



## ***News Release***

FOR RELEASE:  
August 23, 2001  
3 p.m. Central time

CONTACT:  
Jack H. Friedenthal, chair  
NCAA Division I  
Committee on Infractions  
George Washington University

### **UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA** **PUBLIC INFRACTIONS REPORT**

#### **I. INTRODUCTION.**

On June 9, 2001, officials from the University of Southern California appeared before the Division I Committee on Infractions to address allegations of NCAA violations in the institution's athletics programs. The allegations centered on unethical conduct involving academic fraud and the provision of false and misleading information, with allegations of a lack of institutional control and failure to monitor associated with the academic fraud. The information relating to academic fraud was self-reported by the institution to the NCAA. There were also allegations of significant recruiting violations in the men's basketball program.

The university is a member of the Pacific-10 Conference with an enrollment of approximately 29,000 students and sponsors nine men's and 10 women's intercollegiate sports. The university's last major infractions case, in 1986, involved the football program. The institution also had infractions cases involving the football program in 1957, 1959 and 1982.

The allegations of recruiting violations in the men's basketball program involved an assistant men's basketball coach (henceforth, the "assistant coach") who allegedly offered substantial inducements to coaches at a junior college in conjunction with the university's recruitment of a prospective student-athlete who was attending the junior college at the time. Information concerning these allegations was published on August 24, 2000, in the local newspaper of the city in which the junior college is located. This article was later distributed widely by the major wire services. Had information in the article been accurate, the assistant coach would have been involved in major violations of NCAA recruiting and ethical conduct legislation.

Once informed of the allegations, the university aggressively pursued the information and, after an extensive investigation, concluded that the assistant coach did not commit the violations as alleged. After carefully weighing the evidence on both sides of this charge, the committee decided that it should not make a finding against the assistant coach based upon the standard set forth in Bylaw 32.7.6.2. This bylaw states, "the committee shall base its findings on information presented to it that it determines to be credible, persuasive and of a kind on which reasonably prudent persons rely in the conduct of serious affairs." Although there was no violation found relating to this allegation, the committee wishes to emphasize that, based upon the evidence showing the possibility of this alleged violation, it was appropriate and necessary for the enforcement staff to present this allegation to the committee, so that it could weigh the evidence and render a decision on the matter.

## **II. FINDINGS OF VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION.**

### **A. UNETHICAL CONDUCT – ACADEMIC FRAUD; UNETHICAL CONDUCT – PROVISION OF FALSE AND MISLEADING INFORMATION; VIOLATION OF ACADEMIC ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS; EXTRA BENEFITS. [NCAA Bylaws 10.1 (b), 10.1. (d), 14.01.3 and 16.12.2.1]**

On at least three occasions beginning in the summer of 1996 and concluding in March 1998, individuals employed in the office of Student Athlete Academic Services (SAAS) engaged in academic fraud by substantially composing academic papers for three student-athletes. Further, one of the individuals employed with SAAS provided false and misleading information when questioned by university representatives about his involvement in the academic fraud. Finally, the student-athletes involved in this finding violated the principles of ethical conduct by knowingly submitting papers for academic credit that were substantially completed by other individuals. Specifically:

1. During the summer of 1996, a former coordinator of tutor services in SAAS (henceforth, the "tutor coordinator") violated the provisions of ethical conduct when he knowingly committed academic fraud by conducting research and substantially composing and typing portions of a paper submitted by a football student-athlete (henceforth, "student-athlete 1") for a political science course. Further, the tutor coordinator provided false and misleading information to university representatives when questioned about his involvement in the academic fraud. Finally, student-athlete 1 violated the principles of ethical conduct by knowingly

submitting the paper that he knew was substantially composed and typed by the tutor coordinator, which resulted in the student-athlete receiving fraudulent academic credit.

2. In the fall of the 1997-98 academic year, a writing tutor in SAAS (henceforth, "tutor A") violated the provisions of ethical conduct when he knowingly committed academic fraud by substantially composing a paper submitted by a women's diving student-athlete (henceforth, "student-athlete 2") in a writing course. In addition, student-athlete 2 violated the principles of ethical conduct by requesting tutor A to write the paper and knowingly submitting the paper substantially composed by tutor A for academic credit.
3. In March 1998, a writing tutor in the office of SAAS (henceforth, "tutor B"), violated the provisions of ethical conduct when he knowingly committed academic fraud by substantially composing and typing a paper submitted by a football student-athlete (henceforth, "student-athlete 3") for a religion course. Further, student-athlete 3 violated the principles of ethical conduct by knowingly submitting the paper that he knew was substantially composed and written by tutor B which resulted in student-athlete 3 receiving fraudulent academic credit.

