



UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
PUBLIC INFRACTIONS DECISION
MAY 23, 2018

I. INTRODUCTION

The NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions (COI) is an independent administrative body of the NCAA comprised of individuals from the Division I membership and public. The COI is charged with deciding infractions cases involving member institutions and their staffs.¹ This case involves impermissible coaching activity in the University of Utah baseball program that occurred at the head coach's direction over three years.² The head coach also agreed that he failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance. A panel of the COI 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 accepted the self-imposed penalties for Utah and the head coach but proposed one year of probation, which Utah accepted. Therefore, the parties do not have an opportunity to appeal.

For three years, the Utah baseball program, at the direction and with the approval of the head coach, had the advantage of an impermissible coach over compliant programs. The parties agreed that starting with the 2014-15 academic year, the head coach instructed his then director of baseball operations to engage in impermissible on-field instruction and other activities reserved for coaching staff members. The head coach then permitted these activities to continue through the 2016-17 academic year. Among other actions, the director of operations provided instruction to catchers, threw batting practice and occasionally hit baseballs to pitchers for fielding practice. Because Utah already employed the maximum number of coaches, the activity caused Utah's baseball program to exceed the number of permissible coaches.

The head coach agreed that his involvement in the impermissible coaching activity demonstrated that he failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance over the three-year period. Specifically, the head coach knew that the director of operations could not engage in on-field activity but directed him to do so and then continued to permit him to do so. Further, the head coach went so far as to warn his staff to be careful that the director of operations was not engaged in coaching activity if administrators came to practice. The head coach never reported the activity to the compliance office. The parties proposed and the panel agrees that both violations are Level II.

¹ Infractions cases are decided by hearing panels comprised of COI members. Decisions issued by hearing panels are made on behalf of the COI.

² A member of the Pac-12 Conference, Utah has a total enrollment of approximately 31,000 and sponsors seven men's sports and 11 women's sports. This is Utah's fourth major, Level I or Level II infractions case. It had previous cases in 2003 (men's basketball), 1987 (football) and 1962 (men's basketball).

The panel accepts the parties' factual agreements and concludes violations occurred. Because the violations occurred after October 30, 2012, the current penalty structure applies. After considering applicable aggravating and mitigating factors, the panel classifies Utah's case as Level II-Mitigated and the head coach's violations as Level II-Standard. Utilizing the current penalty guidelines and NCAA bylaws authorizing additional penalties, the panel adopts and prescribes the following penalties: one year of probation, a fine, a head coaching suspension, a reduction in countable athletically related activity (CARA) and other penalties.

II. CASE HISTORY

The case began in late July 2017 when parents of a former student-athlete contacted Utah about its baseball program. On August 17, 2017, Utah informed the NCAA enforcement staff about potential issues in its baseball program. Between August and early November 2017, the parties investigated the matter. On December 21, 2017, the enforcement staff provided Utah and the head baseball coach (head coach) with a draft notice of allegations. On January 3, 2018, the parties agreed to process the case via summary disposition.

The parties submitted the SDR to the COI on March 12, 2018, and on April 25, 2018, a panel considered the case via teleconference.³ On April 30, 2018, the panel proposed a one-year probationary period to Utah, which it accepted.

III. PARTIES' AGREEMENTS

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

The parties jointly submitted an SDR that identifies an agreed-upon factual basis, violations of NCAA legislation, aggravating factors, mitigating factors and violation levels.⁴ The SDR identified:

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 11.7.1, 11.7.3 and 11.7.6 (2014-15 through 2016-17)] (Level II)

Utah, the head coach and enforcement staff agree that during the 2014-15 through 2016-17 academic years, the head coach directed and permitted the then director of baseball operations to engage in on-field instruction and other impermissible

³ Pursuant to COI Internal Operating Procedure (IOP) 4-9-2-1, panels in future cases may view this decision as less instructive than a decision reached after a contested hearing because violations established through the summary disposition process constitute the parties' agreements.

⁴ This decision provides the agreed-upon factual basis, violations and violation levels as exactly stated in the SDR, except for shortening references to the parties.

coaching activities with baseball student-athletes. As a result, the institution exceeded the permissible number of countable baseball coaches. Specifically, the then director of baseball operations participated in on-field coaching activities including instructing catchers, throwing batting practice and occasionally hitting baseballs for pitchers' fielding drills during practices at the head coach's direction. The then director of baseball operations participated in the impermissible activities occasionally during the 2014-15 academic year and regularly during the 2015-16 and 2016-17 academic years.

2. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaw 11.1.1.1 (2014-15 through 2016-17)] (Level II)

Utah, the head coach and enforcement staff agree that during the 2014-15 through 2016-17 academic years, the head coach is presumed responsible for the violations detailed in Violation No. 1 and did not rebut the presumption of responsibility. Specifically, the head coach did not demonstrate that he promoted an atmosphere of compliance due to his personal involvement in the violations when he assigned the then director of baseball operations to catchers and permitted him to engage in impermissible on-field coaching activities during individual defensive drills. Additionally, the head coach and the baseball staff failed to report those activities as violations of NCAA legislation.

B. PARTIES' AGREED-UPON AGGRAVATING AND MITIGATING FACTORS

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

Institution:

1. Aggravating factors. [Bylaw 19.9.3]⁵

None.

2. Mitigating factors. [Bylaw 19.9.4]⁶

- (a) Prompt acknowledgment of the violation, acceptance of responsibility, and imposition of meaningful corrective measures. [Bylaw 19.9.4-(b)]
- (b) Affirmative steps to expedite final resolution of the matter. [Bylaw 19.9.4-(c)]
- (c) An established history of self-reporting Level III or secondary violations.

⁵ Utah agreed in part that Bylaw 19.9.3-(h) *Persons of authority condoned, participated in or negligently disregarded the violation(s) or wrongful conduct* could apply. Because the parties did not fully agree on the aggravating factor, the panel addresses this factor in Section V. Penalties.

⁶ The enforcement staff agreed in part that Bylaw 19.9.4-(i) *Other factors* could apply. Because the parties did not fully agree on the mitigating factor, the panel addresses this factor in Section V. Penalties.

[Bylaw 19.9.4-(d)]

Head coach:

1. Aggravating factor. [Bylaw 19.9.3]

Persons of authority condoned, participated in or negligently disregarded the violation(s) or related wrongful conduct. [Bylaw 19.9.3-(h)]

2. Mitigating factors. [Bylaw 19.9.4]

(a) Prompt acknowledgement and acceptance of the violations and acceptance of responsibility. [Bylaw 19.9.4-(b)]

(b) Absence of prior Level I/Level II violations. [Bylaw 19.9.4-(h)]

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 respective explanations surrounding those agreements, the panel accepts the parties' SDR and concludes that the facts constitute Level II violations of NCAA legislation.

Starting in 2014, the Utah baseball program experienced the impermissible advantage of having an extra coach when the head coach directed and then permitted his director of operations to engage in on-field coaching for three years. The head coach knew such activity was prohibited under NCAA legislation but continued to permit it for three years. In doing so, the head coach personally approved of known violations and failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance in his program. The conduct violated four different provisions of Bylaw 11.⁷

Generally, Bylaw 11 regulates conduct of athletics personnel. As it relates to this case, Bylaw 11 sets limits on athletics personnel and standards of conduct for head coaches. Bylaws 11.7.1, 11.7.3 and 11.7.6 require that institutions specifically designate the individuals who will engage in coaching activity, prohibit non-designated coaches from participating in on-field activities and set the number of permissible coaches in baseball at three. Further, Bylaw 11.1.1.1 requires that coaches monitor their direct and indirect staff members and promote an atmosphere of compliance.

Both agreed-upon violations stem from the head coach directing his director of operations to engage in impermissible on-field coaching activities. The director of operations was in an off-

⁷ The full text of the specific bylaws violated is located in Appendix Two.

field role and Utah employed the maximum number of coaches. Originally, the director of operations participated in the impermissible coaching on an occasional basis during the 2014-15 academic year. However, the head coach permitted these activities to continue for the next two years, during which the director of operations' involvement became more regular. When the director of operations engaged in the on-field activities, the Utah baseball program violated Bylaws 11.7.1 and 11.7.3. The activity also caused Utah to exceed coaching limitations set by Bylaw 11.7.6.

The COI has concluded that Level II violations occur when non-coaching personnel engage in on-court or on-field activities. See *University of Northern Colorado* (2017) (concluding, among other violations, that a Level II violation occurred when, at the direction of the head basketball coach, a director of operations conducted impermissible on-court activities with a nonqualifier) and *University of Hawaii at Manoa* (2015) (concluding that a Level II violation occurred when the head men's basketball coach permitted his director of operations to engage in on-court coaching instruction over an academic year).⁸ Like those cases, the Utah baseball program permitted an off-the-field staff member to engage in on-field activities. Pursuant to Bylaw 19.1.2, the panel concludes that the impermissible coaching activity is Level II because having an extra coach provided Utah with more than a minimal competitive advantage over three years.

