

## AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

to the

President of University of Louisville

### A. Processing Level of Case.

Based on the information contained within the following allegations, the Complex Case Unit (CCU) believes this case should be reviewed by the Independent Resolution Panel (IRP) pursuant to procedures applicable to a severe breach of conduct (Level I violation).<sup>1</sup>

### B. Allegations.

1. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 10.01.1, 10.1, 10.1-(b), 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(e), 13.8.2 and 16.11.2.1 (2016-17 and 2017-18)]

The CCU alleges that from May through September 2017, the Adidas corporation (Adidas), a representative of the institution's athletics interests, through its employees James Gatto (Gatto), then director of global sports marketing for basketball, and Merl Code (Code), then consultant, made a \$100,000 impermissible recruiting offer and arranged for the provision of a \$25,000 extra benefit to ██████████ of then men's basketball prospective and enrolled student-athlete ██████████. Additionally, Jordan Fair (Fair), then assistant men's basketball coach, was knowingly involved in the provision of and provided between \$11,800 and \$13,500 in impermissible recruiting inducements to Brad Augustine (Augustine), then nonscholastic boys basketball coach/trainer and individual associated with then men's basketball prospective student-athlete ██████████. Kenny Johnson (Johnson), then associate head men's basketball coach, knowingly provided a \$1,300 extra benefit to ██████████. Further, Fair's and Johnson's actions violated the NCAA principles of ethical conduct. Specifically:

- a. Between May 18 and June 1, 2017, Code and Gatto impermissibly offered through Christian Dawkins (Dawkins), an associate of ██████████ and his family, \$100,000 in cash to ██████████ in exchange for ██████████ to enroll at the institution as a men's basketball student-athlete. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1 and 13.2.1.1-(e) (2016-17)]
- b. Between July 7 and August 1, 2017, Code and Gatto, with the assistance of Dawkins, arranged for the provision of an extra benefit in the form of a \$25,000 cash payment to ██████████ following ██████████ enrollment at the institution. [NCAA Bylaw 16.11.2.1 (2016-17 and 2017-18)]

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.7.7.1 of the 2019-20 NCAA Division I Manual, if violations from multiple levels are identified in the notice of allegations, the case shall be processed pursuant to procedures applicable to the most serious violation(s) alleged.

## AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 2

---

- c. On or about July 27, 2017, Fair violated the NCAA principles of ethical conduct when he was knowingly involved in the provision of an impermissible inducement in the form of between \$11,000 and \$12,700 in cash to Augustine with the intent to influence ██████ enrollment at the institution. [NCAA Bylaws 10.01.1, 10.1, 10.1-(b), 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(e) and 13.8.2 (2016-17)]
- d. On or about August 23, 2017, Johnson violated the NCAA principles of ethical conduct when he knowingly provided an extra benefit in the form of a \$1,300 cash payment to ██████ [NCAA Bylaws 10.01.1, 10.1, 10.1-(b) and 16.11.2.1 (2017-18)]
- e. Between September 15 and 26, 2017, Fair, through Johnson, provided an impermissible inducement in the form of \$800 in cash to Augustine as reimbursement for costs associated with ██████ September 2017 unofficial visit to the institution. [NCAA Bylaws 13.2.1, 13.2.1.1-(e) and 13.8.2 (2017-18)]

### **Level of Allegation No. 1:**

The CCU believes the IRP could conclude that Allegation No. 1 is a severe breach of conduct (Level I) because the violations (a) were not isolated or limited; (b) provided or were intended to provide an extensive recruiting, competitive or other advantage; (c) provided or were intended to provide substantial or extensive impermissible benefits; (d) involved third-parties in recruiting violations that institutional officials knew about; (e) involved cash payments intended to secure, and which resulted in, the enrollment of a prospect; (f) were intentional; (g) involved unethical conduct; and (h) seriously undermined or threatened the integrity of the NCAA Collegiate Model. [NCAA Bylaws 19.1.1, 19.1.1-(d), 19.1.1-(f), 19.1.1-(g) and 19.1.1-(h) (2021-22)]

### **Involved Individuals:**

The CCU believes the IRP could enter a show-cause order pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.9.5.4 regarding the following individuals' involvement in Allegation No. 1: Fair and Johnson.

2. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 13.02.5.2 (2015-16); 13.1.6.2.1-(b) (2016-17); and 13.5.3 (2016-17 and 2017-18)]

The CCU alleges that from July 2016 through September 2017, Kenny Johnson (Johnson), then associate head men's basketball coach, and Jordan Fair (Fair), then assistant men's basketball coach, participated in impermissible recruiting activities related to a then men's basketball prospective student-athlete and individuals associated with men's basketball prospective student-athletes. Specifically:

AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 3

---

- a. Between July 19 and 25, 2016, during an evaluation period at an NCAA certified event in Las Vegas, Johnson had impermissible in-person off-campus recruiting contact with then men's basketball prospective student-athlete [REDACTED] [NCAA Bylaw 13.02.5.2 (2015-16)]
- b. Between April 28 and 29, 2017, Johnson had impermissible contact and/or communication with individuals associated with Team United, a nonscholastic boys basketball team comprised of men's basketball prospective student-athletes, while Team United was participating in a three-day NCAA certified nonscholastic boys basketball event (event) in the Indianapolis area. Before the commencement of the event, Johnson contacted and invited an administrator of Team United to a social function (function) hosted by Johnson's friend in the locale of the event. Following the first day of the event, Johnson interacted and communicated with Team United's administrator and coaches at the function. [NCAA Bylaw 13.1.6.2.1-(b) (2016-17)]
- c. During May and September 2017, Johnson and/or Fair provided Christian Dawkins (Dawkins), an associate of [REDACTED] and Brad Augustine (Augustine), then nonscholastic boys basketball coach/trainer and individual associated with then men's basketball prospective student-athlete [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] impermissible transportation while Augustine and Dawkins were in the Louisville, Kentucky area to accompany [REDACTED] respectively, on their unofficial visits to the institution. Specifically:
  - (1) Between May 28 and 30, 2017, Johnson transported Dawkins from the Louisville airport to his hotel, and Fair transported Dawkins from his hotel to the institution for a total distance of approximately 9 miles. [NCAA Bylaw 13.5.3 (2016-17)]
  - (2) Between September 15 and 17, 2017, Fair provided Augustine roundtrip transportation between his hotel and a bar, approximately 15 miles. [NCAA Bylaw 13.5.3 (2017-18)]

**Level of Allegation No. 2:**

The CCU believes the IRP could conclude that Allegation No. 2 is a significant breach of conduct (Level II) because the violations (a) were intentional; (b) were not isolated or limited; (c) involved multiple recruiting violations; (d) provided or were intended to provide more than a minimal recruiting advantage; (e) even if individually Level III, are collectively Level II violations; and (f) compromised the integrity of the NCAA Collegiate Model. [NCAA Bylaw 19.1.2, 19.1.2-(d) and 19.1.2-(g) (2021-22)]

## AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 4

---

### **Involved Individuals:**

The CCU believes the IRP could enter a show-cause order pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.9.5.4 regarding the following individuals' involvement in Allegation No. 2: Fair and Johnson.

#### 3. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaw 11.1.1.1 (2016-17)]

The CCU alleges that from May through August, 2017, Rick Pitino (Pitino), then head men's basketball coach, violated head coach responsibility legislation when he failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance within the men's basketball program. Specifically, the Adidas corporation (Adidas), a representative of the institution's athletics interests, and its employee, James Gatto (Gatto), then director of global sports marketing for basketball, informed Pitino that he would assist in the recruitment of then men's basketball prospective student-athlete [REDACTED] by promoting the men's basketball program to [REDACTED]. Despite [REDACTED] belated interest in the institution, Pitino's knowledge of another institution's alleged cash offer for [REDACTED] commitment and Gatto possessing inside knowledge of the institution's interest in and recruitment of [REDACTED] Pitino failed to conduct any additional inquiry as to Gatto's type or level of assistance, which included a \$100,000 impermissible offer and \$25,000 extra benefit, as detailed in Allegation No.1, and did not report Gatto's offer of assistance to the institution's athletics compliance staff.

### **Level of Allegation No. 3:**

The CCU believes the IRP could conclude that Allegation No. 3 is a significant breach of conduct (Level II) because it is a head coach responsibility violation and compromised the integrity of the NCAA Collegiate Model. [NCAA Bylaw 19.1.2 (2021-22)]

### **Involved Individual:**

The CCU believes the IRP could prescribe head coach restrictions pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.9.5.5 regarding Pitino's involvement in Allegation No. 3.

