



**ALCORN STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**PUBLIC INFRACTIONS DECISION**  
**OCTOBER 19, 2016**

## I. INTRODUCTION

The NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions is an independent administrative body of the NCAA comprised of individuals from the NCAA Division I membership and the public. The committee is charged with deciding infractions cases involving member institutions and their staffs.<sup>1</sup> This case involved eligibility certification violations at Alcorn State University.<sup>2</sup> A panel of the committee considered this case through the cooperative summary disposition process in which all parties agreed to the primary facts and violations, as fully set forth in the summary disposition report (SDR). The panel proposed further penalties to the institution. Because the institution agreed to the violations and penalties, there is no opportunity to appeal.

The institution and the NCAA enforcement staff agreed two violations occurred in this case, improper certification of eligibility and a failure to monitor. The parties agreed both violations were Level II.

With respect to eligibility certification, the parties agreed that from the 2011-12 through the 2014-15 academic years, the institution improperly certified 28 student-athletes in 11 sports resulting in violations of NCAA progress-toward-degree legislation. The student-athletes had not met certain NCAA Bylaw 14 requirements. In regard to monitoring, the parties agreed that from the 2011-12 through the 2014-15 academic years, the institution failed to monitor its progress-toward-degree certification process to ensure compliance with NCAA rules. Further, the institution failed to provide adequate rules education to academic advisors to ensure student-athletes were enrolled in courses that demonstrated NCAA progress toward a degree. The parties agreed the violations are Level II. The panel concurs.

The panel accepts the parties' factual agreements and that violations occurred in this case. Based on the timing of the violations, the panel prescribes penalties under the current penalty guidelines. After considering the aggravating and mitigating factors, the panel classifies this case as Level II-Standard. Adopting the institution's self-imposed penalties and utilizing NCAA Bylaw 19.9.5, penalty guidelines and NCAA Bylaw 19.9.7, the panel prescribes the following

---

<sup>1</sup> Infractions cases are decided by hearing panels comprised of NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions members. Decisions issued by hearing panels are made on behalf of the Committee on Infractions.

<sup>2</sup> A member of the Southwestern Athletic Conference, the institution's total enrollment is approximately 3,600. Alcorn State University sponsors eight men's sports and nine women's sports. This is the institution's fourth major, Level I or Level II infractions case, with prior cases in 2006 (women's basketball), 1994 (women's basketball and men's basketball) and 1984 (women's basketball).

penalties: public reprimand and censure, a two-year probationary period, a financial penalty, vacation of records and administrative reporting requirements.

## **II. CASE HISTORY**

In September 2014, the institution was selected for an NCAA Division I Academic Performance Program (APP) audit by the NCAA academic and membership affairs (AMA) staff. The AMA staff and the institution discovered through the audit that the institution did not apply NCAA progress-toward-degree legislation correctly and, as a result, 28 student-athletes in 11 sports competed while ineligible. The institution submitted a self-report to the NCAA enforcement staff in October 2015, at which time the enforcement staff began a cooperative investigation. The institution completed the APP review and received a final report from the AMA staff in December 2015. The enforcement staff provided a written notice of inquiry to the institution on March 7, 2016. In early May 2016, the enforcement staff provided a draft notice of allegations to the institution to determine whether the parties agreed to process the case through summary disposition. Shortly thereafter, the institution notified the enforcement staff that it agreed to the summary disposition process.

On July 15, 2016, the parties submitted the SDR to the committee. On August 4, 2016, a panel considered the case and, six days later, proposed additional penalties to the institution. On August 19, 2016, the institution informed the NCAA Office of the Committees on Infractions (OCOI) of its intention to contest the panel's proposed vacation of records resulting from the ineligible participation of student-athletes who were improperly certified. On September 26, 2016, the institution notified the OCOI that it decided to withdraw its request to challenge the vacation penalty.