The head coach agreed that his direct involvement in the impermissible coaching activity demonstrated that he failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance in his program for three years. He knew that the director of operations could not be involved in on-field coaching activities.⁹ Notwithstanding his knowledge, the head coach personally directed, and then continued to allow, his director of operations to engage in impermissible activity. He also never reported the activity to his compliance staff. To the contrary, the head coach specifically warned his baseball staff to make sure that the director of operations was not engaged in coaching activity if any administrative staff came by practice. The head coach rationalized his decision in three ways: (1) it helped develop the director of operations; (2) he believed that other programs also allowed similar impermissible activity; and (3) it allowed him to spend time on other areas during practice. Regardless of his intent, his decision to knowingly allow impermissible coaching activity demonstrated rules compliance was not a top priority for his program. It also provided his program with the benefit of an extra coach that was not enjoyed by compliant programs. The head coach agreed that his involvement in the violations failed to meet his requirements under Bylaw 11. The COI has previously concluded that head coaches who allow impermissible coaching activities to occur in their program fail to promote an

⁸ Under the previous violations structure, the COI has also concluded that impermissible coaching activity conducted by non-coaching baseball staff members supported major violations of NCAA legislation. See *Arizona State University* (2010) (concluding that major violations occurred when over three years a head coach employed student managers to engage in on-field coaching activities).

⁹ Although non-exhaustive, Bylaw 10.1 identifies examples of unethical conduct. During its review of the SDR, the panel considered whether the head coach's knowing involvement in NCAA violations potentially supported an unethical conduct violation. Although each case is unique, the panel ultimately agreed with the parties' position that the agreed-upon conduct was appropriately addressed by Bylaw 11.1.1.1. See *COI IOP 4-9-2-1*.

atmosphere of compliance. *See Northern Colorado* (concluding, among other underlying violations that a head coach failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance when he directed operations staff member to engage in on-court coaching instructions) and *Hawaii* (concluding, among other violations, that a head coach failed to promote an atmosphere of when he permitted his director of operations to engage in on-court coaching activities and failed to report a known violation). Like those coaches, the head coach failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance in his program because he knew the activity was impermissible, permitted it to occur and failed to inform compliance.

Consistent with Bylaw 19.1.2-(e), the COI has repeatedly concluded that head coach responsibility violations stemming from underlying Level II violations are also Level II. The COI has also specifically concluded that head coaches commit Level II head coach responsibility violations when they fail to report known Level II violations and when they permit directors of operations to engage in coaching activity. *See Grambling State University* (2017) (concluding that a head track coach committed a Level II head coach responsibility violation and failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance when he learned of impermissible Level II inducements and failed to stop and report them) and *Hawaii* (2015) (concluding that the head coach committed a Level II head coach responsibility violation). Like these cases, the COI concludes that the head coach committed a Level II head coach responsibility violation.

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 this case involved Level II violations of NCAA legislation. Level II violations are significant breaches of conduct that provide or are intended to provide more than a minimal, but less than an extensive, advantage.

Pursuant to Bylaw 19.9.1, the panel prescribes penalties under the current penalty structure because the violations in this case occurred after October 30, 2012. In considering penalties, the panel first reviewed aggravating and mitigating factors pursuant to Bylaws 19.9.2, 19.9.3 and 19.9.4 to determine the appropriate classifications for the parties. The panel then used the current penalty guidelines (Figure 19-1) and Bylaws 19.9.5 and 19.9.7 to prescribe penalties.¹⁰

Because the parties did not agree on all aggravating and mitigating factors, the panel had to resolve additional factors. Utah and the enforcement staff did not agree on four total factors, and the head coach and the enforcement staff did not agree on five total factors.

¹⁰ The membership recently adjusted and expanded the ranges in the penalty guidelines related to scholarship reductions and the duration of postseason bans, probation and show-cause orders. The adjusted guidelines became effective on August 1, 2017. Because the panel considered this case after the effective date of the adjusted guidelines, the panel used the adjusted guidelines to prescribe penalties.

