



UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
PUBLIC INFRACTIONS REPORT

July 29, 2010

A. INTRODUCTION.

On April 17, 2010, officials from the University of Arizona appeared before the Division I Committee on Infractions to address allegations of NCAA violations in the men's basketball program.

The violations in this case centered around three basketball tournaments and one basketball "showcase" game that a representative of the institution's athletics interests ("promoter") was allowed to conduct on the institution's campus in 2006, 2007 and 2008. The events all involved prospective student-athletes. Prior to the events occurring, the then-head men's basketball coach at the institution ("former head coach") solicited other representatives of the institution's athletics interests to support the events by providing financial backing to the promoter. Further, the former head coach arranged for the promoter to speak directly to other boosters at regularly scheduled booster club meetings. At those meetings, the promoter solicited funds in support of his events. On one occasion, the former head coach personally exhorted members of a booster club to assist the promoter, and the former head coach also sent a letter to boosters reminding them that the events were important for the recruitment of prospective student-athletes to the institution.

As a result of the former head coach's involvement in the promotion of the events, the funding received by participants in the events (travel, lodging, etc.) became impermissible inducements. The events also violated NCAA legislation regarding tryouts.

Finally, the former head coach invited two incoming assistant coaches to campus in May 2008, when one of the events was occurring. The two assistants had not yet begun their official duties at the institution, but they attended the event (held during a quiet period) and evaluated prospects taking part in it. During this time period, they also conversed with members of the institution's men's basketball squad regarding the upcoming season. As a result, the coaches became "countable coaches" under NCAA legislation. Subsequently, they engaged in recruiting activities that violated NCAA legislation.

The actions of the former head coach established a failure on his part to promote an atmosphere of compliance within the men's basketball program. By not taking adequate steps to keep the violations from occurring, the institution failed to monitor its men's basketball program.

A member of the Pacific-10 Conference, the institution has an enrollment of approximately 36,000 students. The institution sponsors eight men's and 11 women's intercollegiate sports. This was the institution's fifth major infractions case. The institution appeared before the committee in October 1984 for a case involving the men's basketball program. The institution also had previous infractions cases in 1983, 1974 and 1961 in football and men's track.

B. FINDINGS OF VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION.

1. IMPERMISSIBLE INDUCEMENTS AND TRYOUTS. [NCAA Bylaws 13.02.13, 13.2.1, 13.11.1, 13.11.3.2 and 13.15.1]

From 2006 through 2008, the promoter organized and conducted four events on the institution's campus involving numerous men's basketball prospective student-athletes. The former head coach was impermissibly involved in the events, resulting in the provision of impermissible inducements to the participants and violations of NCAA tryout legislation.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff and institution were in agreement with the facts of this finding and that those facts constituted violations of NCAA legislation. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

On four separate occasions from 2006 through 2008, the promoter conducted events for men's basketball prospects on the institution's campus. Three of the events were known as the Arizona Cactus Classic (Cactus Classic), a 32-team invitational nonscholastic tournament in which only unsigned prospects were allowed to participate. They took place during May in 2006, 2007 and 2008. The fourth event was the GOAZCATS.com Showdown, a "showcase" game between two highly regarded high school teams. It occurred on December 22, 2007. All four events were held in gyms on the institution's campus.

Prior to the events occurring, the former head coach arranged time for the solicitation of funds by the promoter from the Rebounders, a group of representatives of the institution's athletics interests focused on men's basketball. During regularly scheduled meetings of the Rebounders Board of Directors from the spring of 2006 through the spring of 2008, and again at a special meeting of the board in April 2008, the former head coach introduced the promoter to the group and highlighted the fact that the Cactus Classic was an important recruiting tool for the men's basketball program. The promoter was

provided with the opportunity to address the Rebounders board members and seek financial support for the events. During the October 2007 Rebounders board meeting, the former head coach indicated to the Rebounders board that the members needed to "step up" and support the representative's events. In late March 2008, a "Personal and Confidential" letter was sent to board members by the former head coach emphasizing the importance of the Cactus Classic in the recruitment of prospective student-athletes. The former head coach's participation in the promotion of the events violated NCAA tryout legislation.

Although the promoter would not allow the institution to review his records, reconstructed records established that Rebounders board members made contributions exceeding \$197,000 to the promoter to assist with the four events. Because they were solicited with assistance from the former head coach, the funds impermissibly benefited the prospective student-athletes who participated in the events. For the three Cactus Classic events, the promoter paid for a portion of the prospective student-athletes' costs (lodging, meals and local transportation) with board members' contributions. For the Showdown, all of the prospective student-athletes' costs (lodging, meals, air transportation and local transportation) were paid for by the promoter with board members' contributions.

