PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL

Indiana University

Response to

the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)

Notice of Allegations

May 8, 2008

Prepared by:

Indiana University and
The Ice Miller Collegiate Sports Practice
One American Square, Suite 3100
Indianapolis, Indiana 46282

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Individuals Referenced Substantively in the Response

DeJuan Blair	Then Prospective Student-Athlete
Wil Buford	Prospective Student-Athlete
Ayodele Coker	Then Prospective Student-Athlete
[redacted]	Men's Basketball Student-Athlete and Then Prospective Student-Athlete
Travis Daugherty	Coach of Elston, Prospective Student-Athlete
Tony Dees	Father and Coach of Gates, Prospective Student-Athlete
Devin Ebanks	Prospective Student-Athlete
Derek Elston	Prospective Student-Athlete
Kenny Frease	Prospective Student-Athlete
Yancy Gates	Prospective Student-Athlete
Jerry Green	Former Director of Basketball Operations
[redacted]	Men's Basketball Student-Athlete
Robbie Hummel	Then Prospective Student-Athlete
Yvonne Jackson	Mother of Ebanks, Prospective Student-Athlete
Phillip Jurick	Prospective Student-Athlete
Erica Mackey	Mother of Mackey, Prospective Student-Athlete
Jonathan "Bud" Mackey	Prospective Student-Athlete
Scott Martin	Then Prospective Student-Athlete
Ray McCallum	Former Assistant Men's Basketball Coach
Demetri McCamey	Then Prospective Student-Athlete
Keith McClure	Coach of Buford, Then Prospective Student-Athlete
Jeff Meyer	Former Assistant Men's Basketball Coach
Marcus Morris	Prospective Student-Athlete
Markieff Morris	Prospective Student-Athlete
Darelle Porter	Influential Person for the Recruitment of Blair, Then Prospective Student-Athlete
Kelvin Sampson	Former Head Men's Basketball Coach
Rob Senderoff	Former Assistant Men's Basketball Coach
[redacted]	Men's Basketball Student-Athlete and Then Prospective Student-Athlete
Brett Thompson	Prospective Student-Athlete
Rob Toth	Coach of Frease, Prospective Student-Athlete
Evan Turner	Then Prospective Student-Athlete

ATTACHMENTS

1. October 3, 2007 report to the Committee on Infractions (see other binder for the Attachments)
2. October 25, 2007 self-report and attachments
3. June 12, 2006 clarification letter from Committee on Infractions
4. June 13, 2006 clarification e-mail and memorandum to the men's basketball staff
5. Sample phone bill showing three-way call notations (3W) adjacent to local calls
6. October 30, 2007 Indiana University press conference transcript
7. Summary of impermissible recruiting calls as requested in subquestions 1-a and 2-a
8. March 13, 2008 e-mail containing the interpretation regarding recruiting calls to twins
9. May, 1, 2006 clarification e-mail to Senderoff, including the phone call restrictions
10. Compliance staff notes from men's basketball recruiting meetings
11. Impermissible three-way call chart
12. August 1, 2006 report to the Committee on Infractions
13. E-mails sent to the men's basketball staff specific to the recruiting sanctions
14. E-mails sent to the men's basketball staff concerning general compliance matters
15. Letters of reprimand sent to the involved men's basketball staff
16. Secondary case precedent
17. Men's basketball staff recruiting phone logs during weeks of impermissible calls
18. Cybersports sample of a report regarding recruiting phone calls
19. 2007 Kentucky boys basketball sweet sixteen bracket
20. Cybersports printout containing March 24, 2007 evaluation of Mackey
21. December 18, 2007 revised secondary report and reinstatement request for Elston
22. October 26, 2007 secondary report and reinstatement request for Elston
23. February 29, 2008 reinstatement decision on Elston
24. May 25, 2006 Infractions report No. 250
25. Summary of secondary violations reported by Indiana University in the last five years
26. Indiana University athletics department organizational chart
27. Squad lists from last four years
28. May 31, 2006 Letter to Committee on Infractions Seeking Clarification about the Sanctions

ATTACHMENTS TO OCTOBER 3 REPORT

A. Compliance Agreement dated April 19, 2006.

B. Revised Compliance Agreement dated June 9, 2006 and e-mail amendment dated May 7, 2007.

C. Signed statements by the three assistant coaches and a signed declaration by Sampson regarding the sanctions.

D. Agendas and miscellaneous materials covered in the weekly compliance meetings.

E. Sample handwritten phone logs from each assistant coach.

F. Sample Cybersports recruiting phone call and other reports.

G. Monthly signed statements from men's basketball coaches regarding the phones used for recruiting purposes.

H. Documentation of the protocol for and sample e-mails concerning the review of phone records.

I. Summary of Sampson's off-campus speaking engagements and samples of the compliance monitoring efforts in this area.

J. Samples of written reminders, clarifications and interpretations regarding NCAA rules.

K. Sample of monthly compliance newsletters and questions of the week.

L. June 13, 2006 e-mail and memorandum clarifying the impermissibility of three-way calls.

M. Summary of three-way calls chart.

N. Summary of known outgoing recruiting three-way calls chart.

O. Summary of impermissible calls for each prospect chart.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
RESPONSE TO THE NCAA
NOTICE OF ALLEGATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

Indiana University ("the University") has carefully reviewed and assessed the February 8, 2008 Notice of Allegations ("Notice") regarding its men's basketball program, former head men's basketball coach Kelvin Sampson ("Sampson"), and former assistant men's basketball coaches Rob Senderoff ("Senderoff") and Jeff Meyer ("Meyer"). Based on the information, including documentary evidence and interview testimony, obtained from the thorough investigations conducted first by the University and then subsequently by the NCAA Enforcement Staff in cooperation with Indiana University, the University is in substantial agreement with the facts set forth in the Notice and concurs violations occurred, as set forth below in the response to each allegation.

