



**MOREHOUSE COLLEGE
PUBLIC INFRACTIONS DECISION
JULY 15, 2015**

I. INTRODUCTION

The NCAA Division II Committee on Infractions is an independent administrative body of the NCAA comprised of individuals from the Division II membership and the public. The committee decides infractions cases involving member institutions and their staffs. This case involved the football, cross-country, basketball, golf and baseball programs at Morehouse College.¹ The committee considered this case through the cooperative summary disposition process in which all parties agree to the primary facts and violations as fully set forth in the Summary Disposition Report (SDR). The committee accepted the violations and self-imposed penalties set forth in the SDR, and the institution accepted the committee's additional penalties. Consequently, there is no opportunity to appeal.

As detailed in the SDR, this case centered on student-athletes competing while ineligible and receiving impermissible travel expenses due to the institution's failure to properly certify student-athletes' eligibility in two areas: (1) continuing eligibility (progress-toward-degree requirements); and (2) good academic standing. The case also included a secondary violation involving the improper signing of financial aid documents. Finally, as the result of the violations in this case and an inadequate compliance education program, the institution failed to monitor.

After reviewing the parties' principal factual agreements and respective explanations surrounding those agreements, the committee accepted the parties' SDR and concluded that those factual agreements constituted major violations of NCAA bylaws. The committee prescribed the following principal penalties: three years of probation, a fine of \$5,000 and a vacation of records resulting from ineligible competition.

II. CASE HISTORY

A September 22, 2013, letter sent to the institution from an attorney triggered this case. The attorney, who represented the interests of eight families of current and former Morehouse College football student-athletes, alleged multiple violations of NCAA legislation in the letter. In response, the institution contacted the NCAA enforcement

¹ A member of the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, Morehouse College is an all-male institution located in Atlanta, Georgia. It has an enrollment of approximately 2,100 students and sponsors seven sports. The institution had one previous major infractions case, in 2003, involving the soccer program.

staff on October 9, 2013. The institution informed the enforcement staff that it would investigate the alleged violations identified in the letter, conduct a continuing-eligibility certification audit pertaining to the football program for the 2011-12 through 2013-14 academic years and provide a written report to the NCAA. The enforcement staff provided a verbal notice of inquiry to the institution on November 19, 2013. The institution retained two outside firms to investigate the alleged violations and to conduct the eligibility audit. The institution submitted a self-report to the enforcement staff on April 28, 2014. The self-report formed the basis of the SDR, which the enforcement staff and the institution jointly submitted to the committee on April 8, 2015.

The committee reviewed the SDR by teleconference on May 13, 2015, and accepted the violations, self-imposed penalties and corrective actions. In a letter dated May 19, 2015, and pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 32.7.1.4.3, the committee proposed additional penalties for the institution. The institution responded to the committee in writing on May 26, 2015, accepting the additional penalties.

III. PARTIES' AGREEMENTS

PARTIES' AGREED-UPON FACTUAL BASIS AND VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION

The parties jointly submitted an SDR that identified an agreed-upon factual basis and violations as established by NCAA legislation. The SDR identifies:

- 1. [NCAA Division II Manual Bylaws 14.01.1, 14.4.3.1-(b), 14.11.1 and 16.8.1.2 (2010-11 through 2013-14); 14.4.3.1-(a), 14.4.3.1.5 and 14.4.3.2 (2011-12); 14.4.3.3.5 (2010-11 through 2013-14); and 14.01.2.1 (2011-12 and 2012-13)]**

The institution and NCAA enforcement staff agreed that during the 2010-11 through 2013-14 academic years, the institution permitted 29 student-athletes to compete and receive impermissible travel expenses even though the student-athletes were academically ineligible because they (1) did not meet NCAA progress-toward-degree requirements and/or (2) were not in good academic standing per institutional policy. In addition, seven student-athletes with remaining eligibility competed after becoming academically ineligible and before the institution became aware of the violations and sought reinstatement of the student-athletes' eligibility. Finally, all of the involved student-athletes, with the exception of one football student-athlete and one golf student-athlete, were involved in violations of NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.3.5.