2. IMPERMISSIBLE RECRUITING ACTIVITIES. [NCAA Bylaws 11.7.1.1, 11.7.1.1.1 and 30.10.1]

During May 9-11, 2008, two incoming assistant men's basketball coaches who were not yet employed by the institution came to the vicinity of campus at the invitation of the former head coach. Prior to their employment starting dates, the assistant coaches engaged in countable coaching activities with enrolled student-athletes and evaluated prospects participating in the 2008 Cactus Classic, which occurred during a quiet period on the recruitment calendar.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff and institution were in agreement with the facts in this finding and that those facts constituted violations of NCAA legislation. The institution and enforcement staff disagreed whether the violations in this finding should be processed as related secondary infractions or as part of the major case. The committee finds that the violations occurred and that they are major as part of the larger series of violations involving the four events.

At the time of the 2008 Cactus Classic, held on May 9-11 of that year, the men's basketball coaching staff was in a state of transition. The former head coach had just

returned from a leave of absence, and the three assistant coaches from the previous season (2007-08) were going to all be replaced by three new assistants for the upcoming (2008-09) year. The employment starting dates of all three new assistants were set for days subsequent to the conclusion of the Cactus Classic. However, two of the incoming assistants ("assistant coaches A and B," respectively), were present on the institution's campus during the Cactus Classic and took part in impermissible activities during that time. Immediately prior to that year's Cactus Classic, assistant coach A traveled to California at the suggestion of the former head coach and met with one of the institution's men's basketball student-athletes ("student-athlete 1") and his parents on May 8 and 9. Student-athlete 1 was contemplating leaving school for professional basketball at the time. During the conversation, assistant coach A addressed the family's concerns regarding the stability of the institution's men's basketball coaching staff. At the invitation of the former head coach, assistant coach A then traveled to the vicinity of campus to attend the Cactus Classic. While on campus on May 10, assistant coach A had a conversation with a second men's basketball student-athlete at the institution ("student-athlete 2") regarding student-athlete 2's possible transfer to another institution.

Also at the invitation of the former head coach, assistant coach B traveled to the vicinity of campus prior to the start of his employment. On May 10, he too had a conversation with student-athlete 2. The actions of assistant coaches A and B caused them to become "countable" pursuant to Bylaw 11.7. Both assistant coach A and assistant coach B then attended various sessions of the Cactus Classic while on campus and observed the prospects compete. They did so during a quiet period on the men's basketball recruiting calendar, which rendered their observations impermissible evaluations.

**3. FAILURE TO PROMOTE AN ATMOSPHERE OF COMPLIANCE.
[NCAA Bylaw 11.1.2.1]**

The scope and nature of the violations detailed in Findings B-1 and B-2 demonstrate that, during the 2005-06 through 2007-08 academic years, the former head coach failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance within the men's basketball program and failed to monitor certain activities regarding compliance of his program.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff and institution were not in agreement with the facts of this finding and that those facts constituted violations of NCAA legislation. The institution asserted that the former head coach simply failed to correctly understand and apply certain elements of NCAA legislation. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

The former head coach was a long-time NCAA Division I head men's basketball coach. He has many years of NCAA rules education and annually took the required recruiting test. Regarding the Cactus Classic tournaments, he and his staff were made aware that they could have no involvement with the events.

In spite of this background, the former head coach did not check with the compliance office to determine if his interactions with the promoter posed any potential NCAA rules issues. And though the former head coach made statements to the members of the Rebounders group that neither he nor the institution could be involved with the on-campus events, he allowed the promoter (a booster with whom he had a close relationship) to attend some meetings of the Rebounders board. At those meetings, and with the knowledge and support of the former head coach, the promoter made requests that members of the group support his venture; the Rebounders responded with \$197,000 in donations.

Not only did the former head coach facilitate the meetings between the promoter and other boosters, he took proactive steps to ensure that members of the Rebounders knew how crucial to the men's basketball program the former head coach considered the promoter's activities to be. When he introduced the promoter at the meetings, the former head coach emphasized the importance of the promoter's events as a recruiting tool. At the Rebounders board meeting in the fall of 2007, the former head coach exhorted the board members to "step up" with their support of the promoter's activities. And in the spring of 2008, as that year's Cactus Classic approached, the former head coach sent a "Personal and Confidential" letter to Rebounders board members which said, among other things:

--"This tournament brings some of the top players in the country to Tucson and is very critical for our recruiting. These are high level players that wouldn't ordinarily have a chance to visit our city and the University of Arizona campus;"

--"To ensure the future of this tournament, [the promoter] needs support from private donations;"

--"I want you to know how important this is to Arizona basketball recruiting."