With respect to Utah, the panel reviewed three aggravating factors and one mitigating factor. Regarding the aggravating factors, the enforcement staff proposed, but Utah did not fully agree, that Bylaws 19.9.3-(b) *A history of Level I, Level II or major violations by the institution*, 19.9.3-(g) *Multiple Level II violations* and 19.9.3-(h) *Persons of authority condoned, participated in or negligently disregarded the violation(s) or wrongful conduct* applied. Due to the length of time, the type of violations and the programs involved in Utah's past infractions cases, the panel determines that Bylaw 19.9.3-(b) does not apply to this case. The panel determines that Bylaws 19.9.3-(g) and (h) apply to the case. Utah agreed that this case involved two Level II violations but asserted that the second violation was derivative of the first violation. Utah further conceded that its head baseball coach, a person of authority, committed the violations when he knew they were against NCAA legislation but attempted to confine the activity to the actions of just one individual. These factors are consistent with recent COI decisions. *See Prairie View A&M University (2017) and Florida International University (2017)*. Like those cases, the aggravating factors are applicable to the agreed-upon conduct in this case.

Utah also proposed Bylaw 19.9.4-(i) *Other factors* should apply because of its compliance initiatives during the time the violations occurred. The enforcement staff acknowledged those efforts but noted that despite the efforts, the violations occurred for three years and were not detected by the compliance office. While the panel acknowledges Utah's compliance efforts, it does not believe they rise to Bylaw 19.9.4-(i) because, despite those efforts, Utah did not discover the violations for three years. After resolving these factors, the panel classifies Utah's case as Level II-Mitigated.

The head coach and enforcement staff also did not agree on all factors. The panel reviewed two aggravating and three mitigating factors related to the head coach's agreed-upon violations. The enforcement staff identified Bylaws 19.9.3-(g) *Multiple Level II violations* and 19.9.4-(m) *Intentional, willful or blatant disregard for the NCAA constitution and bylaws* because the head coach was involved in underlying and head coach responsibility Level II violations and he knew the underlying conduct was impermissible. The head coach believed the factors should not apply because his two violations arose from the same conduct and the second aggravating factor was duplicative of his agreed-upon aggravating factor (Bylaw 19.9.3-(h)). The panel disagrees and determines that both apply. Like Utah, the head coach agreed that he was involved in two Level II violations. Further, he agreed that he knew the conduct was impermissible. Nonetheless, he continued to allow the impermissible activity to occur in his program for a total of three years. The COI has recently concluded that a head coach's intentional actions support both of these factors. *See Hawaii*. Although involving different underlying conduct and violations, the same expectations apply to all head coaches. Therefore, the factors are also appropriate for this head coach's violations.

The head coach also proposed three mitigating factors to which the enforcement staff did not agree, Bylaws 19.9.4-(c) *Affirmative steps to expedite final resolution of the matter*, 19.9.4-(f) *Exemplary cooperation*, and 19.9.4-(i) *Other factors—the head coach's history of compliance*. The panel does not determine any apply to the head coach's violations. With respect to Bylaw

19.9.4-(c) and (f), the panel acknowledges the head coach's cooperation and acceptance of responsibility once the violations were discovered. However, the head coach failed to alert the compliance staff to his known violations for three years, delaying ultimate resolution of the impermissible coaching activity and increasing the severity of the violations. Once engaged in the investigation, the panel determines that the head coach met his obligations under Bylaw 19.2.3. Further, the panel determines that Bylaw 19.9.4-(i) also does not apply. The panel acknowledges the head coach's history of compliance in its acceptance of Bylaw 19.9.4-(b) *Absence of prior Level I, Level II or major violations*. After resolving these factors, the panel classifies the head coach's violations as Level II-Standard.

Utah and the head coach agreed to the facts, violations and penalties. Therefore, there is no opportunity for appeal. All penalties prescribed in this case are independent and supplemental to any action that has been or may be taken by the NCAA Division I Committee on Academics through its assessment of postseason ineligibility, historical penalties or other penalties. In prescribing penalties, the panel considered Utah's cooperation in all parts of this case and determines it was consistent with the institution's obligation under Bylaw 19.2.3. The panel also considered Utah's corrective actions, which are set forth in Appendix One, in prescribing penalties. After considering all information relevant to this case, the panel prescribes the following penalties (self-imposed penalties are noted):

Core Penalties for Level II-Mitigated Violations (Bylaw 19.9.5)

1. Probation: One year of probation from May 23, 2018, through May 22, 2019.¹¹
2. Financial Penalty: Utah shall pay a fine of \$5,000 to the NCAA. (Self-imposed.)

