

FOR RELEASE After 11 p.m. (EST)

April 23, 1982

Contact: David Cawood

April 23, 1982

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PLACED ON NCAA PROBATION

MISSION, KANSAS--The University of Southern California has been placed on probation for three years by the National Collegiate Athletic Association as a result of occurring primarily in the conduct of the university's football program.

The penalty, which was proposed by the NCAA Committee on Infractions and upheld upon appeal to the Association's Council, includes sanctions that will prohibit the university's football team from participating in any postseason football bowl game during the 1982-83 and 1983-84 academic years, and from appearing on any NCAA-controlled television program or series during the 1983 and 1984 regular football seasons.

As a result of his involvement in this case and in accordance with the "show cause" provision of the NCAA penalty structure, an assistant football coach will be prohibited from performing any of his official or unofficial duties on behalf of the university, with the exception of coaching, for a two-year period. During this two-year period, the coach's salary will be frozen at its current level and the university will not be permitted to replace the coach with another recruiter.

"The most flagrant example of willful circumvention of NCAA legislation in this case," noted Charles Alan Wright, chair, NCAA Committee on Infractions, "involves an assistant football coach who, during the period 1971-1979, deliberately violated NCAA rules by selling complimentary tickets of varsity football team members at prices in excess of face value in order to provide large sums of cash to the team members who chose to participate in this arrangement."

Also, in accordance with the NCAA "show cause" provision, 16 individuals who purchased complimentary tickets through these arrangements will be prohibited from participating in any activities associated with the recruitment of prospective student-athletes on behalf of the university during the probationary period, and the university will curtail, to the extent of its authority, any involvement of the individuals in the university's athletic program during that period.

The NCAA's inquiries related to the institution's football program began in early 1980 after publication of newspaper articles quoting former football team

members concerning improper football ticket-selling arrangements. During the NCAA's investigation of this matter, the Pacific-10 Conference took punitive action against the university in August 1980 as a result of violations concerning arrangements for unearned academic credits for student-athletes enrolled at the university.

The Pacific-10 Conference penalty prohibited the institution's participation in conference championships or in postseason competition during the 1980-81 academic year in the sports of football and men's outdoor track, and required the adjustment of team scores and track records for the 1978 men's outdoor track season. The conference's action was reviewed by the NCAA Committee on Infractions in conjunction with its consideration of the remaining violations found in this case.

"The violations in this case that were found independently from the academic matters considered by the Pacific-10 Conference," said Mr. Wright on behalf of the committee, "represent a significant and extensive pattern of improper benefits made available to enrolled student-athletes, particularly members of the university's football team, over a period of approximately 10 years, as well as a lack of administrative control in the conduct of the university's intercollegiate athletic program.

"The Committee on Infractions believes that because of the benefits that accrued to student-athletes who had been instrumental in contributing to the successful football team records of the university, the institution realized a significant competitive advantage over other member institutions," Wright said. "The committee believes such an improper competitive advantage and the resultant athletic prestige gained by the university should not be realized without substantial disciplinary action."

The findings of violations in this case involved the principles governing amateurism, complimentary tickets, sound academic standards, compensation for work performed, ethical conduct, institutional responsibility eligibility for NCAA championship events and certification of compliance with NCAA legislation.

The following is a statement of the penalty imposed upon the University of Southern California and a summary of the violations committed by the university.

Penalty To Be Imposed Upon Institution

1. The University of Southern California shall be publicly reprimanded and censured, and placed on probation for a period of three years, effective April 22, 1982, it being understood that should any portion of the penalty in this case be set aside for any reason other than by appropriate action of the Association, the penalty shall be

reconsidered by the NCAA; further, prior to the expiration of this period of probation, the NCAA shall review the athletic policies and practices of the university.

2. The institution's intercollegiate football team shall end its 1982 and 1983 seasons with the playing of its last, regularly scheduled in-season contest and the university shall not be eligible to participate in any postseason football competition **durin9 the** 1982-83 and 1983-84 academic years.

3. The institution's intercollegiate football team shall not be eligible to appear on any television series or program subject to the administration or control of this Association during the 1983 and 1984 football seasons.

4. In accordance with the "show cause" provision of the NCAA penalty structure, the university will take disciplinary and corrective actions in regard to:

a. One assistant football coach, who will be prohibited from participating in activities relating to his official and unofficial duties on behalf of the university (with the exception of coaching) for a two-year period. [NOTE: This prohibition includes all activities associated with administration, supervision, recruiting, athletic booster groups, public relations and fund raising. During this period, the coach's recruiting role will not be assumed by another, i.e., the football program will operate with one less recruiter than would otherwise be permitted by NCAA rules.] Further, the coach's salary will be frozen at its current level during this period. Also, any further action by this coach constituting a violation of the principles of amateurism or the principles of ethical conduct will result in his immediate dismissal from the university, and also the suspension of the head football coach at the university.

b. Sixteen individuals (who were involved in the improper ticket arrangements as described in this case) to prohibit them from participation in any activities associated with the recruitment of prospective student-athletes on behalf of the university during the university's probationary period. Further, the university will curtail, to the extent of its authority, the involvement of any of these individuals in the university's athletic program for the period of NCAA probation. [NOTE: This action will not preclude these individuals from purchasing tickets and attending football games, but the university will return any monetary contributions which might be tendered by any of the individuals and to the extent permitted by law will preclude them from involvement in any recruiting, booster group, public relations or fund-raising activities on behalf of the university.]