Not only did the former head coach actively push for support of the promoter's activities, he relieved one member of the Rebounders ("former member") of his position on the board of directors after the former member told the promoter that he (the former member) would not provide financial assistance for the 2008 Cactus Classic [Note: The former head coach alone chose the board members.] A booster of the program, season

ticket holder and charter member of the Rebounders board, the former member subsequently received a letter from the former head coach informing him that he was relieved of his position on the board. Added to the letter was the following postscript: "[The promoter] indicated that you would not do anything for me or for Arizona basketball so I think this letter will be welcomed by you!"

The former head coach also set in motion the events that resulted in the violations detailed in Finding B-2. He invited assistant coaches A and B to the vicinity of campus prior to the start of their employment, and he was aware that they would attend the Cactus Classic while in town. The former head coach did not check with the compliance office on the propriety of the new assistants being present at the event, performing evaluations, and having personal conversations with members of the institution's men's basketball team.

As was stated by the director of athletics in his July 2, 2008, letter of admonishment to the former head coach regarding the letter asking Rebounders to support the promoter, "you [the former head coach] are ultimately responsible for what happens within your program." Those responsibilities included establishing an atmosphere of compliance. By failing to check the permissibility of his activities with the compliance office, involving himself in the promotion of on-campus basketball events for prospects, and allowing coaches who had not yet joined his staff to interact with student-athletes and evaluate prospects during quiet periods, the former head coach did not meet this duty.

4. FAILURE TO MONITOR. [NCAA Constitution 2.8.1]

From the spring of 2006 through the spring of 2008, the institution failed to monitor the men's basketball program's involvement in the administration of four events involving numerous men's basketball prospective student-athletes held on the institution's campus between 2006 and 2008.

Committee Rationale

The enforcement staff and institution were not in agreement regarding this finding. The institution agrees that the former head coach allowed the promoter to have access to other boosters at Rebounders Board of Directors meetings and that the promoter used that access to promote and solicit funds for his events. The institution further agrees that the promoter used a conference room adjacent to the men's basketball offices in the on-campus McKale Center before and during the 2006 event. However, the institution does not agree that a violation of NCAA Constitution 2.8.1 occurred as a result of these facts. The institution agrees that the failure of an administrator ("associate athletics director for development") to report the former head coach's actions and/or raise questions regarding

their propriety constituted failure to monitor. The committee finds that the violations occurred.

During the spring of 2006 and the 2006-07 and 2007-08 academic years, in preparation for the Cactus Classic basketball events held on the institution's campus, and as set forth in Finding B-1 above, the promoter was provided direct access to the Rebounders Board of Directors, the leadership of the men's basketball program's premier-level support group, during the group's regularly scheduled meetings. This access, provided by the former head coach, gave the promoter the opportunity to solicit funds in support of the four events. Further, leading up to and during the 2006 event, the promoter used the conference room beside the men's basketball offices as his primary work area. The promoter and the former head coach had a close relationship.

While the institution had a broad rules education program for all coaches, staff and student-athletes, it did not provide further, specific guidance regarding the Cactus Classics and the GOAZCATS.com Showcase to the men's basketball staff, the promoter or the Rebounders board. The events, particularly because they were held on campus, presented compliance challenges that required more than the general admonition that the institution cannot be involved in the event. For example, further explanations of what entails "involvement" with the event might have avoided the occasions when the former head coach gave the promoter access to the board and personally exhorted the board (both verbally and in writing) to support the promoter's efforts. Further, the compliance office was not informed that assistant coaches A and B had arrived in the vicinity of campus and were attending the Cactus Classic; had the compliance office been made aware, it could have undertaken a specific review of recruiting legislation in advance of the events. By doing so, it may well have prevented the "quiet period" evaluations that occurred when the incoming coaches observed the prospects participating in the 2008 Cactus Classic.

Further, there was no education to the members of the Rebounders board, which was the former head coach's hand-picked leadership of a group kept in existence to support the men's basketball program even after other such groups had been disbanded or incorporated under an "umbrella" organization known as the Wildcat Club. The larger Rebounders group had received some education, but the activities of the board itself, described by the institution's director of compliance ("director of compliance") as "well-heeled folks in the area that [the former head coach] wants to associate with," were not monitored by the compliance staff. They had likewise received no education regarding the basketball events which were known by all to be taking place on campus, even though they repeatedly wrote checks to the promoter and were listed on the promoter's event Web site as benefactors of the events.