## **III. PARTIES' AGREEMENTS**

The parties jointly submitted the SDR that identifies an agreed-upon factual basis, violations of NCAA legislation and violation levels. The SDR identifies:

### **A. PARTIES' AGREED-UPON FACTUAL BASIS, VIOLATIONS OF NCAA LEGISLATION AND VIOLATION LEVELS**

- 1. NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 14.01.1 (2011-12 through 2015-16.); 14.4.3.2 (2011-12 through 2014- 15); 16.8.1.2 (2011-12 and 2012-13); 14.4.3.1-(b) and 14.4.3.1-(c) (2012-13 and 2013- 14); 14.4.3.1.7-(b) (2012-13); 14.10.1 (2013-14); 16.8.1 (2013-14 through 2014-15); and 12.11.1 (2014-15)]**

The NCAA enforcement staff and institution agree that, from at least the 2011-12 through 2014-15 academic years, the institution improperly certified 28 student-

athletes in 11 sports as eligible for competition. As a result, the student-athletes competed while ineligible. Specifically:

- a. During the 2012-13 through 2014-15 academic years, a men's basketball student-athlete, women's cross country student-athlete and women's tennis student-athlete competed without satisfactory completion of at least 18 semester hours of degree credit toward the students' designated degree program since the beginning of the previous fall term. As a result, the student-athletes received actual and necessary travel expenses for competition while ineligible and competed during subsequent academic years without the institution seeking reinstatement. [NCAA Bylaws 14.01.1 (2012-13 through 2014-15); 14.4.3.1-(b) (2012-13 and 2013-2014); 16.8.1.2 (2012-13); 16.8.1 (2013-14 through 2014-15); and 12.11.1 (2014-15)]
- b. During the 2012-13 through 2014-15 academic years, a men's basketball student-athlete and women's tennis student-athlete competed without satisfactory completion of at least six semester hours of degree credit toward the student-athletes' designated degree program during the preceding regular academic term. As a result, the student-athletes received actual and necessary travel expenses for competition while ineligible and competed during subsequent academic years without the institution seeking reinstatement. [NCAA Bylaws 14.01.1 (2012-13 through 2014-15); 14.4.3.1-(c) (2012-13 and 2013-14); 16.8.1.2 (2012-13); 16.8.1 (2013-14 through 2014-15); and 12.11.1 (2014-15)]
- c. During the 2011-12 through 2014-15 academic years, 26 student-athletes in the sports of baseball, men's basketball, men's and women's cross country, football, women's soccer, softball, men's and women's tennis, men's track and field and women's volleyball competed without successfully completing their percentage-toward-degree requirements. As a result, the student-athletes received actual and necessary travel expenses for competition while ineligible and competed during subsequent academic years without the institution seeking reinstatement. [NCAA Bylaws 14.01.1 (2011-12 through 2014-15); 14.4.3.2 (2011-12 through 2014-15); 16.8.1.2 (2011-12 and 2012-13) 14.10.1 (2013-14); 16.8.1 (2013-14 through 2014-15); and 12.11.1 (2014-15)]
- d. During the 2012-13 academic year, a baseball student-athlete, in the fourth year of enrollment, competed without designating a program of study. As a result, the student-athlete received actual and necessary travel expenses for competition while ineligible and competed during subsequent academic years without the institution seeking reinstatement. [NCAA Bylaws 14.01.1, 14.4.3.1.7-(b) and 16.8.1.2 (2012-13)]

**2. [NCAA Constitution 2.8.1 (NCAA Division I Manual 2011-12 through 2014-15)]**

The NCAA enforcement staff and institution agree that from at least the 2011-12 through 2014-15 academic years, the scope and nature of the violations detailed in Violation No. 1 demonstrate that the institution failed to monitor its progress-toward-degree certification process to ensure compliance with NCAA rules. Specifically, institutional staff members responsible for certifying eligibility failed to apply progress-toward-degree legislation appropriately and the institution failed to provide adequate rules education to academic advisors to ensure student-athletes were enrolled in courses that demonstrated NCAA progress toward a degree.

**B. PARTIES' AGREED-UPON AGGRAVATING AND MITIGATING FACTORS**

Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.6.2-(g), the parties agreed to the following aggravating and mitigating factors:

1. Agreed-upon aggravating and mitigating factors. [NCAA Bylaws 19.9.3 and 19.9.4]
  - a. Aggravating factors.
    - (1) A history of Level I, Level II or major violations by the institution. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(b)]
    - (2) Multiple Level II violations by the institution. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(g)]
  - b. Mitigating factors.
    - (1) Prompt acknowledgement of the violation(s), acceptance of responsibility and imposition of meaningful corrective measures and/or penalties. NCAA Bylaw 19.9.4-(b)]
    - (2) Implementation of a system of compliance methods designed to ensure rules compliance and satisfaction of institutional/coaches' control standards. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.4-(e)]

**IV. REVIEW OF CASE**

The SDR fully detailed the parties' positions in the infractions case and included the agreed-upon primary facts, violations, violation levels and aggravating and mitigating factors. After reviewing the parties' principal factual agreements and the respective explanations surrounding

those agreements, the panel accepts the parties' SDR. This case involved two agreed-upon violations: the institution's improper eligibility certification of student-athletes and a failure to monitor. The panel agrees with the parties and concludes that the violations are Level II.