The Notice is based on information discovered and self-reported by Indiana University as a result of monitoring by the University's compliance staff and the University's commitment to NCAA compliance, although some new information was developed during the NCAA Enforcement Staff's investigation and the University's continued review of phone records. As soon as the potential violations of the Committee on Infractions' sanctions were discovered, the athletics department began an immediate and thorough review to determine the extent of any issues with the sanctions or NCAA rules violations, which evolved into the investigation detailed below. The University notified the NCAA as soon as issues with the sanctions and violations

were confirmed, submitted two reports to the NCAA based on a conservative approach of counting questionable calls as impermissible, and self-imposed significant sanctions.

Overview of the University's Response to the Allegations

In brief, the violations involved impermissible recruiting calls made by the then men's basketball coaching staff during an approximately one-year period when the men's basketball program was subject to sanctions, imposed by the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions ("the Committee") in Infractions Report No. 250, as a result of violations that occurred when Sampson was the head men's basketball coach at the University of Oklahoma. These phone calls were impermissible because they were contrary to penalties imposed on the University's men's basketball coaching staff in Infractions Report No. 250 and/or NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2.

Allegation No. 1 concerns the phone calls that were contrary to the sanctions. Specifically, the University's response to Allegation No. 1 sets forth the calls that were contrary to Penalty L, which prohibited Sampson from being present when members of his staff made phone calls that related in any way to recruiting. These impermissible recruiting calls involved the use of three-way technology, speakerphone and phone passing to connect Sampson to recruiting calls that also included a then assistant men's basketball coach, most often Senderoff. Allegation No. 1 also includes a number of other phone calls placed by Senderoff (primarily) and Meyer (a limited number) that were contrary to Penalty E or Penalty F, which reduced by half the number of recruiting telephone calls that the University's men's basketball coaching staff could place. These calls were discovered by the University during its investigation, even though the vast majority had not been documented by the coaches or included in the University's

electronic recruiting monitoring system ("Cybersports").[1] Further, many of these calls were placed from the then assistant coaches' home phones even though the coaches reported on monthly forms that they only used their cell or office phones to make recruiting calls.

Allegation No. 2, which was self-reported by the University, concerns phone calls that violated NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 regarding the number of permissible calls that can be placed to prospects (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians). As detailed in the response to this allegation, Indiana University believes this violation should be considered secondary in nature as it was isolated; provided a minimum, if any, recruiting, competitive or other advantage; and did not include any recruiting inducement or extra benefit. Case precedent also supports the classification of this violation as secondary. Further, because the University adopted a conservative approach of counting and reporting potentially questionable calls as improper, the number of calls that clearly violated NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 was actually lower than what is reported below.

Allegation Nos. 3 and 4 regarding the unethical conduct by Sampson and Senderoff, respectively, and for Sampson regarding the responsibilities of a head coach, are the most troubling and were the primary focus of the University's review following the receipt of the Notice. Much of the information forming the basis for these allegations was developed during the interviews conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff. After careful and thorough analysis of the documentary evidence and interview statements, the University determined that it is

[1] Even when some calls were documented, other undocumented calls that were discovered during the investigation then caused some documented calls that had been considered permissible to become impermissible.

reasonable to conclude there is sufficient information and evidence to support the majority of the specific information alleged, as well as the general charges regarding each individual.

Allegation No. 5 is unrelated to the phone calls that form the basis for the other allegations. The first part of the allegation is related to an impermissible recruiting contact by Sampson and Meyer with one prospect, which was self-reported by Indiana University after the NCAA Secondary Enforcement Staff alerted the University to the potential issue. The second part of the allegation addresses the provision of one or two T-shirts and drawstring backpacks to the prospect's coach by Meyer. The University believes these violations should be considered secondary in nature, as set forth below.

It is important to note at the outset of this response that the phone calls that are at the center of this case occurred despite the University's NCAA compliance monitoring and rules education systems, which are discussed more thoroughly below and in the October 3 report to the Committee. **(See Attachment 1 and Attachments D and H of the October 3 report.)** The compliance office regularly cross-referenced cell and office phone bills against handwritten phone logs and information documented in Cybersports that was provided by the coaches to monitor compliance with NCAA rules and the sanctions. The compliance office also checked the phone bills for other recruiting calls that might not have been documented. However, because the then assistant coaches who used their home phones for recruiting calls did not report such use and because they also failed to document all of their recruiting calls, the University was unable to detect the vast majority of the impermissible phone calls. In addition, the investigation revealed that some recruiting numbers were not listed by the coaches as recruiting numbers or

were listed incorrectly. Even though a few of the impermissible calls could possibly have been detected earlier, their discovery would not have prevented the violations that resulted from the failure of the coaching staff to follow the University's procedures for documenting recruiting phone calls. It should also be noted, it would have been impossible for the compliance staff to have discovered the impermissible phone calls that involved speakerphones or phone passing, as these calls would have appeared as permissible calls, either between Senderoff and a prospect or between Senderoff and Sampson. Further, the three-way phone calls that triggered the investigation were difficult to detect as the three-way notation was connected to Sampson's home or cell phone numbers, which appeared as local calls on the assistant coaches' phone bills, and not to the prospects' numbers.

The coaches were aware of the sanctions and of the procedures for monitoring recruiting phone calls. As detailed below, following an initial April 3, 2006 compliance meeting with the new men's basketball coaching staff, weekly compliance meetings with the director of basketball operations and other coaches specifically covered the penalties and included information regarding the use of handwritten phone logs and the recruitment monitoring database ("Cybersports") to monitor phone calls. **(See Attachment 10 for a summary of the information covered during these meetings and Attachment D of the October 3 report for the agendas.)** Indiana University reviewed the details of the penalties at a May 30, 2006 meeting with the men's basketball coaching staff, during which the coaches requested a number of clarifications regarding what would be permissible under some of the sanctions, including questions regarding the permissibility of three-way recruiting calls involving Sampson that

received responses from the compliance staff and the Committee that such calls would not be permissible.