The institution was in agreement that, during the 2007-08 academic year, it failed to respond adequately to information indicating a possible violation. It was the usual practice for an administrator to attend every meeting of the Rebounders board, and the associate athletics director for development was present at the October 2007 Rebounders meeting when the former head coach exhorted the board members to "step up" and support the upcoming Cactus Classic. The associate athletics director for development failed to report the former head coach's statements to the board to the compliance office or any other member of the athletics administration.

On April 10, 2008, the associate athletics director for development provided the director of compliance with a copy of the "Personal and Confidential" letter that had recently been sent to the Rebounders board by the former head coach. Four days later, on April 14, the director of compliance sent an "initiation of investigation" memo regarding the situation to the director of athletics and associate athletics directors with supervisory responsibilities. But no one spoke directly to the former head coach about the matter and, the very next day, April 15, the former head coach convened a special Rebounders board meeting during which the promoter was permitted to give a presentation and request financial assistance in anticipation of the upcoming 2008 Cactus Classic. While the committee understands and appreciates that the five-day period between the receipt by the director of compliance of the letter and the special Rebounders board meeting included a weekend, there was still ample time for the athletics administration to investigate the matter, contact the former head coach and cut off any further violations.

C. PENALTIES.

For the reasons set forth in Parts A and B of this report, the Committee on Infractions found that this case involved violations of NCAA legislation. The former head coach set in motion the violations when he, without checking with the compliance staff on the propriety of his actions, allowed the promoter to have access to other boosters for solicitation purposes. The money solicited was used to bring prospects to campus for basketball events, which the former head coach acknowledged were beneficial to recruiting. Both verbally and in writing, the former head coach supported the promoter's efforts.

Further, the former head coach invited incoming assistant basketball coaches who were not yet employed by the institution to visit with enrolled student-athletes and come to campus. By engaging in conversations with the enrolled student-athletes and performing evaluations of prospects, the incoming coaches became "countable." They then evaluated prospects during a quiet period in violation of NCAA recruiting legislation.

By his participation in these activities, and former head coach failed to establish an atmosphere of compliance. The violations occurred on multiple occasions over a period of years in part as a result of the institution's failure to monitor.

In determining the appropriate penalties to impose, the committee considered the institution's self-imposed penalties and corrective actions. [Note: The institution's corrective actions are contained in Appendix Two.] Further, the committee considered the institution's cooperation in this case. The committee determined that the cooperation exhibited by the institution was consistent with Bylaw 32.1.4, Cooperative Principle, which requires member institutions to cooperate in investigations, and did not warrant consideration by the committee of possible penalty reductions. The committee imposes the following penalties, with the institution's self-imposed penalties so noted):

1. Public reprimand and censure.
2. Two years of probation from July 29, 2010, through July 28, 2012. (The institution proposed a two-year probation to begin with the date it submitted its response to the NCAA's Notice of Allegations, with regular compliance reports to the NCAA during the probationary period.)
3. Reduction in the number of official visits in the sport of men's basketball (from the maximum of 12) to six for the 2010-11 academic year and six for the 2011-12 recruiting years, respectively. (The institution imposed a limit of 11 official paid visits for 2009-10 and eight for 2010-11, however, the institution has only averaged six visits per year from 2006-07 to 2009-10).
4. Reduction in the number of "recruiting-person days" (from the overall maximum of 130) by 10 during the 2009-10 and 30 during the 2010-11 academic years, respectively. (Institution imposed. The committee added 10 days to the institution's 20 day reduction for 2010-11)
5. Reduction in the number of "recruiting-person days" by eight during the summer evaluation period in 2010. (Institution imposed)
6. Reduction of one from the permissible maximum of 13 grants-in-aid in the sport of men's basketball for the 2011-12 academic year. (Institution imposed) The committee determined that the institution shall also reduce grants-in-aid by one, to no more than 12, for the 2012-13 academic year.
7. Institutional recertification [as contemplated in Bylaw 19.5.2.1-(g)] that the institution's current athletics policies and practices conform to all requirements of NCAA regulations. (Institution imposed)

