education for all staff members concerning academic eligibility for incoming and continuing student-athletes.
6. The institution hired a second compliance office staff member to focus on rules education for the athletics department and all external constituents.