With respect to improper certification, the parties agreed that for four years, the institution improperly certified 28 student-athletes as eligible when they failed to meet certain progress-toward-degree requirements. The institution also permitted these student-athletes to compete and receive travel expenses. The infractions in this case violated NCAA Constitution 2 and NCAA Bylaws 12, 14 and 16.

NCAA Bylaw 14 outlines eligibility requirements. NCAA Bylaw 14.4 sets progress-toward-degree requirements with specific requirements for competition identified in NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3. Among others, NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.1-(b) requires student-athletes to have completed 18 semester hours toward their designated degree in the previous two regular academic terms, while NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.1-(c) requires student-athletes to have completed six semester or six quarter hours of academic credit during the preceding regular academic term. In addition, NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.1.7-(b) specifies that student-athletes must have designated a program of studies (declare a major) leading toward a specific baccalaureate degree by the beginning of the third year of enrollment. Finally, starting with a student-athlete's third year on campus, NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.2 requires student-athletes to have completed certain percentage benchmarks toward their degree.

As it relates to institutions' responsibilities, NCAA Bylaws 12.11.1, 14.01.1 and 14.10.1 obligate institutions to certify student-athletes' eligibility and require institutions to withhold ineligible student-athletes from competition. Finally, NCAA Bylaw 16.8.1 permits institutions to provide actual and necessary travel expenses only to eligible student-athletes.

In total, the institution improperly certified 28 student-athletes when it failed to meet various provisions of NCAA Bylaw 14. Some of the 28 student-athletes were improperly certified in multiple years. Of these 28 student-athletes who were improperly certified, the vast majority, 26, failed to meet percentage-toward-degree benchmarks. Included in the 26 student-athletes who did not meet percentage-toward-degree requirements was one student-athlete who also failed to designate a program of studies and one student-athlete who also failed to meet minimum credit hour requirements. Finally, two student-athletes did not meet minimum credit hour requirements only. All of the student-athletes competed and received travel expenses while ineligible.

When the institution improperly certified the 28 student-athletes as eligible, it violated numerous progress-toward-degree bylaws. The institution's failure is particularly apparent where it violated eligibility requirements for competition detailed in NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3. Additionally, when the institution permitted those 28 ineligible student-athletes to receive travel expenses, the institution violated NCAA Bylaw 16.8.1. Finally, the institution failed to fulfill its responsibilities under NCAA Bylaws 12.11.1 (2014-15 Division I Manual), 14.01.1 (2011-12 through 2015-16 NCAA Division I Manuals) and 14.10.1 (2013-14 NCAA Division I

Manual) when it permitted ineligible student-athletes to represent the institution in competition, did not ensure that student-athletes were properly certified and failed to withhold ineligible student-athletes from competition.<sup>3</sup> Collectively, these violations were Level II because they consisted of, or resulted from, multiple eligibility violations that did not amount to a lack of institutional control.

With respect to monitoring, the parties agreed that over the course of four academic years, the institution failed to monitor its progress-toward-degree certification process to ensure compliance with NCAA rules. It also failed to provide adequate rules education to academic advisors to ensure student-athletes were enrolled in courses that demonstrated progress toward a degree. The institution's insufficient monitoring and failure to provide adequate education to academic advisors violated NCAA Constitution Article 2.

NCAA Constitution 2.8.1 requires institutions to monitor their athletics programs and assure compliance. It also requires institutions to identify and report noncompliance.

In this case, the institution had a faulty eligibility certification process, particularly with regard to progress-toward-degree certification. The process was plagued by institutional staff members who made false assumptions and had a lack of awareness and understanding of the steps in the certification process. The process began with the registrar entering student-athlete data from the institution's automated system into the Southwestern Athletic Conference eligibility form. This form recorded various academic information including current number of hours enrolled, current GPA and cumulative hours earned. The registrar assumed that the compliance director would make appropriate assessments whether courses were degree applicable and met progress-toward-degree requirements. However, the compliance director did not know that the registrar entered all earned hours rather than only the hours applicable to the degree program. As a result, the compliance director erroneously certified student-athletes' eligibility based on the total hours earned, not those hours that were applicable to their degrees.