8. Documentation in the institution's response to the notice of allegations and the enforcement staff's case summary established that two men's basketball student-athletes at the institution competed while ineligible during the 2007-08 academic year, based on their receipt of impermissible benefits in conjunction with the 2006 Cactus Classic. As noted elsewhere in this report, those violations directly involved the former head coach. He arranged for the promoter to come to Rebounder's board meetings and speak to the board, and he urged board members to support the promoter's events. Further, as this case also involves a finding of failure to monitor, two of seven aggravating factors considered for vacation of records are present. Therefore, pursuant to NCAA Bylaws 19.5.2.2-(e)-(2) and 31.2.2.3-(b), the institution will vacate all wins in which the ineligible student-athletes competed while ineligible. The vacations shall apply to contests in the regular season, conference tournaments and all other postseason play, including NCAA championships. The individual records of the ineligible student-athletes shall be vacated as well. Further, the institution's records regarding men's basketball, as well as the record of the former head coach will reflect the vacated records and will be recorded in all publications in which men's basketball records are reported, including, but not limited to, institution media guides, recruiting material, electronic and digital media plus institution and NCAA archives. Any public reference to these vacated contests, including any championships, shall be removed from athletics department stationery, banners displayed in public areas and any other forum in which they may appear.

Finally, to ensure that all institutional and student-athlete vacations, statistics and records are accurately reflected in official NCAA publication and archives, the sports information director (or other designee as assigned by the director of athletics) must contact the NCAA director of statistics, to identify the specific student-athletes and contests impacted by the penalties. In addition, the institution must provide the NCAA statistics department a written report, detailing those discussions with the director of statistics. This document will be maintained in the permanent files of the statistics department. This written report must be delivered to the NCAA statistics department no later than 45 days following the initial Committee on Infractions release or, if the vacation penalty is appealed, the final adjudication of the appeals process.

9. Disassociation of the promoter from the institution's athletics program based upon his involvement in violations of NCAA rules. (Institution imposed. See Corrective Actions, Appendix Two) This disassociation shall be for at least the institution's probationary period and shall include:

- a. refraining from accepting any assistance from the individual 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 individual;
 - c. ensuring that no athletics benefit or privilege is provided to the individual, either directly or indirectly, that is not available to the public at large; and
 - d. implementing other actions that the institution determines to be within its authority to eliminate the involvement of the individual in the institution's athletics program.
10. During this period of probation, the institution shall:
- a. Continue to 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 institution staff members with responsibility for the certification of student-athletes for admission, retention, financial aid or competition;
 - b. Submit a preliminary report to the office of the Committees on Infractions by September 15, 1010, setting forth a schedule for establishing this compliance and educational program; and
 - c. File with the office of the Committees on Infractions annual compliance reports indicating the progress made with this program by April 15 of each year during the probationary period. Particular emphasis should be placed on monitoring and educating booster groups, adhering to recruiting calendars and the interaction between coaches and boosters. The reports must also include documentation of the institution's compliance with the penalties adopted and imposed by the committee.
11. The above-listed penalties are independent of and supplemental to any action that has been or may be taken by the Committee on Academic Performance through its assessment of contemporaneous, historical, or other penalties.
12. At the conclusion of the probationary period, the institution's president shall provide a letter to the committee affirming that the institution'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, the University of Arizona shall be subject to the provisions of NCAA Bylaw 19.5.2.3, concerning repeat violators, for a five-year period beginning on the effective date of the penalties in this case, July 29, 2010.

Should the University of Arizona appeal either the findings of violations or penalties in this case to the NCAA Infractions Appeals Committee, the Committee on Infractions will submit a response to the Appeals Committee.

The Committee on Infractions advises 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. Any action by the institution contrary to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations shall be considered grounds for extending the institution's probationary period or imposing more severe sanctions or may result in additional allegations and findings of violations. An institution that employs an individual while a show-cause order is in effect against that individual, and fails to adhere to the penalties imposed, subjects itself to allegations and possible findings of violations.

Should any portion of any 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

Britton Banowsky
John S. Black
Melissa (Missy) Conboy
Paul T. Dee, chair
Roscoe Howard
Eleanor W. Myers
Dennis E. Thomas

APPENDIX ONE

CASE CHRONOLOGY.

2008

April 10 – The former associate athletics director for external operations provides director of compliance, with a copy of a "Personal and Confidential" letter bearing the electronic signature of the former head coach urging support from the Rebounders, a group of representatives of the institution's athletics interests focused on men's basketball, for the 2008 Cactus Classic. The director of compliance immediately communicates with the Pacific-10 Conference (Pac-10) office via e-mail seeking feedback concerning a potential violation; Pac-10 responds the following day.