1. NCAA Constitution 3-1-(a)-(3) and 3-1-(g)-(3) [amateurism and complimentary tickets] --During a period beginning the fall of 1971 and continuing through the fall of 1979, an assistant football coach directed a ticket-selling arrangement through which sold regular-season football game tickets on behalf of football team members who desired to participate in the arrangement; further, the coach sold these tickets for prices substantially in excess of the face value to representatives of the university's athletic interests, and finally, the proceeds from such sales were forwarded directly to the involved student-athletes. Included among the representatives of the institution's athletic interests who purchased such tickets through these arrangements during this period were at least 16 individuals who have been identified. In addition, this coach sold postseason football bowl game tickets on behalf of football team members during this period at prices substantially in excess of face value, and to encourage participation in these arrangements, he conducted at least one football team meeting during which he wrote the sale price for a ticket on the blackboard for consideration by the team members who were present. Identified team members who received funds for their tickets received amounts of cash ranging from \$410 to \$2,000 in one year.

2. NCAA Constitution 3-3-(a)-(2), 3-3-(a)-(3), 3-6-(a) and 4-2-(a); Bylaws 5-1-(b) and 5-1-(k)-(l)-(i) [sound academic standards, ethical conduct, institutional responsibility and eligibility for NCAA championship events. The violations listed in this paragraph were considered initially by the Pacific-10 Conference in August 1980 and reviewed by the NCAA Committee on Infractions in conjunction with the remaining findings of violations in this case.] -- (a) During the fall of 1979, the academic coordinator for athletics made arrangements with a lecturer in the department of speech communications at the university to permit student-athletes to enroll in certain speech communications courses with the understanding that the young men would do little, if any, academic work and would be graded as student-athletes, not as students; further, these arrangements constituted an improper intrusion by a member of the athletic department into the academic functioning of the university and also represented an abdication of responsibility by an academic department, and finally, the university attempted to remedy the situation by conducting a so-called intensive "crash" course, the effect of which was to accord special treatment to student-athletes in an attempt to comply with conference and NCAA regulations; (b) On the basis of a fraudulent transcript submitted to the university by a student-athlete, the young man was certified eligible and permitted to compete during the 1978 men's outdoor track season and in the 1978 National Collegiate Division I Outdoor Track Championships while ineligible; further, the university failed to adequately investigate the credits and unusual circumstances surrounding submission of this transcript; (c) During the 1977-78 academic year, two student-athletes were permitted to participate in men's outdoor track competition and in the 1978 National Collegiate Division I Outdoor Track Championships while ineligible, in that eligibility was established in part on the basis of unearned academic credit that had been transferred from another collegiate institution; (d) From 1974-76, student-athletes were permitted to enroll in certain courses in electrical engineering at the university although the student-athletes did not meet the published requirements for such enrollment; (e) During the 1977-78 academic year, a student-athlete participated in men's outdoor track competition and in the 1978 National Collegiate Division I Outdoor Track Championships while

ineligible, in that he did not complete the requirements for an Associate of Arts degree until subsequent to his enrollment at the university.

3. NCAA Constitution 3-6-(a) [ethical conduct] -- A former academic coordinator for athletics and an assistant football coach acted contrary to the principles of ethical conduct, inasmuch as they did not, on all occasions, deport themselves in accordance with the generally recognized high standards normally associated with the conduct and administration of intercollegiate athletics, in that their involvement in the findings of violations in this case demonstrates a knowing and willful effort on their part to operate the university's intercollegiate football program contrary to NCAA legislation.

4. NCAA Bylaw 5-6-(d)-(4) [certification of compliance with NCAA legislation] -- With full knowledge at the time that certain practices of the university's intercollegiate football program were not in compliance with NCAA legislation, an assistant football coach attested each year (1974-1980) on statements filed with the chief executive officer of the university that he had reported to the chief executive his knowledge of and involvement in any violations of NCAA legislation involving the institution.

5. NCAA Constitution 3-1-(f) [compensation for work performed by student-athletes] -- (a) From the 1975-76 academic year to the 1980-81 academic year, the university conducted a work program for student-athletes in all sports during the institution's Christmas, semester and Easter vacation periods. Because of inadequate supervision of the student-athletes in the program and an ineffective system of employment records, it is known that in some instances payment was made for work not performed, and the records are insufficient to establish that other involved student-athletes actually performed reasonable services to justify the earnings received. The failure of the university to exercise reasonable care to be sure that compensation was paid for work actually performed is a violation of Constitution 3-1-(f); (b) During the 1978-79 Christmas vacation period, the university provided compensation for work that was not actually performed to numerous members of the intercollegiate football team. Specifically, the involved student-athletes were paid on the basis of time cards (filled out approximately three months in advance) reflecting work performed at times when the football team practice schedule for the 1979 Rose Bowl game and the explanations of the actual hours worked by football team members who participated in this program would not appear to justify the payments received, and (c) During the 1979-80 Easter vacation period, the university compensated two student-athletes for work that was not actually performed because of ineffective record keeping.

6. NCAA Constitution 3-3-(a)-(1) [sound academic standards] -- During an approximate 10-year period (1970-1980), an average of 33 student-athletes in each year in all sports were admitted who met NCAA academic standards for athletic eligibility but who fell below the institution's normal standards of admission. From 1972-1980 the institution had an Experimental Admissions Program, described in its published official documents, that permitted admission of a limited number of high-potential students who did not meet the regular admissions requirements of the institution. Experimental Admission students, however, were, as one of the conditions of that program, not eligible

to participate in NCAA sports while in the program. The student-athletes specially admitted, therefore, were admitted as regular students. Thus, the student-athletes in question were neither admitted in accordance with the regular published entrance requirements of the institution, nor were they admitted under a discretionary authority identified in official documents published by the institution, and their admission was a violation of Constitution 3-3-(a)-(1).