Further, the academic counselor in the athletics department only advised those student-athletes who completed less than 50 hours of the institution's core requirements. Once student-athletes completed the core requirements, they transferred from the athletics academic counselor to academic advisors in their respective fields of study. The compliance director expected the advisors in the various academic departments to ensure that student-athletes met NCAA progress- toward-degree-requirements. Those advisors, however, had no NCAA rules education. Thus they were unaware of the courses needed to comply with NCAA continuing eligibility requirements.

Under the NCAA Constitution, institutional staff members are required to comply with the applicable Association rules, and the member institution shall be responsible for such

---

<sup>3</sup> For the 2014-15 Manual, NCAA Bylaw 14.10.1 was renumbered to NCAA Bylaw 12.11.1.

compliance. As a result of the institution's flawed eligibility certification process and the institution's failure to provide appropriate NCAA eligibility education to academic advisors, the institution permitted the eligibility violations to occur. In doing so, the institution did not fulfill its responsibilities under NCAA Constitution 2.8.1 and failed to monitor. A failure to monitor is presumed Level II, unless the failure is substantial or egregious.

## **V. PENALTIES**

For the reasons set forth in Sections III and IV of this decision, the panel accepts the parties' agreed-upon factual basis and violations and concludes that this case involved Level II violations of NCAA legislation. Level II violations are those that provide or are intended to provide more than a minimal but less than a substantial or extensive recruiting, competitive or other advantage.

This case involved violations that predominated after the adoption of the current version of NCAA Bylaw 19. Therefore, the panel determined that the current penalty structure should apply. Under the new penalty structure, the panel assessed the weight and number of the aggravating and mitigating factors in order to classify the case. The panel accepted all of the parties' agreed-upon aggravating and mitigating factors. It did not add additional aggravating or mitigating factors. The panel classifies the institution's case as Level II-Standard.

The institution agreed to the facts, violations, violation levels and the panel's proposed penalties; therefore, there is no opportunity to appeal. All penalties prescribed in this case are independent and supplemental to any action that has been or may be taken by the Committee on Academics through its assessment of postseason ineligibility, historical penalties or other penalties. The institution's corrective actions are contained in the Appendix. After considering all information relevant to the case, the panel prescribes the following. Those penalties self-imposed or proposed by the institution are so noted:

### **Core Penalties for Level II-Standard Violations (NCAA Bylaw 19.9.5)**

1. Probation: Two years of probation from October 19, 2016, through October 18, 2018, or completion of the final penalty, whichever is later.<sup>4</sup> (Institution proposed)
2. Financial penalty: The institution shall pay a \$5,000 fine. The funds from this penalty shall be retained by the institution and used for compliance education of the following staff members: the registrar, academic advisors and compliance staff.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Probationary periods always commence with the release of the infractions decision. Pursuant to NCAA Bylaws 19.3.6-(e), 19.9.5.7, the committee normally tethers probationary periods to the prescribed penalties.

<sup>5</sup> See *Florida A&M University* (2015) (prescribing a financial penalty that the panel ordered the institution to retain for funding of compliance-related activities and education).

### **Additional Penalties for Level II-Standard Violations (NCAA Bylaw 19.9.7)**

3. Public reprimand and censure.
4. The SDR acknowledged that the student-athletes referenced in Violation No. 1 competed while ineligible and the institution did not seek reinstatement of these student-athletes. Therefore, pursuant to NCAA Bylaws 19.9.7-(g) and 31.2.2.3, the institution shall vacate all regular season and conference tournament records and participation in which the ineligible student-athletes detailed in Violation No. 1 participated.<sup>6</sup> This order of vacation includes all regular season competition and conference tournaments. The individual records of the ineligible student-athletes will also be vacated. However, the individual finishes and any awards for all eligible student-athletes will be retained. Further, the institution's records regarding its athletics programs, as well as the records of head coaches, will reflect the vacated records and will be recorded in all publications in which such records are reported, including, but not limited to, institutional media guides, recruiting material, electronic and digital media plus institutional, conference and NCAA archives. Any institution that may subsequently hire the affected head coaches shall similarly reflect the vacated wins in their career records documented in media guides and other publications cited above. Head coaches with vacated wins on their records may not count the vacated wins toward specific honors or victory "milestones" such as 100<sup>th</sup>, 200<sup>th</sup> or 500<sup>th</sup> career victories. Any public reference to the vacated contests shall be removed from the athletics department stationary, banners displayed in public areas and any other forum in which they may appear. Any trophies awarded by the NCAA in these sports shall be returned to the Association.