### **Committee Rationale**

In reference to the academic fraud committed by the tutor coordinator (Finding II-A-1), the committee agrees with the university, the involved student-athlete and the enforcement staff regarding the facts underlying this finding and that violations of NCAA legislation occurred. In a written submission, the tutor coordinator disputed the facts contained in this finding, but he did not appear at the hearing before the committee. The committee bases its finding on the following evidence self-reported by the university and confirmed by the enforcement staff:

During the 1996 summer semester, student-athlete 1 was enrolled in a political science course, which required submission of a paper. On the day before the paper was due, student-athlete 1 had not completed any work on the assignment other than choosing the topic. An assistant football coach brought the student-athlete to SAAS and informed the tutor coordinator that the student-athlete would fail the political science course if he did not finish the paper. The coach asked the tutor coordinator to make certain that student-athlete 1 completed the paper in time to submit it the next day. As there were no tutors available to work with student-athlete 1, the tutor coordinator elected to assist student-athlete 1 himself. The tutor coordinator personally instructed student-athlete 1 how to

use the Internet to conduct research and assisted student-athlete 1 in formulating a thesis for the paper and in printing pertinent selections from the Internet. Student-athlete 1 attempted to type the paper, but had such poor typing skills that the tutor coordinator assumed the typing for him. Once at the keyboard, the tutor coordinator typed some sentences from a handwritten rough draft the student-athlete had prepared, and then began independently to compose additional sentences with limited input from student-athlete 1. Student-athlete 1 and the tutor coordinator worked on the paper for approximately seven to eight hours and spent an additional hour the next day finalizing the paper. Student-athlete 1 submitted the paper for academic credit and received an overall grade of A- in the course.

During an interview on October 22, 1997, with university officials investigating charges of academic fraud, the tutor coordinator asserted that his assistance in completing the paper was limited to aiding student-athlete 1 in downloading and printing information from the Internet and in "cutting and pasting" text into an electronic document. The tutor coordinator maintained that student-athlete 1 hand wrote much of the rough draft for the paper, which the tutor read and critiqued and that student-athlete 1 completed the draft of the paper on the computer. The tutor coordinator denied composing any portion of student-athlete 1's paper.

During their interviews with university investigators, student-athlete 1's and the tutor coordinator's accounts of what transpired with regard to the completion of the paper in question differed substantially. The committee concluded that the student-athlete's account was more credible than that of the tutor coordinator. The student-athlete's account was clear and consistent, while the tutor coordinator's version conflicted with later statements he made on May 18, 1998, at the Pacific-10 Conference hearing on the matter. For the first time, the tutor coordinator conceded that he had typed most of the paper and had told student-athlete 1 that he must pay for the typing service. Moreover, the committee concluded that student-athlete 1 did not have a motive to lie about the degree of assistance provided by the tutor coordinator. In fact, the information he reported impacted negatively his eligibility for competition. The young man was withheld from two contests during the 1997 season as a result of his involvement in this violation. For these reasons, the committee concludes that the allegations involving academic fraud and the provision of false and misleading information to the university investigators are correct. Although the committee recognizes that there were unrelated disputes between the tutor coordinator and other university employees, the committee determined that these disputes were irrelevant to the issues in this case.

With reference to Finding II-A-2 (academic fraud perpetrated by a writing tutor on behalf of a women's diving student-athlete), the committee agrees with the university and the enforcement staff regarding the facts and that violations of NCAA legislation occurred. Although tutor A did not respond to the letter of official inquiry, he submitted a written

response to the university claiming that his involvement in the completion of the paper in question was not improper.

The evidence self-reported by the university and confirmed by the enforcement staff reflected the following:

During the fall 1997 semester, student-athlete 2 was enrolled in an intensive writing course. One of the course assignments required student-athlete 2 to submit an initial draft of a paper, discuss the draft with the instructor and then incorporate the instructor's comments into the final paper. Student-athlete 2 requested tutor A to compose the paper for her so that she could earn a higher grade in the course. Tutor A composed the initial draft in his own handwriting, and student-athlete 2 submitted this draft to the professor. After student-athlete 2 met with the professor to discuss the draft, tutor A revised the draft and incorporated the instructor's comments into a final paper. Student-athlete 2 then copied the final paper and submitted it in her own handwriting to the professor for academic credit. Based in large part on the difference in handwriting between the two drafts of the paper in question, the fraud was immediately detected by the professor. The case was processed in accordance with the university's academic integrity policies, which resulted in student-athlete 2 receiving an F in the course. It was later discovered that the student-athlete's high school transcript had been altered, and she was subsequently expelled from the university.