#### 4. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaw 2.8.1 (2016-17 and 2017-18)]

The CCU alleges that from May through August 2017, the scope and nature of the violations in Allegation Nos. 1-a and 1-b demonstrate that the institution violated the NCAA principle of rules compliance when it failed to adequately monitor its men's basketball program's recruitment of then men's basketball prospective student-athlete [REDACTED] a McDonald's All-American, to ensure compliance with NCAA recruiting legislation. Specifically, despite the men's basketball program's recent

AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 5

---

involvement in an NCAA infractions case involving Level I recruiting and extra benefit violations, the institution failed to adequately monitor or heighten its monitoring of the circumstances surrounding its men's basketball program's sudden and belated recruitment and signing of ██████████ that involved an impermissible offer and eventual extra benefit from representatives of the institution's athletics interests.

**Level of Allegation No. 4:**

The CCU believes the IRP could conclude that Allegation No. 4 is a significant breach of conduct (Level II) because the failure to monitor (a) is presumed Level II, (b) was not substantial or egregious and (c) compromised the integrity of the NCAA Collegiate Model. [NCAA Bylaw 19.1.2 (2021-22)]

**Involved Individual:**

None.

5. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 11.01.7, 11.01.7-(b), 11.01.7-(d), 11.7.3 (2018-19 through 2020-21)]

The CCU alleges that from the 2018-19 season through the 2020-21 season, members of the institution's men's basketball staff violated NCAA Bylaws by allowing graduate assistants, managers and noncoaching staff members with sport-specific responsibilities to participate in impermissible on-court activities with current men's basketball student-athletes. Specifically:

- (a) Graduate assistants and/or managers of the institution's men's basketball staff actively participated on a consistent basis in impermissible on-court activities with current men's basketball student-athletes including but not limited to on-court competitive situations. [NCAA Bylaw 11.01.7, 11.01.7-(b), 11.01.7-(d), 11.7.3 (2018-19 through 2020-21)]
- (b) From June 2020 through the 2020-21 season, the director of player development, a noncoaching staff member with sport-specific responsibilities, participated in impermissible on-court activities with current men's basketball student-athletes including but not limited to on-court competitive situations. [NCAA Bylaw 11.7.3 (2019-20 through 2020-21)]

This allegation serves as part of the basis for the head coach responsibility violation in Allegation No. 7.

## AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 6

---

### **Level of Allegation No. 5:**

The CCU believes the IRP could conclude that Allegation No. 5 is a significant breach of conduct (Level II) because the violations (a) were not isolated or limited, (b) provided or were intended to provide more than a minimal competitive advantage, and (c) were more serious than a Level III violation. [NCAA Bylaw 19.1.2 (2021-22)]

### **Involved Individual:**

None.

6. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaws 13.4.1.9, 13.4.1.9.2, 13.7.3 (2017-18); 13.4.1.5 (2017-18 through 2018-19); 13.4.1.9-(b) (2018-19); 13.7.4 (2018-19 through 2020-21); 13.4.1.6 and 13.4.1.10-(b) (2019-20 through 2020-21); 13.6.7.9 (2017-18 through 2020-21)]

The CCU alleges that from June of 2018 through the 2020-21 season, members of the institution's men's basketball staff violated NCAA Bylaws by producing and showing, playing, or providing personalized recruiting videos and recruiting aids to prospective men's basketball student-athletes containing the names, pictures and/or likenesses of the prospective men's basketball student-athletes. In addition, members of the institution's men's basketball staff created personalized pamphlets and itineraries for prospective men's basketball student-athletes to be used on both official and unofficial visits.

This allegation serves as part of the basis for the head coach responsibility violation in Allegation No. 7.

### **Level of Allegation No. 6:**

The CCU believes the IRP could conclude that Allegation No. 6 is a significant breach of conduct (Level II) because the violations (a) were not isolated or limited, (b) involved multiple recruiting violations, (c) provided or were intended to provide more than a minimal recruiting advantage, and (d) were more serious than a Level III violation. [NCAA Bylaw 19.1.2 (2021-22)]

### **Involved Individual:**

None.

7. [NCAA Division I Manual Bylaw 11.1.1.1 (2017-18 through 2020-21)]

The CCU alleges that from June of 2018 through the 2020-21 season, Chris Mack (Mack), the current head men's basketball coach, is presumed responsible for the violations detailed

## AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 7

---

in Allegation Nos. 5 and 6 and did not rebut the presumption of responsibility. Specifically, Mack did not demonstrate that he promoted an atmosphere for compliance due to his personal involvement in the violations and/or the impermissible conduct being done at his direction.