Appendix One contains a chart documenting the ineligible competition by student-athletes.

**2. [NCAA Division II Manual Bylaw 15.3.2.3 (2009-10 through 2013-14)]
(Secondary Violation)**

The institution and NCAA enforcement staff agreed that during the 2009-10 through 2013-14 academic years, the director of athletics improperly signed prospective student-athletes' written offers of athletically related financial aid, even though the signature of the chair of the regular committee or other agency for the awarding of financial aid to students generally, or the chair's official designee, was required by NCAA legislation. [NCAA Bylaw 15.3.2.3 (2009-10 through 2013-14)]

3. [NCAA Division II Manual Constitution 2.8.1 (2009-10 through 2013-14)]

The NCAA enforcement staff and institution agreed that from the 2009-10 through 2013-14 academic years, the scope and nature of the violations in Proposed Findings of Fact Nos. 1 and 2 demonstrated that the institution did not properly monitor its athletics programs, as demonstrated by its failure to (1) establish an adequate system for ensuring compliance with NCAA eligibility requirements, (2) provide adequate NCAA rules education and training to institutional staff members to ensure that the athletics programs operated in compliance with NCAA rules and (3) ensure that the appropriate staff member signed prospective student-athletes' written offers of athletically related financial aid.

IV. REVIEW OF CASE

The submitted SDR fully detailed the parties' positions in the infractions case and included the agreed-upon primary facts and violations. After reviewing the parties' principal factual agreements and the respective explanations surrounding those agreements, the committee accepted the parties' SDR and concluded that the facts constituted major violations of NCAA legislation.

Major violations are those that provide more than a minimal recruiting, competitive or other advantage or include any significant impermissible benefit. In this case, the institution agreed that it committed NCAA violations when it: (1) erroneously certified the eligibility of numerous student-athletes and, as a result, allowed them to compete and receive travel-related expenses while ineligible; (2) incorrectly signed financial aid agreements (secondary violation); and (3) failed to monitor as the result of the violations in this case and inadequate rules education. The violations were not isolated and occurred over the course of four academic years. Moreover, in failing to properly certify the eligibility of these student-athletes and allowing them to compete, the institution received a significant advantage not available to those member institutions abiding by NCAA eligibility legislation.

First, the institution committed major violations when it erroneously certified the eligibility of 29 student-athletes and allowed them to compete and receive travel expenses while academically ineligible from the 2010-11 through 2013-14 academic years. In total, the institution permitted the 29 student-athletes to represent the institution in 323 contests and receive travel expenses for 169 contests while academically ineligible during the four-year period.

The vast majority of the student-athletes who competed while ineligible, 27 out of 29, did so as the result of eligibility certification violations resulting from a failure to meet credit hour requirements. This occurred because the institution improperly allowed three remedial courses to be used in the calculation of student-athletes' fulfillment of credit hours that were applied to progress-toward-degree requirements and continuing eligibility, in violation of NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.3.5. In turn, the impermissible use of these remedial courses caused student-athletes to have insufficient credit hours for academic eligibility in violation of NCAA Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(a) and 14.4.3.1-(b). Both bylaws set forth credit hour requirements student-athletes must meet for eligibility.

Further, two student-athletes who were not in good academic standing with the institution also competed while ineligible. NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.2 requires that, in order to be eligible for competition, student-athletes must be in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students. Because these two student-athletes competed while they were not in good academic standing, the institution violated NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.2.

In addition, among the 29 ineligible student-athletes were three who failed to designate a degree program. NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.1.5 mandates that, by the beginning of a student-athlete's third year of enrollment, the student-athlete shall have designated a degree program. Because the three student-athletes had not designated a degree program by the beginning of their third year of enrollment, the institution violated NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.1.5.

Also, within the group of 29 student-athletes were seven with remaining eligibility who competed after becoming academically ineligible, but before the institution became aware of the violations and sought reinstatement of their eligibility. NCAA Bylaws 14.01.1 and 14.11.1 require institutions to withhold ineligible student-athletes from competition. Because the institution did not withhold the seven student-athletes after they failed to meet academic eligibility requirements, the institution violated NCAA Bylaws 14.01.1 and 14.11.1.