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

3. Head Coach Restrictions: The head coach agreed that he instructed his director of operations to engage in coaching activity when he knew such activity was impermissible. He further agreed that he then permitted his director of operations to engage in coaching activity for a three-year period, even cautioning his staff to be careful if athletics administrators came around. Therefore, pursuant to Bylaw 19.9.5.5, the head coach shall be suspended for the first 25 percent of the 2018 baseball season. The provisions of the suspension require that the head coach not be present in the venue where the games are played and have no contact or communication with members of the baseball coaching staff and student-athletes during the suspension period. The prohibition includes all coaching activities for the period of time which begins at 12:01 a.m. the day of the first game and ends at 11:59 p.m. on the day of the final game which comprises a 25 percent suspension. During that period, the head coach may not participate in any activities, including, but not limited to, team travel, practice, recruiting, video study and team meetings. (Self-imposed.)

¹¹ Periods of probation always commence with the release of the infractions decision.

Although each case is unique, the COI has previously prescribed similar suspensions. *See Sam Houston State University* (2017) (prescribing, among other show-cause restrictions, a 30 percent suspension associated with the head coach's violations) and *Monmouth University* (2017) (prescribing, among other show-cause provisions, a 30 percent suspension associated with the head coach's Bylaw 11.1.1.1 violations). Utah's self-imposed 25 percent game suspension falls within the panel's classification of the head coach's violations.

Additional Penalties for Level II Violations (Bylaw 19.9.7)

4. Public reprimand and censure.
5. The baseball program shall reduce the weekly number of CARA from 20 to 18 during the 2018 baseball season. (Self-imposed.)
6. During the time of 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 NCAA recruiting and certification legislation;
 - b. Submit a preliminary report to the OCOI by July 1, 2018, setting forth a schedule for establishing this compliance and educational program;
 - c. File with the OCOI an annual compliance report indicating the progress made with this program by March 31, 2019. Particular emphasis shall be placed on monitoring non-coaching staff activities and rules education related to permissible activities for coaching and non-coaching staff members.
 - d. Inform in writing baseball prospects that the institution is on probation for one year 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 prospect 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 programs and a direct, conspicuous link to the public infractions report located on the athletic department's main or "landing" webpage. The information shall also be included in baseball media guides and in an alumni publication. The institution's statement must: (i) clearly describe the infractions; (ii) include the length of the probationary period associated with the infractions case; and (iii) provide a clear

indication of what happened in the infractions case. A statement that refers only to the probationary period with nothing more is not sufficient.

7. Following the receipt of the compliance report and prior to the conclusion of probation, the institution's president shall provide a letter to the COI affirming that the institution's current athletics policies and practices conform to all requirements of NCAA regulations.
-

The COI advises Utah that it should take every precaution to ensure the terms of the penalties are observed. The COI will monitor the penalties during their effective periods. Any action by Utah contrary to the terms of any of the penalties or any additional violations may be considered grounds for prescribing more severe penalties or may result in additional allegations and violations.

NCAA COMMITTEE ON INFRACTIONS PANEL

Norman Bay

Jody Conradt

Bobby Cremins

Thomas Hill

Jason Leonard

Gary L. Miller, Chief Hearing Officer

Roderick Perry

APPENDIX ONE

**UNIVERSITY OF UTAH'S CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AS IDENTIFIED IN THE
MARCH 12, 2017, SUMMARY DISPOSITION REPORT**

1. The head coach will receive a letter of reprimand.
2. The University has not permitted baseball to hire a director of baseball operations to replace [the director of baseball operations involved in this case], who left the institution following the 2017 baseball season, during the course of the investigation.
3. The University will redefine the job description for the director of baseball operations and will seek to hire a person who is not interested in becoming a coach or in gaining experience in a coaching profession. The revised role will be solely administrative.
4. The baseball staff will be required to attend additional rules education, beyond the University's requirement for all staff. The athletics compliance staff will continue to regularly engage in monitoring of practice activities.

APPENDIX TWO
Bylaw Citations

Division I 2014-15 Manual

11.1.1.1 Responsibility of Head Coach. An institution's head coach is presumed to be responsible for the actions of all assistant coaches and administrators who report, directly or indirectly, to the head coach. An institution's head coach shall promote an atmosphere of compliance within his or her program and shall monitor the activities of all assistant coaches and administrators involved with the program who report, directly or indirectly, to the coach.