### **Level of Allegation No. 7:**

The CCU believes the hearing panel of the IRP could conclude that Allegation No. 7 is a significant breach of conduct (Level II) because it is a head coach responsibility violation and compromised the integrity of the NCAA Collegiate Model. [NCAA Bylaw 19.1.2 (2021-22)]

### **Involved Individual:**

The CCU believes the IRP could prescribe head coach restrictions pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.9.5.5 regarding Mack's involvement in Allegation No. 7.

## **C. Potential Aggravating and Mitigating Factors.**

Pursuant to Bylaw 19.7.1, the CCU has identified the following potential aggravating and mitigating factors that the IRP may consider.

### **1. Institution:**

#### **a. Aggravating factors. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3]**

- (1) Multiple Level I and II violations by the institution. [NCAA Bylaws 19.9.3-(a) and (g)]

Allegation No. 1 is a Level I violation and Allegation Nos. 2 through 7 are Level II violations.

- (2) A history of Level I, Level II or major violations by the institution and men's basketball program.<sup>2</sup> [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(b)]

- (a) January 11, 1957: Improper transportation; extra benefits; improper recruiting inducements. Involved sport: men's basketball.

---

<sup>2</sup> The dates of previous Level I, II or major infractions violations and the accompanying descriptions are provided directly from the Legislative Services Database for the Internet (LSDBi).

AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 8

---

- (b) November 20, 1996: Preferential treatment, student-athlete received extensive personal use of automobile and cost for removing stereo system from summer employer; extra benefits, athletics representative provided an automobile, insurance and payment of parking tickets; athletics representative cosigned credit application and provided transportation and meal, improper cash payment to student-athlete by a coach; and impermissible recruiting, improper telephone and in-person recruiting contacts by athletics representative with knowledge of members of the coaching staff; impermissible telephone calls to prospective student-athletes. Involved sport: men's basketball.
- (c) September 22, 1998: Impermissible recruiting, women's volleyball prospective student-athletes provided financial assistance, temporary lodging, automobile transportation, out-of-season practice/tryout for prospective and enrolled student-athletes; Improper financial aid, dormitory housing provided to two prospective student-athletes; extra benefits, student-athletes received automobile transportation and temporary lodging; prospective student-athlete received free dental care; unethical conduct; and institutional control. Secondary violations. [Reflects changes by the Infractions Appeals Committee vacating repeat-violator penalty and changing basketball findings to be secondary rather than major.] Involved sport: men's basketball and women's volleyball.
- (d) June 15, 2017: A former University of Louisville (Louisville) director of basketball operations acted unethically when he committed serious violations by arranging striptease dances and sex acts for prospects, student-athletes and others, and did not cooperate with the investigation. The head men's basketball coach violated NCAA head coach responsibility rules when he did not monitor the activities of his former operations director. Involved sport: men's basketball.
- (3) Violations were premeditated, deliberate or committed after substantial planning. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(f)]

Allegation No. 1 involves cash payments provided to a then men's basketball student-athlete's [REDACTED] and a nonscholastic boys basketball coach after substantial planning by representatives of the institution's athletics interests, an aspiring sports agent and a then men's basketball coach.

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

As alleged in Allegation Nos. 1 and 2, Johnson and Fair, then assistant men's basketball coaches, either participated in, condoned, or negligently disregarded

AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 9

---

violations involving impermissible recruiting inducements and activities. In addition, as alleged in Allegation Nos. 5, 6 and 7, Mack, the current men's basketball head coach, either participated in, condoned, or negligently disregarded the violations involving graduate assistants and others participation in practice as well as the creation and use of personalized recruiting videos and aids.

- (5) One or more violations caused significant ineligibility to a student-athlete. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(i)]

As a result of Allegation No. 1, [REDACTED] was ineligible to compete during the 2017-18 academic year.

- (6) A pattern of noncompliance within the sport program involved. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(k)]

At the time of the violations, the institution was awaiting a decision from the Committee on Infractions and subsequently on probation as a result of the decision, a prior Level I infractions matter involving the men's basketball program.

- (7) Intentional, willful or blatant disregard for the NCAA constitution and bylaws. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(m)]

Allegation No. 1 involves over \$100,000 in an impermissible offer and cash payments arranged or provided by employees of a representative of the institution's athletics interests or assistant men's basketball coaches.

- b. Mitigating factor. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.4]

An established history of self-reporting Level III or secondary violations. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.4-(d)]

The institution reported 89 Level III or secondary violations from 2015 through 2019, approximately 18 violations each year.