Moreover, because the institution allowed student-athletes to receive impermissible travel expenses while ineligible, violations of NCAA extra benefit legislation also occurred. NCAA Bylaw 16.8.1.2 allows institutions to provide actual and necessary travel expenses (e.g., transportation, lodging and meals) to student-athletes for participation in athletics

competition, but only if student-athletes are eligible for competition. Because the 29 student-athletes received travel expenses associated with competition while they were academically ineligible, the institution violated NCAA Bylaw 16.8.1.2.²

Second, the institution committed secondary violations during the 2009-10 through 2013-14 academic years when the director of athletics improperly signed prospective student-athletes' written offers of athletically related financial aid. NCAA Bylaw 15.2.3 requires that "the chair of the regular committee or other agency for the awarding of financial aid . . . or the chair's official designee, shall sign the written statement." Moreover, the bylaw specifies, "the signature of the director of athletics does not satisfy this requirement." (emphasis added) Because the director of athletics signed the financial aid awards during the four-year period, the institution violated NCAA Bylaw 15.2.3.

Third, the institution did not monitor its athletics programs, as demonstrated by its failure to: (1) establish processes that ensured compliance with NCAA eligibility requirements; (2) ensure that the appropriate staff member signed prospective student-athletes' written offers of athletically related financial aid; and (3) provide adequate NCAA rules education and training to institutional staff members.

First, NCAA Constitution 2.8.1 requires institutions to comply with all applicable rules and regulations of the NCAA. It also requires institutions to monitor their athletics programs to assure compliance and to identify and report to the NCAA instances in which institutions were not in compliance. In this case, the institution did not have processes in place for ensuring compliance with NCAA bylaws governing academic eligibility. The institution's eligibility certification process was dependent upon a computer software program that erroneously allowed remedial courses to fulfill progress toward degree requirements in violation of NCAA eligibility legislation. Only one individual staffed the institution's compliance office and his workload was extremely heavy. Consequently, the institution audited only 10 to 15 percent of student-athletes' academic transcripts to verify that their earned credit hours complied with NCAA progress-toward-degree requirements and continuing eligibility legislation. Significantly, institutional procedures did not include verification of the compliance officer's certification of student-athletes' progress-toward-degree requirements. It was only after the institution received the letter of concern from an attorney and conducted an internal eligibility audit that the institution discovered the violations. A routine review of all student-athletes' transcripts would have revealed that the institution had improperly included remedial courses in student-athletes' earned credit hours. In addition, the institution allowed two student-athletes who were not in good academic standing to

² During the 2011-12 through 2013-14 academic years, the following language was deleted from NCAA Bylaw 16.8.1.2: "Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per Constitution 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility." It is important to note that although this language was removed from the bylaw, the application of the legislation did not change. A [D] designation was added to the bylaw to indicate that the bylaw was *de minimus* and did not affect a student-athlete's eligibility.

compete while academically ineligible. These breakdowns in the institution's eligibility certification process demonstrated a failure to monitor in violation of NCAA Constitution 2.8.1.

Additionally, over the course of four years, the institution's director of athletics improperly signed prospective student-athletes' written offers of athletically related financial aid in violation of NCAA Bylaw 15.3.2.3. The fact that NCAA Bylaw 15.3.2.3 expressly prohibits directors of athletics from signing these documents and the fact that this occurred over four years, demonstrated that the institution failed to monitor in violation of NCAA Constitution 2.8.1.

Finally, from 2004 through 2014, the athletics department did not provide NCAA rules education to staff members from other departments and offices who were involved in the eligibility certification process, most notably the registrar. The registrar admittedly did not understand NCAA progress-toward-degree legislation. This unfamiliarity with the applicable eligibility legislation was the direct result of a lack of appropriate education and training that the athletics department should have provided. Because the institution failed to educate individuals involved in the eligibility certification process, it violated its duty to monitor under NCAA Constitution 2.8.1.