Finally, to ensure that all institutional and student-athlete vacations, statistics and records are accurately reflected in official NCAA publications and archives, the sports information director (or other designee as assigned by the director of athletics) must contact the NCAA Media Coordination and Statistics office and appropriate conference officials to identify the specific student-athletes and contests impacted by the penalties. In addition, the institution must provide the NCAA Media Coordination and Statistics office with a written report, detailing those discussions. This document will be maintained in the permanent files of the NCAA Media Coordination and Statistics office. This written report must be delivered to the office no later than 45 days following the release of this decision. The sports information director (or designee) must also inform the Office of the Committees on Infractions of this submission to the NCAA Media Coordination and Statistics office.

---

<sup>6</sup> Among other examples, the committee has indicated that a vacation penalty is particularly appropriate when cases involve a failure to monitor violation. *See Division I Internal Operating Procedure 4-16-4*. Further, the committee has consistently applied a comprehensive vacation of records in cases that involved student-athletes competing when they failed to meet eligibility or amateurism requirements. *See Campbell University (2016), Samford University (2016), University of North Carolina, Greensboro (2015), University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff (2014) and Southeastern Louisiana University (2013)*.



5. During this period of probation, the institution shall:
  - a. Continue to develop and implement a comprehensive educational program on NCAA legislation to instruct coaches, the faculty athletics representative, all athletics department personnel and all institution staff members with responsibility for 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 by December 15, 2016, setting forth a schedule for establishing this compliance and educational program;
  - c. File with the Office of the Committees on Infractions annual compliance reports indicating the progress made with this program by August 30 of each year during the probationary period. Particular emphasis should be placed on: (1) enhancements to the institution's eligibility certification policies and procedures; and (2) monitoring of the institution's eligibility certification process. The reports must also include documentation of the institution's compliance with the penalties adopted and prescribed by the committee;
  - d. Inform in writing prospective student-athletes in the involved sport programs that the institution is on probation for two years and detail the violations committed. If a prospective student-athlete takes an official paid visit, the information regarding violations, penalties and terms of probation must be provided in advance of the visit. Otherwise, the information must be provided before a prospective student-athlete signs a National Letter of Intent; and
  - e. Publicize specific and understandable information concerning the nature of the infractions by providing, at a minimum, a statement to include the types of violations and the affected sport program and a direct, conspicuous link to the public infractions decision. This information shall be located on the athletic department's "landing" 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 the Level II infractions case; and (3) give members of the general public a clear indication of what happened in the Level II infractions 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.
6. Following the receipt of the final compliance report and prior to the conclusion of probation, 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 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, prescribing more severe penalties or may result in additional allegations and violations.

NCAA COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS PANEL

Britton Banowsky

Bobby Cremins

Alberto Gonzales

Thomas Hill

Gary L. Miller

Joseph Novak

Dave Roberts, Chief Hearing Officer

**APPENDIX**

**CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AS IDENTIFIED IN THE INSTITUTION'S  
JULY 15, 2016, SUMMARY DISPOSITION REPORT**

1. President setting clear expectations and standards. (March 2014)
2. New director of athletics. (September 2014)
3. Associate director of athletics for compliance. (November 2014)
4. New athletics administration aligned with institutional mission and vision. (November 2014)
5. Provided fiscal investment of additional athletics-academic staff; creation of an entire new Office of Athletics Academic Enhancement. (November 2014)
6. Director of compliance and student-athlete services. (March 2015)
7. Academic counselor 1. (April 2015)
8. Academic counselor 2. (May 2015)
9. New academic center for student-athletes. (Office of Athletic Academic Enhancement) (May 2015)
10. Change in coaching staff in MBB program. (May 2015)
11. Receipt of NCAA AASP grant. (July 2015)
12. Athletic academic enhancement interns (through new degree completion program). (September 2015)
13. Coordinator of student-athlete support services. (October 2015)
14. Athletics academic enhancement graduate assistant (x2). (October 2015)
15. Student and area/departmental tutors. (October 2015)
16. President commissioned the APR Task Force in early spring of 2015. The APR Task force is a broad-based group of internal and external constituents to the athletics department. These committees provide perspective and valuable input into clear strategies to rectify and eradicate

identified issues. Broad-based collaboration and cooperation are essential in establishing a foundation for the journey to academic excellence in athletics.