**2. Involved Individual [Fair]:**

- a. Aggravating factors. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3]

- (1) Multiple Level I or Level II violations. [NCAA Bylaws 19.9.3-(a) and (g)]

Allegation Nos. 1-c and 1-e and Fair's post-separation allegation for failing to cooperate are Level I, and Allegation No. 2 is Level II.

AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 10

---

(2) Unethical conduct. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(e)]

As detailed in Allegation No. 1-c, Fair violated the NCAA principles of ethical conduct when he was knowingly involved in an impermissible inducement in the form of an \$11,000 to \$12,700 cash payment.

(3) Violations were premeditated, deliberate or committed after substantial planning. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(f)]

Allegation No. 1-c involves a multiple thousand-dollar cash payment provided to a nonscholastic boys basketball coach as part of a larger scheme that included substantial planning by multiple individuals in a Las Vegas hotel room, hundreds of miles away from the institution and the nonscholastic coach's home.

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

As alleged in Allegation Nos. 1 and 2, Fair, then assistant men's basketball coach, either participated in, condoned, or negligently disregarded violations involving impermissible recruiting inducements and activities.

(5) Intentional, willful or blatant disregard for the NCAA constitution and bylaws. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(m)]

As detailed in Allegation No. 1-c, Fair's involvement in an impermissible inducement in the form of an \$11,000 to \$12,700 cash payment was a blatant disregard for the NCAA constitution and bylaws.

b. Mitigating factor. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.4]

The absence of prior conclusions of Level I, Level II or major violations committed by the involved individual. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.4-(h)]

During his approximately 18 months of working in collegiate athletics, there are no prior conclusions that Fair committed Level I, Level II or major violations.

**3. Involved Individual [Johnson]:**

a. Aggravating factors. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3]

(1) Multiple Level I or Level II violations. [NCAA Bylaws 19.9.3-(a) and (g)]

AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 11

---

Allegation No. 1-d and Johnson's post-separation allegation of unethical conduct are Level I, and Allegation No. 2 is Level II.

(2) Unethical conduct. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(e)]

As detailed in Allegation No. 1-d, Johnson violated the NCAA principles of ethical conduct when he knowingly provided or arranged for the provision of an extra benefit and an impermissible inducement in the form of a \$1,300 cash payment.

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

As alleged in Allegation Nos. 1 and 2, Johnson, then assistant men's basketball coach, either participated in, condoned, or negligently disregarded violations involving impermissible recruiting inducements and activities.

(4) Intentional, willful, or blatant disregard for the NCAA constitution and bylaws. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(m)]

As detailed in Allegation No. 1-d, Johnson intentionally provided an extra benefit in the form of a \$1,300 cash payment.

b. Mitigating factor. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.4]

The absence of prior conclusions of Level I, Level II or major violations committed by the involved individual. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.4-(h)]

During his approximately nine years of working in collegiate athletics, there are no prior conclusions that Johnson committed Level I, Level II or major violations.

**4. Involved Individual [Pitino]:**

a. Aggravating factors. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3]

(1) A history of Level I, Level II or major violations by the involved individual. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(b)]

Louisville, June 15, 2017: Pitino violated NCAA head coach responsibility rules when he did not monitor the activities of his former operations director.

(2) Other facts warranting a higher penalty. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3-(o)]

AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 12

---

At the time that Pitino failed to promote compliance in the men's basketball program, as detailed in Allegation No. 3, he was awaiting a decision from the Committee on Infractions and subsequently subject to a show-cause order as a result of the decision, a Level I head coach responsibility infraction.

- b. Mitigating factor. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.4]

None.

**5. Involved Individual [Mack]:**

- a. Aggravating factors. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.3]

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

As alleged in Allegation Nos. 5, 6 and 7, Mack, the current men's basketball head coach, either participated in, condoned, or negligently disregarded violations involving graduate assistants and others participation in practice as well as the creation and use of personalized recruiting videos and aids.

- b. Mitigating factor. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.4]

- (1) The absence of prior Level I, Level II or major violations committed by the involved individual. [NCAA Bylaw 19.9.4-(h)].

During his time working in collegiate athletics, there are no prior conclusions that Mack committed Level I, Level II or major violations.

**D. Hearing Attendance.**

In addition to the involved individuals and institutional representatives as outlined in Bylaw 19.11.5.7.3.2, the IRP may benefit from asking the following individual(s) to attend the hearing pursuant to Bylaw 19.11.5.7.3: None.