The compliance staff monitored compliance with all of the sanctions, including recruiting phone calls, off-campus recruiting by the assistant coaches and off-campus appearances and speaking engagements by Sampson. The coaches, in fact, complied with the majority of the sanctions. In particular, the investigation and a thorough review of phone records revealed no recruiting phone calls initiated by Sampson during the time period of the sanction prohibiting such calls. Further, Sampson did not engage in off-campus recruiting activities during his one-year sanction, including not making any speeches or presentations or conducting his radio show where prospects might be in attendance.

Review of the Corrective Actions and Self-Imposed Sanctions

Indiana University remains deeply disappointed by these violations and by the fact that they occurred during a time when the men's basketball program should have had a heightened awareness of the need for absolute and total compliance with the spirit and the letter of NCAA rules. Accordingly, when the impermissible phone calls were confirmed, the University determined that significant sanctions were necessary and that these penalties should more than counter the number of phone calls that occurred as well as any positive impact they may have had on the men's basketball program's recruiting efforts. These penalties, which are detailed in **Section D** later in this response, were designed to directly impact the coaches involved as well as the men's basketball program as a whole by limiting permissible recruiting activities, including phone calls.

Since these penalties were imposed in mid-September, additional impermissible calls have been discovered and information has been developed regarding Sampson's and Senderoff's actions. In addition, all members of the University's then men's basketball coaching staff have been replaced. Following the receipt of the Notice, the University thus carefully reassessed the penalties that were initially imposed and determined these penalties were sufficient to respond to the violations that had occurred, even with the new information and violations taken into account. For example, Penalty 2-c, which reduces by half the number of permissible calls to prospects during their senior year of high school, results in a reduction of 700 calling opportunities plus an additional reduction of 350 calls for Sampson and the subsequent head coaches. Similarly, Penalty 2-d, which reduces the number of calls that Sampson (and the University's subsequent head coaches) could make to prospects during their junior year in high school, resulted in a reduction of approximately 885 calling opportunities. In contrast, the total number of impermissible calls that occurred was a fraction of the missed calling opportunities caused by the penalties.

Further, the University left these penalties largely intact despite the complete turnover in the coaching staff. When Senderoff resigned on October 29, 2007, the University transferred his penalty (Penalty 2-a) to another assistant coach. Similarly, when Sampson resigned on February 22, 2008, the subsequent two head coaches operated subject to Penalties 2-c and 2-d. All of the penalties regarding phone calls have remained intact.

In April 2008, the University determined, however, that it was necessary and appropriate to adjust two of its initial self-imposed penalties, which, because of the coaching staff changes,

were going to have far greater detrimental and harmful impacts than were anticipated upon their imposition last fall. Specifically, because the ten off-campus recruiting days allotted to Sampson in self-imposed Penalty 2-f have been used (six by Sampson and four by the interim head coach, Dan Dakich), the University determined that Tom Crean, the current head men's basketball coach, should be allowed 10 off-campus recruiting days through July 31, 2008. Further, because all six of the official visits permitted under self-imposed Penalty 2-g were used by the prior men's basketball coaching staff by the early signing period of November 2007, the University decided to allow the current men's basketball coaching staff to provide two additional official visits for the remainder of the current academic year.[2] It should be noted that these penalties were modified and not withdrawn; rather, penalties in these areas remain. Limiting the current head coach to 10 off-campus recruiting days through July 31, 2008 is still a penalty as the number of days a head coach may recruit off-campus is not normally limited other than the 130 person-day-limit for off-campus recruiting. Further, the modified limit of eight official visits is still below the NCAA limit of 12 and the University's four-year average of 9.25 visits. In addition, the University has added an additional penalty that reduces by two the number of recruiting days in July 2008 – one day during each evaluation segment – where none of the men's basketball coaches will be allowed to recruit off campus.

The University believes that, although these limited adjustments provide necessary relief for the current men's basketball coaching staff, all of whom were completely uninvolved in the violations, they do not alter the strength of the initial penalties in any material way, particularly

[2] This increase from six to eight official visits is consistent with the waiver available under NCAA Bylaw 13.6.2.7 that allows institutions to provide additional official visits after a new head coach is hired if the prior coach has used 75% or more of the permitted official visits.

since the phone call restrictions remain intact. In addition, the four off-campus recruiting days used by the interim head coach had no impact and brought no benefit to the men's basketball program or the University. Further, in large part because the University carefully evaluated the need for these modifications, the men's basketball coaching staff missed 22 days of off-campus recruiting and the head coach was not able to recruit off-campus for 14 permissible recruiting days (i.e., this number does not include dead periods), until April 26, 2008.

Indiana University continues to view this matter very seriously and believes the significant self-imposed sanctions and corrective actions, which are set forth in **Section D** later in this response, remain appropriate and sufficient to respond to the violations that occurred and to send a strong message that complete commitment to NCAA compliance is expected and required of all coaches and staff.

B. SUMMARY OF THE UNIVERSITY'S INVESTIGATION

As detailed below and in Attachment H of the October 3 report, the University conducted regular checks of phone records throughout the year. On July 10, 2007, during the course of the compliance staff's additional year-end review of recruiting logs and phone calls for all sports, the staff noticed that one men's basketball prospective student-athlete ([redacted]) had been called twice in one day. This was immediately brought to the attention of the assistant athletics director for compliance, who instructed the director of compliance to follow-up with specific searches of phone records. Upon further inspection of the phone records, the director of compliance confirmed that on January 29, 2007, there were two calls made by a then assistant men's basketball coach, Rob Senderoff ("Senderoff"), from his cell phone to the prospect on the same day[3] and that both involved a three-way connection to a third phone number that was ultimately determined to be the home number for the then head men's basketball coach, Kelvin Sampson ("Sampson"). The director of compliance then searched the men's basketball coaching staff's cell and office phone records for other three-way calls.[4]

Upon the discovery of the three-way recruiting calls that included Sampson, which were contrary to one of the sanctions as discussed in more detail below, the compliance staff immediately informed the director of athletics and the senior woman administrator, and within 24 hours the faculty athletics representative, the general counsel and president also became involved. The president, faculty athletics representative and other senior officials at the

[3] The first call appeared to be "dropped", resulting in the need for a second call, which is permissible under an NCAA rules interpretation received from the Big Ten Conference. However, per the Committee's sanctions, this call-back was not allowed.