Notwithstanding the limited instructions given tutor A by the university, the committee concluded that tutor A knew the degree of assistance he provided was improper and constituted academic fraud.

With regard to Finding II-A-3 (academic fraud perpetrated by a writing tutor on behalf of a football student-athlete enrolled in a religion course), the committee agrees with the university and the enforcement staff regarding the facts and that violations of NCAA legislation occurred. While tutor B did not respond to the letter of official inquiry nor consent to an interview, he provided a statement in which he denied that his involvement in the completion of the paper in question was improper.

The evidence self-reported by the university and confirmed by the enforcement staff reflected the following facts relative to the religion paper in question:

During the 1998 spring semester, student-athlete 3 was enrolled in a religion course that required each student to submit a six- to eight-page paper. Approximately five days before the paper was due, student-athlete 3 had prepared limited notes on the topic, but he had no rough draft or thesis statement. Student-athlete 3 reported that he approached an academic counselor in SAAS to express his concern about completing the paper. As a result of his concern, the academic counselor assigned tutor B to assist student-athlete 3

with the paper. Tutor B was not one of student-athlete 3's regularly assigned tutors. Student-athlete 3 stated that he prepared handwritten notes and typed approximately two pages from the notes, but due to his poor typing skills, tutor B began typing for him. Once at the keyboard, tutor B typed sentences from student-athlete 3's notes and then began to compose additional sentences himself, conferring occasionally with student-athlete 3. Student-athlete 3 and tutor B continued working together on the paper in this manner. Student-athlete 3 reported that he and tutor B spent a total of approximately eight hours working together on the paper in SAAS when it became apparent that the paper would not be completed by the due date (on or about March 23), student-athlete 3 spoke with the professor and requested an extension. After the extension was granted, tutor B assisted student-athlete 3 in completing the paper. Student-athlete 3 submitted the paper for academic credit and received a grade of C in the class.

Based upon the evidence reviewed, the committee concluded that tutor B improperly assisted student-athlete 3 in writing a paper for the religion course. The committee agreed with the university and the enforcement staff that the information provided by student-athlete 3 was credible in light of its detail and the fact that his eligibility was jeopardized by acknowledging the inappropriate participation by tutor B in completing the paper. Tutor B's unwillingness to be interviewed and his blanket denial of any improper help to student-athletes did not provide a credible basis for determining that student-athlete 3's account was inaccurate.

**B. LACK OF MONITORING. [NCAA Constitution 2.1.1, 2.8.1, 3.2.4.1 and 6.01.1]**

The scope and nature of the violations in this case demonstrate a lack of monitoring in the administration of the institution's SAAS program in that three separate acts of academic fraud, including one involving the tutor coordinator, occurred during the period between the summer of 1996 and the spring of 1998. These violations occurred because the institution failed to:

1. Follow its own institutional policy and procedures regarding the provision of academic tutorial assistance to student-athletes.
2. Ensure that all SAAS tutors received appropriate orientation and training before tutoring student-athletes;
3. Adequately monitor and provide sufficient oversight to ensure compliance with SAAS and NCAA rules; and
4. Ensure that tutors were properly qualified to assume such positions.

### **Committee Rationale**

The committee agrees with the enforcement staff that the violations of NCAA legislation previously set forth in Finding II-A evidenced a lack of adequate monitoring in the administration of the SAAS program. The institution disagreed with some of the facts of this finding and maintained that no violation of the principles governing the monitoring of rules compliance occurred in this situation.

Regarding Finding II-B-1, the university's failure to follow its institutional guidelines, the committee agreed with the enforcement staff on the facts constituting this finding and that it was proof of inadequate monitoring by the university. The committee noted that the SAAS tutor/mentor training manuals specifically prohibited SAAS tutorial staff from composing or typing "any material that would eventually become part of the student's work for a class." In this instance, the tutor coordinator, tutor A and tutor B composed all or large portions of the papers of the student-athletes whom they tutored, as noted in Findings II-A-1, II-A-2 and II-A-3 respectively, and the tutor coordinator and tutor B typed substantial portions of such papers, as noted in Findings II-A-1 and II-A-3, respectively. The institution did not dispute that the tutor coordinator, tutor A and tutor B failed to follow institutional guidelines in that each of the individuals engaged in academic fraud in violation of those guidelines. Furthermore, it was not disputed that the tutor coordinator had additional responsibilities in the SAAS department as the coordinator for tutor services charged with overseeing the institution's administration of its tutoring program and its adherence to institutional guidelines. However, the university argued that these incidents spanned three academic years and each was an isolated act by a different institutional employee who acted with knowledge that his conduct was inappropriate. The university contended that these violations would not be automatically detected by routine monitoring because persons who set out to commit fraud also include measures in their schemes to deceive their victims and monitors.