17. Improved infrastructure by increasing the counselor to student-athlete ratio from 1:300 to 1:60 by hiring an associate athletic director for compliance, a director of compliance/student-athlete services, coordinator of student-athlete services, and two full-time athletic academic advisors (previous advisor/coordinator had dual duties in athletics/undergraduate studies) who will be supported by at least two graduate assistants. The institution has implemented completely new processes and streamlined responsibilities to address this issue.
18. The director of athletics and the associate athletic director for compliance report directly to the president and serve on the institution's leadership cabinet.
19. Increased staffing by 166 percent from 1.5 full-time employees to four full-time employees.
20. Increased budget by 176 percent from \$85,000 to \$235,000 (inclusive of salaries).
21. Mandated application for AASP Grant.
22. Received AASP Grant added \$300,000 per year to budget.
23. Completely new institutional and athletics leadership holding individuals and areas accountable for compliance with NCAA, SWAC, ASU, and MS Institution of Higher Learning guidelines, practices, policies, and other rules and regulations. Taken together, the underlying philosophy of Alcorn State University's continuous quality improvement—in light of this waiver—is that when problems arise our policies, procedures, and processes ensure that a student-athlete will receive proper academic advisement relative to the evaluation of the student-athlete's degree program and course selection and the evaluation of the student-athlete's transcript to ensure courses are acceptable for satisfying the progress-toward-degree requirements.
24. Eight two percent of all sport programs have new leadership (from March 2014 to present)
  - At the heart of ASU Athletics core focus areas, under the new vision and administration are academic excellence and strong compliance systems, policies, personnel. Alcorn State University and its leaders are cognizant of the complexity of the problems associated with past practices and structure. In taking full responsibility for these inherited problems and complete ownership of and pride in our program, much has been done to rectify the matter; strategic, focused decisions will continue to be made to strengthen and solidify the operations and practices of the department and all associated university constituents. We are highly focused on ensuring institutional control and shared responsibility for compliance.

25. The institution has implemented a plethora of new policies, forms, and systems. They include:  
All new compliance forms:
- New Eligibility Notification Form
  - New PTD Tracking Forms
  - Progress Towards Degree/Eligibility Evaluation Form
  - Eligibility Verification Forms
26. Dual Advisement Policy/Process between Athletics Academic Personnel and Major Department Advisors/Personnel
- Trial Advisement Forms (required signature of athletics advisor, departmental advisor, and student-athlete)
  - Curriculum evaluations by departmental advisors
  - Revised Dual Advisement structure
  - All student-athlete advised by assigned athletics academic personnel
  - Advisors must keep complete, accurate, up-to-date student-athlete files (transcripts, evaluations, advisement forms, etc.)
  - Maintain PTD/Eligibility Evaluation forms
  - Assist compliance with eligibility verification process
  - Update academic screens in the CAi software (in process)
  - Freshmen and Sophomores advised by Undergraduate Studies
  - Juniors and Seniors advised by departmental advisor (Reason: to ensure compliance with NCAA requirements and institutional requirements)
27. Eligibility Verification by Committee Process
- Committee includes the faculty athletics representative (FAR), compliance staff, associate director of athletics for academics, registrar, and respective sport head coach
  - Committee meets and goes through each individual case to ensure that all applicable eligibility requirements have been met and are justifiable through departmental and institutional records (i.e. curriculum evaluations, transcripts, accurate PTD/Eligibility Evaluation forms, etc.)
28. Campus-wide Education Programs
- Dean/Chairs Presentation on APR/PTD/POD requirements and importance
  - Student-athlete education through informational handouts and compliance education sessions regarding APR/PTD/POD
  - Coaches education
  - Educational sessions with the FAR, registrar, admissions, financial aid, information technology and other pertinent constituent across campus
29. Lastly, the institution has provided extensive rules education to all coaches and applicable staff from November 2014 through the present. The following items include but are not limited to the extensive rules education provided by the institution:

- Monthly compliance mini session.
- Monthly compliance newsletters.
- Compliance tip of the week
- Rules education meeting with deans.
- Rules education meeting with chairs.
- Rules education meeting with president's cabinet.
- APR and rules education session presented by Forward Progress for coaches, administrators and staff.
- Eligibility certification meetings with coaches and staff
- Team rules education meetings
- Web based collaborative platform created to minimize violations of NCAA Legislation