[4] Each of the men's basketball coaches reported in writing on monthly forms that home phones were not used for making recruiting calls. **(See Attachment G of the October 3 report.)**

University received frequent updates throughout the remainder of the investigation, which immediately ensued. The University continued its review and analysis of phone and recruiting records and retained the services of the Ice Miller Collegiate Sports Practice, as outside counsel, for assistance in investigating and determining the full scope of any failure to comply with the Committee's sanctions and/or NCAA rules. On July 16, the first possible opportunity for an in-person meeting, the director of athletics and senior woman administrator met with Sampson and separately with Senderoff, who placed the majority of the three-way calls. On July 20, the University's general counsel, senior woman administrator and outside counsel interviewed these two coaches individually and the only other assistant coach, Ray McCallum ("McCallum"), who had made any three-way calls.[5] The review and analysis of office and cell phone records from May 2006 through June 2007 continued and calls were placed to all ten of the known phone numbers involved in the three-way calls in an attempt to confirm the content and nature of the calls.[6]

[5] Although McCallum placed 11 three-way calls, only four of those calls included Sampson and were thus potentially at issue. Of those four calls, three involved incoming calls from an unknown origin and it could not be determined if the calls involved recruiting (these calls are nonetheless included in the maximum total of impermissible calls set forth below). Neither Sampson nor McCallum recalled these calls. The remaining three-way call involving Sampson, which occurred on May 8, 2007, was not a recruiting call because the involved prospect had enrolled in summer school at the University, which began that day, and thus was no longer considered a prospective student-athlete per NCAA Bylaw 13.02.11-(c). The remaining seven three-way calls placed by McCallum included four calls to his own cell phone (perhaps his voicemail) and three other miscellaneous short calls not involving Sampson.

[6] The University was able to reach only three individuals as many of the numbers had changed or been disconnected, despite repeated attempts (three to five times per number) to reach the remaining numbers. Of the 10 phone numbers called, only three resulted in interviews. The other calls either resulted in voicemail messages that were never returned, or confirmed that phone numbers had been reassigned without forwarding information. Due to the need to handle the investigation in a confidential manner, the University did not contact other NCAA institutions to try to gain access to their student-athletes, other than one university where a student-athlete who had received multiple three-way calls was enrolled. After an initial exchange of voicemails, an interview was not arranged when the departure of that university's athletics director left the university short staffed.

It was determined at that time there were at least some three-way calls contrary to one of the sanctions and that this information should be included in the report the University was scheduled to submit to the Committee by August 31 regarding the monitoring of and compliance with the sanctions. Outside counsel contacted Shep Cooper, Director for the Committees on Infractions, on August 22 to apprise him of these issues and to request additional time to thoroughly review and investigate this matter and to complete the report to the Committee. This request was granted.

Although all of the assistant coaches had reported monthly, in writing, to the University that they only used their cell or office phones for recruiting and Sampson had reported monthly that he had not engaged in any recruiting calls **(see Attachment G of the October 3 report)**, Indiana University requested that Sampson and Senderoff provide their home phone records for the time period of the sanctions to ensure a complete review of all known phones, to confirm no other three-way calls had occurred and to verify their veracity regarding the signed forms. Sampson provided his home phone records shortly thereafter. Outside counsel reviewed the home phone records for Sampson from June 2006[7] through May 2007 and determined there were no three-way or recruiting phone calls during the time period of the sanctions. Outside counsel and the University then conducted follow-up interviews with Sampson and Senderoff[8] on August

[7] Sampson, who was hired by Indiana University on March 29, 2006, did not begin home phone service until June 2006.

[8] An additional interview with McCallum and the review of his home phone records was deemed unnecessary at that time as his involvement in three-way recruiting calls was limited to at most three phone calls involving undetermined incoming phone calls, only one of which occurred after receipt of a June 13, 2006 email and memorandum clarifying the impermissibility of three-way calls **(see Attachment 4, Item No. 8)**. An additional call that occurred on May 8, 2007 and that was initially at issue, was later determined not to be a recruiting call as noted above.

23 to address outstanding issues and to obtain additional information regarding their recollections of the three-way calls.

In early September, after consulting with legal counsel, Senderoff provided his home phone records from June 2006 through July 2007.[9] The review of these records revealed that, although there were no three-way calls, Senderoff had placed a significant number of recruiting calls from his home phone (approximately 75), even though he had not reported the use of this phone to Indiana University on the required monthly forms **(see Attachment G of the October 3 report)** or included these calls from home on the handwritten phone logs and with the required reporting that was entered into the compliance office's electronic recruiting monitoring system ("Cybersports"). Outside counsel documented the calls to known recruiting phone numbers (or numbers very close to recruiting numbers) and the University's compliance staff then cross-referenced these home calls against other recruiting calls (compiled from office and cell phones records) to determine whether any calls were contrary to the sanctions or NCAA rules. In addition, the compliance staff called unknown numbers that were similar to the phone numbers listed for a prospect to determine the identity of the individual called and whether the call was countable and permissible. Consistent with the University's conservative and strict approach in reviewing the records (i.e., assuming any questionable call was problematic), if the individual called could not be identified as permissible, the call was presumed to be impermissible. This review of recruiting calls made from Senderoff's home phone revealed that a number of calls

[9] Senderoff started his employment at Indiana University on April 17, 2006 but did not have a home phone until June 2006.

were contrary to the sanctions and NCAA rules and thus resulted in an expansion of the scope of the investigation.

The University immediately requested and received the home phone records of the two remaining then men's basketball coaches, McCallum and Jeff Meyer ("Meyer"), again despite the fact both coaches had reported on monthly forms that they only used their office or cell phones for recruiting. A review of the records revealed that Meyer placed ten recruiting calls from his home phone, several of which were contrary to the sanctions and one of which was contrary to NCAA rules. McCallum placed one recruiting call from his home phone, which was not contrary to the sanctions or to NCAA rules.