V. PENALTIES

For the reasons set forth in Sections III and IV of this decision, the Committee on Infractions concluded that this case involved major violations of NCAA legislation. The institution committed major infractions when, during a four-year period, it failed to properly certify the eligibility of 29 student-athletes, causing them to compete in 323 contests and receive travel expenses for 169 contests while ineligible. The institution also committed a secondary violation involving the improper signing of financial aid documents. The violations demonstrated a failure by the institution to monitor certain aspects of the athletics program.

In prescribing the penalties, the committee considered the institution's cooperation in the processing of this case. NCAA Bylaws 19.01.3 and 32.1.4 address cooperation during the infractions process. The committee concluded that the cooperation exhibited by the institution was consistent with its obligation under the bylaws. Because the institution agreed to the factual findings and violations, as well as the additional penalties prescribed by the committee, there is no opportunity to appeal.

The committee prescribes the following penalties. Those self-imposed by the institution are noted. The institution's corrective actions are contained in Appendix Two.

Penalties and Disciplinary Measures (NCAA Bylaw 19.5.2)

1. Public reprimand and censure.
2. Three years of probation, beginning July 15, 2015, and concluding July 14, 2018.³
3. A financial penalty of \$5,000 (Institution proposed a fine of \$2,500).
4. Pursuant to NCAA Bylaws 19.5.2-(g) and 31.2.2.4, the institution shall vacate all wins in which ineligible student-athletes competed. Further the institution shall vacate any NCAA Championship competition in which student-athletes participated while ineligible. The individual records of the student-athletes shall also be vacated. In addition, the institution's records regarding the affected sports, as well as the records of the head coaches, will reflect the vacated records and will be recorded in all publications in which institutional athletics records are reported, including, but not limited to institutional media guides, recruiting material, electronic and digital media plus institutional, conference and NCAA archives. Any institutions that may subsequently hire the 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 to attain specific honors or victory "milestones" such as 100th, 200th or 500th career victories. The institution shall remove any public reference to these vacated contests 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 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 NCAA Media Coordination and Statistics Office a written report detailing those discussions with the director of statistics. The institution shall retain this document in the permanent files of the statistics department. The institution must deliver the written report to the NCAA Media Coordination and Statistics Office no later than 45 days following the initial Committee on Infractions release. The sports information director (or designee) must also inform the Office of the Committees on Infractions of its submission to the NCAA Media Coordination and Statistics Office. (Institution proposed to "vacate all wins in which any

³ The institution proposed a three-year probationary period. Institutions may propose probationary periods but the authority to prescribe probation rests solely with the respective NCAA Committee on Infractions. In this instance, the committee agreed with the institution's proposal of a three-year probationary period. Periods of NCAA probation always commence with the date of the infractions decision release and include reporting requirements.

(ineligible) student-athletes competed" and "any individual points earned by an ineligible student-athlete will be removed from team totals").

5. Within one year following the release of the decision in this case, the institution shall undertake a comprehensive audit of its athletics compliance program. The audit shall be conducted by an outside agency and include, at minimum, eligibility certification, financial aid administration and compliance education.
6. The institution's director of athletics, compliance officer, registrar and director of financial aid shall attend a NCAA Regional Rules Seminar in 2016.
7. During probation, the institution shall:
 - a. Continue to develop and implement a comprehensive educational program on NCAA legislation 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' eligibility for admission, financial aid, practice or competition;
 - b. Submit a preliminary report to the Office of the Committees on Infractions no later than September 1, 2015. The preliminary report shall set forth a schedule for establishing this compliance and educational program related to the violations in this case;
 - c. File with the Office of the Committees on Infractions annual compliance reports indicating the progress made with this program by May 15 of each year during the probationary period. The reports should place emphasis on policies and procedures relating to eligibility certification and the proper administration of financial aid. The reports must also include documentation of the institution's compliance with the penalties adopted and prescribed by the committee;
 - d. Inform prospective student-athletes in football, basketball, cross-country, golf and baseball that the institution is on probation for three years because of this infractions case. The institution shall explain the violations committed in this infractions case. If a prospective student-athlete takes an official paid visit, the institution must provide the information regarding violations, penalties and terms of probation in advance of the visit. Otherwise, the information must be provided before a prospective student-athlete signs a National Letter of Intent; and
 - e. For the full term of probation, publicize specific and understandable information concerning the nature of the infractions by providing, at a