April 14 – The director of compliance sends "Initiation of Investigation" memo to senior institutional athletics administrators.

April 15 – The former head coach convenes a special Rebounders meeting during which the promoter is permitted to give a presentation and request financial assistance in anticipation of the soon-approaching 2008 Cactus Classic.

April 17-18 – The director of compliance interviews the secretary for the men's basketball program; an administrative assistant and video coordinator for the men's basketball program; and the promoter.

April 23 – The director of compliance interviews the former head coach.

May 9-11 - The Cactus Classic takes place on the institution's campus.

September 4-5 - Representatives of the NCAA enforcement staff's basketball focus group and institutional officials conduct joint on-campus interviews (including the promoter and members of the Rebounders).

September 30 through April 2009 - Representatives of the enforcement staff (major and the basketball focus group) and institutional officials conduct on-campus and off-campus interviews.

November 3 - The institution initiates communication with NCAA student-athlete reinstatement (SAR) staff concerning restoration of eligibility request.

2009

February 6 - The enforcement staff sends a notice of inquiry to the institution.

August 6 - The enforcement staff sends the six-month letter to the institution.

September 3 - The enforcement staff and institution finalize fact patterns submitted to academic and membership affairs (AMA) for interpretations.

September 17 - The institution submits its requests for restoration of eligibility to student-athlete reinstatement (SAR) for relevant student-athletes for the 2009-10 academic year.

September 25 - AMA responds to the joint interpretations request.

October 30 - The enforcement staff sends the notice of allegations.

November 11 - The institution requests and the Committee on Infractions grants an extension of the notice of allegations response date from January 28 to February 5, 2010.

2010

February 5 - The institution submits its response to the notice of allegations.

February 12 – The former head coach submits a letter to the Committee on Infractions indicating that he does not intend to respond to the notice of allegations or participate in the Committee on Infractions hearing.

March 5 - Prehearing conference is conducted with the institution.

March 11 - Teleconference with enforcement staff and institution to further discuss remaining issues in the case.

March 15 - Teleconference with enforcement staff, institution and AMA to seek clarifications concerning interpretations that were the basis for potential remaining issues in the case.

April 17 – The institution appears before the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions.

July 29 - Infractions Report No. 325 was released.

APPENDIX TWO

CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AS IDENTIFIED IN THE INSTITUTION'S February 4, 2010, RESPONSE TO THE NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS.

- **Letter of Admonishment to former head coach:** The then former head men's basketball coach was issued a letter of admonishment by the then director of athletics, on July 2, 2008. The letter was issued as a result of the letter sent over the former head coach's electronic signature to Rebounders board members requesting support for the 2008 Cactus Classic.
- **Disassociation of the promoter:** For his role in the violations in this case, the promoter, who conducted the four events involving prospective student-athletes that are referenced in this matter, was disassociated as a representative of the institution's athletics interests.
- **Elimination of Campus Basketball Events Involving Prospects** – The institution notified the promoter early in the joint investigation that it would no longer permit the Cactus Classic or any other youth basketball event conducted by the promoter to be held on the institution's campus. The institution has applied and will continue to apply this same restriction to prohibit the use of its facilities for any men's or women's nonscholastic basketball event that involves prospective student-athletes. The institution intends to continue this prohibition regardless of NCAA action on Proposal No. 2009-100, which would ban the hosting of nonscholastic events involving men's basketball prospects.
- **Policy Concerning Guest Speakers** – The institution developed a policy to require the prior approval of any guest speaker from outside the institution who is to address a sports interest group of the Wildcat Club, the intercollegiate athletics support organization. A form has been created for submission to the compliance office to facilitate such approval.
- **Improved Booster Brochure** – In light of the issues identified in this case, a revised version of the brochure developed to provide NCAA rules education to members of the Wildcat Club and its sports interest groups is being prepared for publication.
- **Elimination of the Rebounders Board of Directors** – The institution has disbanded the smaller group of members of the Rebounders, the sports interest group that supports men's basketball, that was identified as the Board of Directors and was involved in the violations in this case. This is the group that was identified by the prior head coach and with whom he met on a monthly basis during the basketball season.
- **Enhanced Education Efforts** – The institution has used the infractions in this case as an opportunity to increase the awareness of the entire athletics department staff (to include all coaches, athletics staff members and support personnel) about potential problems. Included in the enhanced efforts will be more extensive rules education for the athletics event management staff and the athletics development office. Also, senior and associate athletics directors will receive additional rules instruction.