On September 12, outside counsel and the University conducted another interview with Senderoff to discuss the recruiting calls placed from his home phone. A similar interview with Meyer was held on October 1. In total, Sampson was interviewed three times, Senderoff four times and McCallum and Meyer one time each. During each interview, in addition to specific questions regarding the known phone call issues, the coaches were asked open-ended questions, such as whether there were any other impermissible calls or other information to report. The coaches did not report or provide information regarding any other impermissible calls.

After these interviews and the final cross-checking of phone records were completed, the University determined it had obtained information sufficient and complete enough to submit a report to the Committee on October 3, 2007, setting forth the calls discovered that were contrary to the sanctions, as well as outlining its monitoring and education regarding the Committee's

penalties. **(See Attachment 1.)** On October 25, 2007, the University submitted a report to the NCAA Enforcement Staff regarding the phone calls placed by Senderoff and Meyer that were in violation of NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2. **(See Attachment 2.)** On October 29, 2007, Senderoff resigned from his position at the University, effective immediately.

Upon the receipt of the reports, the NCAA Enforcement Staff began its review of the self-reported information. The University fully cooperated with the NCAA throughout its investigation, including providing information and assistance as requested. From late October 2007 through early February 2008, the NCAA Enforcement Staff conducted interviews with various prospects who were the subjects of the impermissible calls, some of whom were enrolled student-athletes at other NCAA institutions, as well as some of the prospects' relatives and coaches. In addition, the NCAA interviewed the four coaches referenced in the reports (Sampson, Senderoff, Meyer and McCallum), as well as the former director of basketball operations, Jerry Green. The University ensured its representatives were available to participate in any interviews where such involvement was permitted by the individuals interviewed.[10] The University participated in approximately 13 interviews with prospects and their relatives and coaches, the interview with the former director of basketball operations, an interview with the assistant director for compliance (Jennifer Brinegar) and follow-up interviews with Sampson, McCallum and Meyer.

[10] Approximately six individuals declined to allow Indiana University to attend the interviews conducted by the NCAA, including five prospects and Senderoff.

During this phase of the investigation, new information surfaced in a number of interviews regarding additional potential impermissible recruiting phone calls with Sampson that were initiated by Senderoff and involved the use of a speakerphone or the passing of a phone. Specific information was also reported regarding the conversations with Sampson and Senderoff during a number of the impermissible phone calls included in the University's October reports.[11] On February 8, 2008, the NCAA issued its Notice of Allegations, which was based on the information self-reported by the University, as well as this new information. On February 15, 2008, the University's president directed the director of athletics to oversee an immediate investigation of the new allegations and to make an assessment as to whether they were credible and accurate. The director of athletics was assisted in his review by the University's general counsel, senior woman administrator, faculty athletics representative and outside counsel. On February 22, 2008, Sampson resigned from his position at the University, effective immediately.

During the assessment of the new allegations, the University evaluated transcript testimony and reviewed phone records and other documentary evidence to determine whether the new information regarding the impermissible phone calls could be supported. The University also continued to review telephone records (cell, home and office) to identify other potentially impermissible calls in response to the new information that was learned during the course of these interviews. As a result of the University's continued review, several additional impermissible phone calls were identified and included in this response. Although some of the

[11] Most of this new information as well as some additional impermissible phone calls were discovered at this time because of the failure of Senderoff and Meyer to record all of their calls and recruiting phone number and/or the failure of Sampson and Senderoff to report the full extent of the impermissible phone calls during their interviews with the University.

numbers initially reported in October have changed, the general scope and extent of the impermissible calls have remained the same.

C. RESPONSE TO ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

1. [NCAA Bylaws 2.8.1, 2.8.3 and 19.01.4, and NCAA Infractions Report No. 250]

It is alleged that from March 29, 2006, through July 31, 2007, Indiana University, Bloomington (Indiana), and members of the men's basketball staff failed to comply with the penalties assessed by the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions in Infractions Report No. 250 when Kelvin Sampson, head men's basketball coach; Jeff Meyer, assistant men's basketball coach; and Rob Senderoff, then assistant men's basketball coach, placed or participated in telephone calls that violated recruiting restrictions imposed on the institution, Sampson and the men's basketball staff as penalty for Sampson's prior involvement in violations of NCAA legislation. Specifically:

a. Sampson and Senderoff engaged in multiple telephone calls that violated a recruiting restriction prohibiting Sampson from being present when members of his staff made telephone calls related in any way to recruiting (Penalty L of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250; as adopted by and transferred to Indiana).

b. Senderoff and Meyer placed approximately 100 telephone calls that violated the following recruiting restrictions:

(1) Telephone calls were reduced from one call per month to one call every other month to prospective student-athletes, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s) on or after June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school (Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250; as adopted by and transferred to Indiana).

(2) Telephone calls were reduced from two calls per week to one call per week to prospective student-athletes, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s) on or after August 1 of their senior year in high school (Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250; as adopted by and transferred to Indiana).

Please indicate whether this information is substantially correct and whether the institution agrees that a violation of NCAA legislation occurred. Submit evidence to support your response.

Overview of the University's Position

The University agrees the information set forth in Allegation No. 1 is substantially correct, the conduct described was contrary to the listed sanctions imposed by the Committee on Infractions, and the University and the named individuals were all obligated to comply with these sanctions. Indiana University understands that the impermissible conduct referred to in this allegation includes: (1) three-way recruiting phone calls (involving three phone lines) that included Sampson; (2) use of a speakerphone or passing of the phone by Senderoff to include Sampson in recruiting calls (involving two phone lines – Senderoff's and a third party's, not Sampson's); and (3) phone calls, primarily by Senderoff but also by Meyer, that exceeded the number of phone calls allowed per prospect during the specified timeframes.