minimum, a statement that includes the types of violations and the affected sport programs and a direct, conspicuous link to the public infractions decision located on the athletic department's main webpage. The information shall also be included in institutional media guides and in an alumni publication. The institution's statement must: (1) clearly describe the infractions; (2) include the length of the probationary period associated with this case; and (3) give members of the public a clear indication of what occurred in this case to allow the public (particularly prospective student-athletes and their families) to make informed, knowledgeable decisions. A statement that refers only to the probationary period with nothing more is not sufficient.

8. 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.
-

The committee advises the institution that it should take every precaution to ensure that it observes the terms of the penalties. The committee will monitor the penalties during their effective periods. Any action by the institution contrary to the terms of the penalties or any additional violations may result in an extension of the institution's probationary period, the committee prescribing more severe penalties, or may result in additional allegations of violations.

NCAA DIVISION II COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS

Douglas D. Blais
John D. Lackey
Bridget Lyons
Julie A. Rochester, chair
Carey Snyder
Jane Teixeira

APPENDIX ONE

Ineligible Student-Athletes

Student-Athlete	Sport	Number of Contests Competed while Ineligible	Academic Years	Specific Academic Deficiencies	Number of Contests Travel-Related Expenses Received
Student-athlete 1	Football	5	2013-14	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	3
Student-athlete 2	Football	11	2010-11	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	7
Student-athlete 3	Football	3	2013-14	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	2
Student-athlete 4	Football	10 10	2012-13 2013-14	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year; and competed while ineligible in subsequent years and before the institution sought his reinstatement from the reinstatement staff. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b), 14.4.3.3.5 and 14.11.1	11
Student-athlete 5	Football	9	2012-13	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	3
Student-athlete 6	Football	11	2010-11	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	7

Morehouse College Public Infractions Decision

July 15, 2015

Page No. 11

Student-Athlete	Sport	Number of Contests Competed while Ineligible	Academic Years	Specific Academic Deficiencies	Number of Contests Travel-Related Expenses Received
Student-athlete 7	Football	7	2013-14	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	5
Student-athlete 8	Football	1	2010-11	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	1
Student-athlete 9	Football	8	2012-13	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	2
Student-athlete 10	Football	10	2012-13	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	4
Student-athlete 11	Football	10	2011-12	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	7
Student-athlete 12	Football	10 10 8	2011-12 2012-13 2013-14	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year or 6 hours during the previous academic term; and competed while ineligible in subsequent years and before the institution sought his reinstatement from the reinstatement staff. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(a), 14.4.3.1-(b), 14.4.3.3.5 and 14.11.1	16
Student-athlete 13	Football	7	2013-14	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	5

Morehouse College Public Infractions Decision

July 15, 2015

Page No. 12

Student-Athlete	Sport	Number of Contests Competed while Ineligible	Academic Years	Specific Academic Deficiencies	Number of Contests Travel-Related Expenses Received
Student-athlete 14	Football	10	2012-13	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	4
Student-athlete 15	Football	4	2012-13	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	3
Student-athlete 16	Football	10	2012-13	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	4
Student-athlete 17	Football	10	2012-13	Had not designated a degree program by the beginning of the third year of enrollment. Bylaw 14.4.3.1.5	4
Student-athlete 18	Football	10 10 8	2011-12 2012-13 2013-14	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year; and competed while ineligible in subsequent years and before the institution sought his reinstatement from the reinstatement staff. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b), 14.4.3.3.5 and 14.11.1	16
Student-athlete 19	Football	7	2013-14	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	5