The committee found it troubling that, over the course of approximately two years, three different tutors (including the tutor coordinator) engaged in academic fraud in clear violation of institutional guidelines. The committee recognized that the institution had guidelines in place. However, the committee concluded that the three incidents demonstrated that the institution failed to properly monitor the SAAS department for rules compliance.

Regarding Finding II-B-2 (failure to ensure that all SAAS tutors received appropriate orientation and training before tutoring student-athletes), the committee agrees with the enforcement staff on the facts constituting this finding and that it, too, indicated a failure to monitor by the university. In this case, tutor A was hired as a writing tutor in the fall

of 1997. The orientation and training session for tutors was held on October 4. The sign-in sheet for the session indicates that tutor A did not attend. Tutor A's absence was not noticed, and he tutored student-athletes, including student-athlete 2 prior to attending an orientation and training session. The university acknowledged that tutor A did not attend at least one formal training session required for all SAAS tutors and that the training Tutor A received prior to tutoring student-athletes consisted of only one orientation session. However, the university argued that tutor A was well aware that it was not appropriate to provide the individuals he tutored with the degree of assistance he provided to student-athlete 2.

The committee noted that tutor A reported that he had received no academic integrity training prior to tutoring student-athletes and also reported that he was "never trained and told not to transcribe." Tutor A also reported that the training regarding academic integrity issues was included in a session which occurred after his orientation session. However, the institution acknowledged that tutor A did not attend any subsequent training session after his orientation. Finally, the committee noted that it was shortly after tutor A was hired that he engaged in academic fraud as set forth in Finding II-A-2. The committee concluded that these facts demonstrated a failure to adequately monitor for rules compliance.

With reference to Finding II-B-3, the institution's failure to adequately monitor and provide sufficient oversight, the committee agreed with the enforcement staff on the facts contained in this finding, and this was further evidence of a lack of monitoring in the SAAS. In this instance, the institution did not have adequate procedures or practices in place for monitoring the assistance provided by tutors to student-athletes. Tutors were not required to meet regularly with SAAS administrators regarding their responsibilities, nor were they observed in a formal fashion when performing their tutoring duties. At times, especially in the evenings, only student supervisors with limited oversight authority were present in the office of the SAAS.

The institution maintained that it had adequate control systems in place when the violations occurred. However, the university conceded that it provided only informal in-person monitoring of tutors in SAAS and that, at times, only student supervisors with limited oversight authority observed the SAAS tutors. The institution pointed out that it did have some accountability measures for the tutors in that they were required to submit regular assessment reports of their tutoring sessions with student-athletes. However, the committee concluded that the agreed-upon facts in this allegation further demonstrate that the institution failed properly to monitor SAAS for rules compliance. The committee believed that some oversight to ensure that academic integrity is not being compromised is called for when a tutor works closely with a student-athlete on a single paper eight hours in a single day, such as documented in this case.



With reference to Finding II-B-4, the institution's failure to ensure that tutors were properly qualified, the evidence revealed that many of the tutors employed by the SAAS lacked the experience and qualifications normally expected of individuals filling such positions. The following is a list of some of the shortcomings associated with the tutors as noted by the committee:

- Many of the tutors were undergraduate students.
- Some were in the same classes with student-athletes.
- Some had low grade-point averages.
- Some provided tutoring in academic disciplines in which they were not majors.
- Training appeared inadequate (as previously noted in Finding II-B-2).

The committee concluded that these deficiencies in the qualifications of the tutors employed by the SAAS, a program administered solely by the athletics department, contributed to an atmosphere in which tutors in the SAAS were likely more susceptible to pressure associated with the effort to keep student-athletes academically eligible. In light of this, it was imperative that there be a greater monitoring effort on the part of the university to ensure that academic improprieties, such as those set forth in Finding II-A, did not occur.