11.7.1 Designation of Coaching Category. An individual who coaches and either is uncompensated or receives compensation or remuneration of any sort from the institution, even if such compensation or remuneration is not designated for coaching, shall be designated as a head coach, assistant coach, volunteer coach, graduate assistant coach or student assistant coach by certification of the institution.

11.7.3 Noncoaching Staff Member with Sport-Specific Responsibilities. A noncoaching staff member with sport-specific responsibilities (e.g., director of operations, administrative assistant) is prohibited from participating in on-court or on-field activities (e.g., assist with drills, throw batting practice, signal plays) and is prohibited from participating with or observing student-athletes in the staff member's sport who are engaged in nonorganized voluntary athletically related activities (e.g., pick-up games).

11.7.6 Limitations on Number of Coaches and Off-Campus Recruiters. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches (other than graduate assistant coaches per Bylaw 11.01.3, undergraduate assistant coaches per Bylaw 11.01.4 and volunteer coaches per Bylaw 11.01.5) who may be employed by an institution and who may contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus in each sport as follows:

Sport Limit Sport Limit

Baseball.....3

Division I 2015-16 Manual

11.1.1.1 Responsibility of Head Coach. An institution's head coach is presumed to be responsible for the actions of all institutional staff members who report, directly or indirectly, to the head coach. An institution's head coach shall promote an atmosphere of compliance within his or her program and shall monitor the activities of all institutional staff members involved with the program who report, directly or indirectly, to the coach.

11.7.1 Designation of Coaching Category. [A] An individual who coaches and either is uncompensated or receives compensation or remuneration of any sort from the institution, even

if such compensation or remuneration is not designated for coaching, shall be designated as a head coach, assistant coach, volunteer coach, graduate assistant coach or student assistant coach by certification of the institution.

11.7.3 Noncoaching Staff Member with Sport-Specific Responsibilities. [A] A noncoaching staff member with sport-specific responsibilities (e.g., director of operations, administrative assistant) is prohibited from participating in on-court or on-field activities (e.g., assist with drills, throw batting practice, signal plays) and is prohibited from participating with or observing student-athletes in the staff member's sport who are engaged in nonorganized voluntary athletically related activities (e.g., pick-up games).

11.7.6 Limitations on Number of Coaches and Off-Campus Recruiters. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches (other than graduate assistant coaches per Bylaws 11.01.3 and 11.01.4, undergraduate assistant coaches per Bylaw 11.01.5 and volunteer coaches per Bylaw 11.01.6) who may be employed by an institution and who may contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus in each sport as follows:

Sport Limit Sport Limit

Baseball..... 3

Division I 2016-17 Manual

11.1.1.1 Responsibility of Head Coach. An institution's head coach is presumed to be responsible for the actions of all institutional staff members who report, directly or indirectly, to the head coach. An institution's head coach shall promote an atmosphere of compliance within his or her program and shall monitor the activities of all institutional staff members involved with the program who report, directly or indirectly, to the coach.¹²

11.7.1 Designation of Coaching Category. [A] An individual who coaches and either is uncompensated or receives compensation or remuneration of any sort from the institution, even if such compensation or remuneration is not designated for coaching, shall be designated as a head coach, assistant coach, volunteer coach, graduate assistant coach or student assistant coach by certification of the institution.

11.7.3 Noncoaching Staff Member with Sport-Specific Responsibilities. A noncoaching staff member with sport-specific responsibilities (e.g., director of operations, administrative assistant) is prohibited from participating in on-court or on-field activities (e.g., assist with drills, throw batting practice, signal plays) and is prohibited from participating with or observing student-

¹² This bylaw became effective beginning with the 2013-14 academic year. Prior to the 2012-13 academic year, the head coach responsibility bylaw was found at 11.1.2.1. The language of Bylaw 11.1.1.1 differs slightly from 11.1.2.1 but does not change the responsibility of head coaches to promote an atmosphere of compliance.

athletes in the staff member's sport who are engaged in nonorganized voluntary athletically related activities (e.g., pick-up games).

11.7.6 Limitations on Number of Coaches and Off-Campus Recruiters. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches (other than graduate assistant coaches per Bylaws 11.01.3 and 11.01.4, student assistant coaches per Bylaw 11.01.5 and volunteer coaches per Bylaw 11.01.6) who may be employed by an institution and who may contact or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus in each sport as follows:

Sport Limit Sport Limit

Baseball..... 3