Morehouse College Public Infractions Decision

July 15, 2015

Page No. 13

Student-athlete 20	Football	4 10 3	2011-12 2012-13 2013-14	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year; and competed while ineligible in subsequent years and before the institution sought his reinstatement from the reinstatement staff. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b), 14.4.3.3.5 and 14.11.1	9
Student-athlete 21	Football	7	2010-11	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	5
Student-athlete 22	Cross country	1	2010-11	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	1
Student-athlete 23	Men's basketball	20	2010-11	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	6
Student-athlete 24	Men's basketball	7	2011-12	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	13
Student-athlete 25	Men's golf	2	2011-12	Had not (1) fulfilled the academic requirement to be in good academic standing, (2) fulfilled 6 hours during the previous academic term, (3) fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year, (4) designated a degree program by the beginning of the third year of enrollment and (5) fulfilled the minimum grade-point-average requirements. Bylaws 14.01.2.1, 14.4.3.1-(a), 14.4.3.1-(b), 14.4.3.1.5, 14.4.3.2 and 14.4.3.3.5	1
Student-athlete 26	Men's golf	3	2012-13	Had not fulfilled the academic requirements to be in good academic standing. Bylaw 14.01.2.1	9

Morehouse College Public Infractions Decision

July 15, 2015

Page No. 14

Student-athlete 27	Baseball	8	2011-12	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	7
Student-athlete 28	Baseball	27	2011-12	Had not fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.3.5	4
Student-athlete 29	Baseball	32	2011-12	Had not (1) fulfilled 12 credit hours per regular term or 24 hours per academic year, (2) fulfilled the minimum grade-point-average requirement and (3) designated a degree program by the beginning of the third year of enrollment. Bylaws 14.4.3.1-(b), 14.4.3.2.14.4.3.1.5 and 14.4.3.3.5	5

APPENDIX TWO

**THE INSTITUTION'S CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AS IDENTIFIED IN THE
APRIL 7, 2015, SUMMARY DISPOSITION REPORT.**

- a. Create reporting lines from the director of compliance directly to the general counsel and chief compliance, and indirectly to the vice president of student development.
- b. The faculty athletics representative, vice president of student development and/or chief compliance officer/general counsel will engage in regular communication with the president to discuss athletics compliance matters.
- c. Institutional administrators outside the athletics department with athletics compliance responsibilities (i.e., director of financial aid, registrar and vice president of student development) will receive a performance management plan that incorporates their respective athletics compliance duties and responsibilities.
- d. The institution hired an academic advisor to work with the athletics department to identify the student-athletes who have taken (the three remedial courses). The academic advisor will properly advise the identified student-athletes of the additional credits needed to replace the earned hours not awarded through their successful completion of the involved courses.
- e. At the end of each semester, the registrar will manually adjust the transcripts of the student-athletes who have taken (the three remedial courses) to reflect the appropriate hours earned.
- f. The registrar will increase the athletics compliance officer's access to academic information within Banner to include, among other features, a full view of student-athletes' transcripts.
- g. The athletics compliance officer will conduct a manual certification of all student-athletes with continuing eligibility who took the affected courses within the two preceding semesters.
- h. The athletics compliance officer will conduct a manual certification of all transfer student-athletes and withhold transfer student-athletes from athletically related activities until the student-athlete is determined to be eligible for practice and competition.
- i. The athletics compliance officer will manually certify a random sampling of student-athletes to ensure compliance with progress-toward-degree requirements.

- j. The director of athletics and athletics compliance officer will collaborate with the institution's registrar to ensure proper certification of all student-athletes prior to the start of each academic term.
- k. The director of financial aid will be responsible for preparing and executing all written offers of financial aid.
- l. The institution will commit the financial resources for the following positions to attend the NCAA Regional Rules Seminar on an annual basis: dean of records and registration, director of financial aid, academic advisor working with student-athletes, athletics compliance officer and director of athletics.
- m. The institution will consult with an external entity with extensive experience in compliance administration to conduct a series of mandatory educational training sessions for the dean of records and registration; director of financial aid; athletics compliance officer; athletics academic advisor; director of athletics and other select coaches and administrators.
- n. The institution's registrar will educate faculty and academic advisors on the nuances of NCAA legislation that differ from institutional policies and the effect such differences have on student-athletes.
- o. The athletics compliance officer retired from his position on July 29, 2014.⁴

⁴ The institution listed this action as a self-imposed penalty.