The University does not dispute that the sanctions imposed by the Committee became part of the rules and regulations of the NCAA for Indiana University, as well as its staff and coaches. Therefore, a violation of Constitution 2.8.1 occurred in that, as a result of the failure of the men's basketball staff to abide by the Committee's sanctions, the University did not "comply with all applicable rules and regulations of the Association in the conduct of its intercollegiate athletics programs" as required under the principle of rules compliance. However, the University questions whether there can be violations of NCAA Constitution 2.8.3 and Bylaw 19.01.4, which set forth the fact that an institution and individuals who violate NCAA rules or regulations are subject to disciplinary or corrective actions. Indiana University does not contest the relevance of these bylaws to the circumstances at hand but is not certain that they should be listed as legislation that was violated. Specifically, a failure to comply with penalties does not seem to violate provisions that merely codify the authority of the NCAA to impose disciplinary

measures, rather than explicitly require compliance with penalties. When the University first confirmed the failure by the coaches to fully comply with the Committee's sanctions, it carefully evaluated whether noncompliance with penalties imposed by the Committee on Infractions, without any violation of NCAA bylaws, constituted a stand-alone violation of NCAA legislation. The University was unable to locate any applicable citations in the constitution or bylaws, but now recognizes that the first sentence of Constitution 2.8.1 applies. Understanding that these circumstances present a case of first impression, the University will defer to the judgment of the Committee as to whether noncompliance with some of the sanctions – standing alone – constitutes a violation of NCAA legislation.

Regardless of the outcome of this issue, Indiana University continues to believe that full compliance with sanctions should be an expectation and an obligation of NCAA member institutions, including all staff members and coaches, and that appropriate disciplinary measures, such as the self-imposed sanctions listed in **Section D** later in this response, should be imposed in the event of noncompliance.

Review of the Impermissible Three-Way Phone Calls (Allegation No. 1-a)

The impermissible phone calls generally referenced in Allegation No. 1-a included three-way recruiting calls involving Sampson and primarily Senderoff. These calls were self-reported by Indiana University in an October 3, 2007 report to the Committee on Infractions as being contrary to one of the sanctions imposed on the men's basketball coaching staff. **(See Attachment 1.)** No other three-way phone calls were discovered during the subsequent review of phone records by Indiana University or during the NCAA Enforcement Staff's investigation.

As background, three-way phone calls, which involve connecting three phone lines, are permissible under NCAA rules and University policies, including recruiting calls when multiple coaches are connected on the phone. However, due to Penalty L of Infractions Report No. 250, which prohibited Sampson "from making any phone calls that relate in any way to recruiting or being present when members of his staff make such calls" from May 25, 2006 through May 24, 2007, three-way recruiting calls involving Sampson were not permissible. Of the 27 three-way phone calls that occurred during the period of the sanctions, approximately 10 to 18 involved a then assistant men's basketball coach connecting Sampson into a phone call with a prospective student-athlete or an individual involved in the recruitment of a prospective student-athlete (e.g., relative, coach). **(See Attachment M for a summary of all three-way calls and Attachment N for those known to involve recruiting, both of the October 3 report.)** Indiana University determined these calls were contrary to the intent of Penalty L as well as a June 12, 2006 clarification received from the Committee's staff regarding the impermissibility of three-way calling. **(See Attachment 3, for the letter received from the Committee, and Attachment 4, Item No. 8, for the University's June 13, 2006 communication via email and memorandum providing this clarification to the men's basketball coaching staff.)**

Overview of the Three-Way Calls. Three-way calls occurred when a then assistant coach would either receive an incoming call or make an outgoing call and then connect the call to another number. Sampson did not place any of the three-way phone calls. Two of the three

then assistant men's basketball coaches (Senderoff and Ray McCallum "McCallum"[12]) made three-way calls, some of which were permissible, during the period when Sampson was prohibited from making any recruiting phone calls. All three-way calls placed by the assistant men's basketball coaches[13] were reviewed to determine those that included Sampson and concerned recruiting. Indiana University contacted the phone companies on several occasions in an attempt to identify the phone numbers for the incoming calls, none of which were listed on the phone bills. The phone companies all reported they were unable to provide the phone numbers for the incoming calls. The University therefore focused the review on determining the individuals called during the outgoing calls and, taking a conservative and strict approach, assumed all of the incoming calls were related to recruiting, even though the identities of the callers remained unknown.

During the course of the University's investigation, it became clear that approximately 10 to 18 of the 27 three-way calls placed by the two then assistant coaches included Sampson and were thus contrary to the intent and terms of the sanction prohibiting Sampson from making any recruiting phone calls, and specifically the clarification received from the Committee on Infractions regarding three-way phone calls. **(See Attachment M of the October 3 report for a summary of <u>all</u> three-way calls; and Attachments 3 and 4 for the clarification.)** The lower number (10) represents all of the outgoing calls the assistant coaches placed to known recruiting numbers for prospective student-athletes and counts as one call, on two occasions, two calls (that occurred back-to-back due to a dropped call). **(See Attachment N of the October 3 report for**

[12] McCallum, who was not involved in any other issues or violations, was not tied to any of the known recruiting calls involving Sampson, as set forth below.
[13] The University also reviewed Sampson's phone records and confirmed he did not place any three-way phone calls.

a summary of these recruiting three-way calls.) If these call-backs to the two dropped calls are counted separately, there are 12 known (outgoing) recruiting calls. As noted in Attachment M of the October 3 report, there are six additional three-way calls that included Sampson: five were incoming calls to an assistant coach where the caller could not be identified and one was an outgoing call to an unknown Detroit number.[14] Erring on the side of caution, these six calls have nonetheless been presumed to be recruiting calls for the purpose of analyzing the extent to with which the sanction was not complied and for assessing penalties.