**E. Factual Information.**

The attached exhibit details the factual information on which the CCU relies for Allegation Nos. 1 through 7. The CCU incorporates the factual information referenced throughout this document, its exhibits and all other documents in the secure filing system.

## AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 13

---

### **F. Response to Allegations.**

1. Please indicate whether the information contained within these allegations is substantially correct and whether the institution and involved individuals identified in these allegations believe violations of NCAA legislation occurred. Submit materials to support your response.
2. If the institution and involved individuals believe NCAA violations occurred, please indicate whether there is substantial agreement on the level of the violation. Submit materials to support your response.
3. Please indicate whether the factual information is substantially correct and whether the institution and involved individuals have additional pertinent information and/or facts. Submit facts in support of your response.
4. In accordance with Bylaw 19.11.5.8.3.4, the IRP may view the failure by an institution or involved individual to submit a timely response to a notice of allegations as an admission that an alleged violation, for which the party may be subject to penalty pursuant to Bylaw 19.9, occurred.

### **G. Request for Supplemental Information.**

1. Provide mailing and email addresses for all necessary parties to receive communications from the hearing panel related to this matter.
2. Indicate how the violations were discovered.
3. Provide a detailed description of any corrective or punitive actions implemented by the institution as a result of the violations acknowledged in this inquiry. In that regard, explain the reasons the institution believes these actions to be appropriate and identify the violations on which the actions were based. Additionally, indicate the date that any corrective or punitive actions were implemented.
4. Provide a detailed description of all disciplinary actions taken against any current or former athletics department staff members as a result of violations acknowledged in this inquiry. In that regard, explain the reasons the institution believes these actions to be appropriate and identify the violations on which the actions were based. Additionally, indicate the date that any disciplinary actions were taken and submit copies of all correspondence from the institution to each individual describing these disciplinary actions.

## AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 14

---

5. Provide a short summary of every past Level I, Level II or major infractions case involving the institution or individuals named in this notice. In this summary, provide the date of the infractions report(s), a description of the violations found, the individuals involved, and the penalties and corrective actions. Additionally, provide a copy of any major infractions' reports involving the institution or individuals named in this notice that were issued within the last 10 years.
6. Provide a chart depicting the institution's reporting history of Level III and secondary violations for the past five years. In this chart, please indicate for each academic year the number of total Level III and secondary violations reported involving the institution or individuals named in this notice. Also include the applicable bylaws for each violation, and then indicate the number of Level III and secondary violations involving just the sports team(s) named in this notice for the same five-year time period.
7. Provide the institution's overall conference affiliation, as well as the total enrollment on campus and the number of men's and women's sports sponsored.
8. Provide a statement describing the general organization and structure of the institution's intercollegiate athletics department, including the identities of those individuals in the athletics department who were responsible for the supervision of all sport programs during the previous four years.
9. State when the institution has conducted systematic reviews of NCAA and institutional regulations for its athletics department employees. Also, identify the agencies, individuals or committees responsible for these reviews and describe their responsibilities and functions.
10. Provide the following information concerning the sports program(s) identified in this inquiry:
  - The average number of initial and total grants-in-aid awarded during the past four academic years.
  - The number of initial and total grants-in-aid in effect for the current academic year (or upcoming academic year if the regular academic year is not in session) and the number anticipated for the following academic year.
  - The average number of official paid visits provided by the institution to prospective student-athletes during the past four years.
  - Copies of the institution's squad lists for the past four academic years.

AMENDED NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

Case No. 00843

September 30, 2021

Page No. 15

---

- Copies of the institution's media guides, either in hard copy or through electronic links, for the past four academic years.
  - A statement indicating whether the provisions of Bylaws 31.2.2.3 and 31.2.2.4 apply to the institution as a result of the involvement of student-athletes in violations noted in this inquiry.
  - A statement indicating whether the provisions of Bylaw 19.9.7-(g) apply to the institution as a result of the involvement of student-athletes in violations noted in this inquiry.
11. Please submit the three previous fiscal years' total budgets for all involved sport programs. At a minimum, a sport program's total budget shall include: (a) all contractual compensation including salaries, benefits and bonuses paid by the institution or related entities for coaching, operations, administrative and support staff tied to the sport program; (b) all recruiting expenses; (c) all team travel, entertainment and meals; (d) all expenses associated with equipment, uniforms and supplies; (e) game expenses and (f) any guarantees paid associated with the sport program.

Any additional information or comments regarding this case are welcome.

Complex Case Unit  
September 30, 2021