## **SECONDARY VIOLATIONS**

### **[NCAA BYLAWS 16.12.2.1 and 16.12.2.3-(d)]**

The following secondary violations of extra benefit legislation were found:

1. Near the conclusion of the spring 2000 semester, an SAAS academic counselor for football asked an SAAS student worker to type an academic paper for a football student-athlete. The student worker typed the four- to five-page paper in approximately one hour at no charge to the football student-athlete. The value of the typing services provided by the student worker was \$20. [NCAA Bylaw 16.12.2.1]
2. In July 2000, a men's basketball student-athlete obtained an educational loan that was cosigned by a representative of the institution's athletics interests. The athletics representative in question was the father of the student-athlete's girlfriend at the time. The student-athlete and his girlfriend married a short time later, and the athletics representative became the young man's father-in-law. In light of the special relationship between the athletics representative and the student-athlete, the committee determined that this was a secondary violation. [(NCAA Bylaws 16.12.2.1 and 16.12.2.3-(d))]

### **III. COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS PENALTIES.**

For the reasons set forth in Parts I and II of this report, the Committee on Infractions found that this case involved several major violations of NCAA legislation.

#### **A. CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN AND/OR PENALTIES SELF-IMPOSED BY THE UNIVERSITY.**

In determining the appropriate penalties to impose, the committee considered the following corrective actions taken by the university relative to its athletics program:

1. In September 1997, the tutor coordinator was placed on administrative leave pending the conclusion of an internal investigation into unrelated allegations of inappropriate behavior in his position as Learning Support Coordinator for SAAS. On April 23, 1998, the university terminated his employment based in part on the finding that his personal behavior in the workplace was inappropriate and in part on the university's discovery that he had been involved in the academic fraud and unethical conduct violations.
2. In December 1997, tutor A's employment as an SAAS student tutor was terminated based on his involvement in the academic fraud and ethical conduct violations
3. The university noted that, in May 1999, tutor B voluntarily left his position as a tutor in SAAS prior to the discovery of the violation set forth in Finding II-A-3 of this report.
4. The university restructured and reinforced its training program for SAAS tutors, including coordinating training with the Southern California Learning Center, special presentations by the Office of Student Conduct, the Writing Program and the director of compliance.
5. All tutors are required to sign a code of ethics signifying that they understand their responsibilities and the academic integrity guidelines for their conduct.

6. The student-athlete handbook was revised to include a section on academic integrity.
7. The tutor guidelines were revised to include additional information reinforcing academic integrity training.
8. In hiring tutors, SAAS established a goal to employ graduate students who have been enrolled at the university for at least one academic semester and who have at least a 3.5 grade point average (GPA) in the subject area and a 3.0 overall GPA. However, if tutors who meet the stated policy criteria are not available, SAAS will contact the appropriate course professor and seek recommendations on tutors. In some instances this may result in the hiring of undergraduate students, but only those recommended by the course instructor.

**B. PENALTIES IMPOSED BY THE COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS.**

The Committee on Infractions agreed with and approved of the actions taken by the university, but it imposed penalties because of the serious nature of the violations in the case, including academic fraud and a failure to monitor. For the record, the committee wishes to express its deep concern about information revealed during the hearing. Specifically, the committee was informed that at least two professors at Southern California made no change in the grades of two football student-athletes, despite the fact the professors were informed that the papers represented academic fraud. Such complacency and compromise of academic integrity, which contrasts sharply with the F grade given the student-athlete in women's diving, is inexcusable in the eyes of the committee.

Despite these concerns, the committee chose not to impose all of the presumptive penalties permitted under Bylaw 19.6.2.1. The committee made this decision because of the actions taken by the university to institute appropriate corrective measures. The additional penalties imposed by the committee are as follows:

1. The institution shall receive public reprimand and censure.
2. The institution shall be placed on two years of probation beginning August 23, 2001.
3. The number of total athletically related financial aid awards in the sport of football shall be reduced by two during the 2002-03 academic year, which

limits the institution to 83 total grants-in-aid for that year under current legislation.