The remaining nine three-way calls listed in Attachment M of the October 3 report were not contrary to Penalty L. One of these calls, placed by McCallum on May 8, 2007 to the coach of a prospective student-athlete, [redacted], was determined not to be a recruiting call because [redacted] was no longer a prospect, per NCAA Bylaw 13.02.11-(c), as he was enrolled in and attending the summer session at Indiana University, which began that day. The remaining eight three-way calls that occurred prior to the end of the sanction on May 24, 2007, did not involve Sampson, including: four occasions when McCallum patched into his own cell phone number for one minute, perhaps to his voicemail or perhaps by mistake; two calls that were unrelated to phone numbers for any prospect or Indiana coach; and the remaining two calls that involved McCallum, Senderoff and a third number.

The known impermissible 10 (or 12) recruiting three-way calls involved a total of six prospects, one of whom matriculated at Indiana University and one who signed with Indiana but

[14] To determine the identify of the individual who uses that number, the compliance staff called the phone number but it had been disconnected and reassigned. After consultation with Senderoff, the University is fairly confident that the phone number was previously used by the AAU coach of a prospective student-athlete from Detroit. The call was therefore likely, and is assumed to be, a recruiting call.

was subsequently released from his National Letter of Intent ("NLI") when Sampson resigned, as follows:

Prospect	Recruiting Class	Institution Attending	Number of Three-Way Calls
DeJuan Blair	2007	Pittsburgh	4 (or 5)
Wil Buford	2008	Signed with Ohio State	1
Ayodele Coker	2007	St. John's	1
Devin Ebanks	2008	Signed with Indiana (released from his NLI)	1
Yancy Gates	2008	Signed with Cincinnati	1
[redacted]	2007	Indiana	2 (or 3)

Senderoff initiated all 10 (or 12) of these known recruiting calls. Of the remaining six potentially impermissible three-way calls, all of which were unidentifiable numbers, three involved Senderoff and three involved McCallum.

These three-way calls were not noticed during the compliance staff's regular and usual monitoring of phone calls during the course of the academic year for several reasons. Both manual and computerized searches, which were conducted by the compliance staff, targeted the declared recruiting phone numbers being called, as reported by the coaches and inputted into Cybersports, and the frequency of calls to these numbers, not other columns or information on the phone bills. In addition, because the three-way code that appeared on the bill was always on the same line as a local number on the phone bill (e.g., Sampson's cell or home number), it was not detected in analyzing the calls to the declared recruiting numbers. **(See Attachment 5 for a sample phone-bill page showing a three-way call.)**

Further, since the coaches had requested and received a clear interpretation from the Committee on Infractions in June 2006 that three-way calling with Sampson would not be permissible, three-way calls should not have been an issue. Following a May 30, 2006 meeting between the compliance staff, other athletics administrators and the men's basketball coaching staff to discuss the sanctions from Infractions Report No. 250, the University sought clarification from the Committee on Infractions regarding a number of questions about the application of the sanctions imposed on Sampson and the University's basketball program. **(See Attachment 28 for the May 31, 2006 letter from the University to the Committee.)** Specific to three-way recruiting phone calls, a member of the coaching staff asked whether an assistant coach could place a recruiting call and then add Sampson into the call by three-way technology. The compliance staff responded that this would not be permissible. The coaches did not challenge or questions this interpretation of outgoing three-way calls, thereby indicating that they understood that these calls were impermissible. The coaches then asked whether Sampson could be added by three-way technology to an incoming recruiting call to an assistant coach, since Sampson could receive recruiting calls directly. The coaches were informed by the compliance staff that this was also likely to be impermissible and that, pending clarification from the Committee, such inclusion of Sampson should not occur. A response from the Committee on Infractions regarding several questions from the May 30 meeting, including the three-way question, was received on June 12, 2006. **(See Attachment 3.)** The next day, on June 13, the compliance staff communicated the Committee's clear responses to the men's basketball coaching staff via email and a written memorandum. **(See Attachment 4, Item No. 8.)** In the memorandum provided to the men's basketball staff, Item No. 8 specifically addressed three-way calling as follows:

> If an AAU or HS coach calls one of the IU assistant coaches and then adds a prospect in on a 3-way call, can the assistant coach add in Coach Sampson at that time (since the original call was initiated by the AAU or HS coach and not by anyone at IU)? *No.*

Indiana University believes that this information clearly set forth that connecting Sampson into a recruiting call via a three-way call was not permissible for any of the 10 to 18 three-way recruiting phone calls. Although the scenario presented in the memorandum does not address the exact circumstances that occurred here, it should have been readily apparent that, as this memorandum addressed a more passive circumstance (i.e., a coach receiving a call and having a prospect added in), the more direct action of connecting Sampson on an outgoing recruiting call would also be impermissible, whether or not the assistant coach was an active participant on the call. In addition, the coaches were told in the May 30 meeting that outgoing three-way recruiting calls involving Sampson were impermissible. Further, Sampson readily admitted in his interviews that he knew that he could not participate in a three-way phone call with an assistant coach and, in his November 23, 2007 interview, conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by the University, even stated that he would have hung up had he realized Senderoff was on the phone.

Explanation Regarding Why the Impermissible Three-Way Recruiting Calls Occurred. According to Sampson, the three-way calls primarily occurred when there had been a dropped call involving Sampson, whereas Senderoff explained the calls generally occurred when a prospect (or other individual) informed Senderoff that they were frustrated in their inability to

contact Sampson or that they urgently needed to speak with him.[15] McCallum did not recall making any three-way calls and was thus unable to provide any additional information regarding the calls. Sampson generally did not recall the specifics of most of the calls or their origin and consistently denied knowing that Senderoff or any other coach had initiated a three-way recruiting call. However, in his August 23 interview with the University, Sampson remembered one call involving DeJuan Blair ("Blair") and stated that, although not 100% certain, he thought Senderoff had initiated the call.[16] Sampson also stated in an October 30 telephonic press conference, when Indiana University released the October 25 report that had been submitted to the NCAA, that "[o]ther than one call, I was not aware that it was a three way call". **(See Attachment 6 for a transcript of the press conference at p. 2.)** In contrast, in his November 13, 2007 interview conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff, Sampson said he did not know Senderoff had initiated any of the three-way calls, including the one to Blair. Sampson readily admitted in his various interviews, as set forth in more detail below, that he knew he could not participate in three-way recruiting calls with one of his assistant coaches. In his interviews, Sampson also stated he did not instruct the assistant coaches to connect him into the calls. Senderoff recalled the circumstances of approximately half of the outgoing calls. **Attachment N** of the October 3 report provides some context for those calls the coaches recalled, based on the information reported to Indiana University prior to submission of the October 3 report. None of the coaches disputed the fact that the three-way calls had occurred. Further, none of the coaches

[15] It should be noted that these were the general explanations offered by Sampson and Senderoff during their July and August interviews and that these explanations were somewhat different than those offered during the interviews conducted by the NCAA.