4. The number of athletically related financial aid equivalencies in the sport of women's swimming and diving shall be reduced by 0.5 during the 2002-03 academic year.
5. Pursuant to Bylaw 19.6.2.7, the NCAA president shall forward a copy of this report to the appropriate regional accrediting agency.
6. The former tutor coordinator will be informed in writing by the NCAA that, due to his involvement in certain violations of NCAA legislation found in this case, if he seeks employment or affiliation in an athletically related position at an NCAA member institution during a two-year period (August 23, 2001, to August 22, 2003), he and any involved institution shall be requested to appear before the Committee on Infractions to consider whether the member institution should be subject to the show-cause procedures of Bylaw 19.6.2.2-(1), which could limit his athletically related duties at any such institution for a designated period.
7. During this period of probation, the institution:
  - a. Shall develop and implement a comprehensive educational program on NCAA legislation, including seminars and testing, to instruct the coaches, the faculty athletics representative, all athletics department personnel and all university staff members with responsibility for the certification of student-athletes for admission, retention, financial aid or competition;
  - b. Submit a preliminary report to the director of the NCAA infractions committees by October 15, 2001 setting forth a schedule for establishing this compliance and educational program; and
  - c. File with the committee's director annual compliance reports indicating the progress made with this program by June 15 of each year during the probationary period. Particular emphasis should be placed on monitoring programs and educational measures designed to enhance academic integrity within the institution's athletics programs. The reports must also include documentation of the university's compliance with the penalties (adopted and) imposed by the committee.

8. At the conclusion of the probationary period, the university's president shall provide a letter to the committee affirming that the university's current athletics policies and practices conform to all requirements of NCAA regulations.
- 

As required by NCAA legislation for any institution involved in a major infractions case, Southern California shall be subject to the provisions of NCAA Bylaw 19.6.2.3, concerning repeat violators, for a five-year period beginning on the date of this report, August 23, 2001.

Should Southern California or any of the involved parties choose to appeal either the findings of violations or penalties in this case to the NCAA Division I Infractions Appeals Committee, the Committee on Infractions will submit a response to the members of the appeals committee, with a copy to any party who may appeal. This response may include additional information in accordance with Bylaw 32.10.5.

The Committee on Infractions wishes to advise the institution that it should take every precaution to ensure that the terms of the penalties are observed. The committee will monitor the penalties during their effective periods, and any action contrary to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations shall be considered grounds for extending the institution's probationary period, as well as imposing more severe sanctions in this case.

Should any portion of the penalties in this case be set aside for any reason other than by appropriate action of the Association, the penalties shall be reconsidered by the Committee on Infractions. Should any actions by NCAA legislative bodies directly or indirectly modify any provision of these penalties or the effect of the penalties, the committee reserves the right to review and reconsider the penalties.

#### NCAA COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS

Jack H. Friedenthal, chair  
Gene A. Marsh  
Andrea Myers  
James Park Jr.  
Josephine R. Potuto  
Thomas E. Yeager

## **APPENDIX**

### **CASE CHRONOLOGY.**

#### **1997**

September to October - The former learning support coordinator and coordinator for tutor services for the institution's SAAS reports in correspondence with the institution that improprieties occurred in the SAAS

Fall - The institution forms a special committee to investigate the tutor coordinator's allegations.

#### **1998**

April - The institution self-reports NCAA violations to the Pacific-10 Conference.

May 18 - The conference conducts a hearing related to the institution's self-reported violations.

May 22 - The conference makes findings that all violations occurred as alleged.

June - The conference forwards a report on its findings to the enforcement staff.

October 28 - The enforcement staff sends a letter of preliminary inquiry to the institution.

#### **1999**

April 30 - The enforcement staff sends a six-month update letter to the institution.

October 25 - The enforcement staff sends a one-year update letter to the institution.

#### **2000**

July 28 - The enforcement staff sends the letter of official inquiry to the institution; the former tutor coordinator, two former tutors at the institution and a former student-athlete at the institution.

August 24 - A newspaper publishes an article reporting the alleged offer by an assistant men's basketball coach at the institution. The university, conference and enforcement staff launched a joint inquiry into these matters.

August 30 - The NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions grants an extension to the institution on its response.

September 6 - The enforcement staff sends another copy of the letter of official inquiry to the former tutor coordinator.

November 9 - The committee grants another extension to the institution for its response.

November 29 - The institution submits its response.

## **2001**

January 31 - The enforcement staff sends a supplemental letter of official inquiry to the institution and the assistant coach.

March 19 - The institution submits a response to the supplemental letter of official inquiry on behalf of the institution and the assistant coach.

March 28 - The committee determines it is necessary to postpone the case from the April hearing in order for the enforcement staff to follow up on issues raised in the institution's response to the supplemental letter of official inquiry.

May 11 - The enforcement staff and the institution conduct a prehearing conference. The assistant coach as a current employee of the institution, chose to have the institution conduct the prehearing conference on his behalf.

June 9 - The university appeared before the Division I Committee on Infractions.

August 23 - Infractions Report No. 186 was released.