[16] Sampson's recollection of this call, although better than his memory of other calls, was not very detailed. Generally, regarding the October 4, 2006 call with Blair, Sampson recalled that Blair was scheduled to come to Bloomington for a campus visit and then decided not to visit. Sampson remembered Senderoff explaining that Blair needed to speak with him. He noted that Blair never visited and Sampson never met him.

were able to recall the details of the six incoming calls, which is understandable as the callers are unknown.

There were some unique circumstances that made Sampson's ability to receive phone calls from prospects or other individuals more difficult than it might otherwise have been. All of the calls at issue here occurred in the evening and Sampson understandably did not generally provide his home phone number to prospective student-athletes, who may not receive a scholarship offer or choose to attend Indiana University, or the individuals involved in their recruitment. Instead he provided his cell phone number. Unfortunately, his cell phone reception was at best spotty at his home, which was located several miles outside Bloomington, resulting in many dropped calls. Thus, Sampson reported there were occasions when he would be on an incoming call with a prospect or an individual involved in the prospect's recruitment and the call would drop and he would have to wait for the individual to call him back, per the sanctions.[17] He stated if the individual did not call back, he would text message[18] or call one of the assistant coaches to have them remind the individual that he could not call them back, but they could call him. It was reported that some of the three-way calls at issue here may have occurred as a result of a dropped (permissible) call and then Senderoff helped the prospect or other individual reach Sampson by impermissibly patching Sampson into a call, even though the prospect or individual could have called back Sampson directly.

[17] However, the prospects interviewed by the NCAA Enforcement Staff did not report such dropped calls.
[18] NCAA rules at this time allowed text messaging.

In other instances, Senderoff reported he would receive calls from prospects or other individuals who had trouble reaching Sampson (e.g., his cell phone would go straight to voicemail), at least in part due to the poor cell phone reception at his home. And it was reported there were occasions when a prospect or other individual stressed the urgency of the need to speak with Sampson immediately (e.g., to confirm Indiana's continued interest in the prospect or an upcoming visit to campus). However, the prospects interviewed by the NCAA Enforcement Staff did not offer these details to explain the circumstances of the three-way calls.

According to Senderoff, who placed all 10 (or 12) of the impermissible recruiting calls involving an initial outgoing call from him to a prospect or other individual, he would dial the first number, sometimes engage in a conversation with the individual, place that call on hold, dial Sampson's number and immediately while Sampson's phone was still ringing connect the other call. Senderoff stated he then remained on the line and did not say anything. By using this technique, Senderoff reported that he intended to serve only as an "operator" by allowing two people to have a conversation. Despite the interpretation from the compliance staff at the May 30 meeting regarding the impermissibility of outgoing three-way calls and the clarification obtained from the Committee regarding incoming three-way calls, Senderoff stated that he thought this was a "gray" area in regards to the Committee's sanction and that he never intended to put Sampson or the University in a difficult position.[19] Similarly, he also noted that he used poor judgment and that he probably should have asked the compliance staff to clarify whether his actions were permissible (even though the compliance staff had clearly given the instructions

[19] The compliance staff believed the coaches clearly understood upon leaving the meeting that outgoing three-way calls including Sampson were impermissible as there were no challenges or follow-up questions once this interpretation was given. Rather, the coaches turned their line of questioning to incoming three-way calls.

that these calls were impermissible, as noted above). Senderoff further stated he did not think the spirit of the rule was broken because the individuals were trying to reach Sampson and wanted to speak with him.

Information Developed by The University Regarding Whether Three-Way Conversations Occurred. Neither Senderoff nor Sampson recalled Senderoff ever participating in a three-way conversation or introducing the third party to Sampson. However, two of the three individuals that Indiana University successfully contacted during its investigation from the list of known phone numbers used in the three-way recruiting calls, reported that Senderoff was involved in the respective conversations, as well as Sampson. The University was careful to clarify with both individuals – [redacted] (currently enrolled at Indiana University) and Yvonne Jackson ("Jackson"), the mother of Devin Ebanks ("Ebanks"), (who committed to Indiana University, but was subsequently released from his NLI) – that both coaches participated in the conversation at the same time as opposed to Senderoff speaking only during the first portion of the call and then remaining silent when Sampson was on the phone. In their separate conversations with the University, the two individuals were specific in their recollections that Senderoff was involved during the whole call and it should be noted that these calls were relatively close to their conversations with the University in the late summer of 2007. [redacted] received three-way calls, on January 29 and April 5, 2007; and Jackson received one call on May 1, 2007. The third individual contacted, Keith McClure ("McClure"), a coach for Wil Buford ("Buford") did not recall ever speaking to Sampson.

As noted in its October 3, 2007 report to the Committee, Indiana University determined the connection of Sampson into a recruiting call via a three-way call was contrary to the intent of the sanction each and every time such a three-way call occurred regardless of whether the assistant coach ever spoke while Sampson was on the call. The University thus counted all 18 possible recruiting calls in assessing the appropriate sanctions, as set forth in **Section D** later in this response, without regard to whether an assistant coach spoke on the call with Sampson and the third party.

Additional Information Regarding Three-Way Conversations Developed During NCAA Enforcement Staff Interviews. When the NCAA Enforcement Staff conducted a November 27, 2007 interview with Jackson,[20] she corroborated the information reported to the University that both Senderoff and Sampson had spoken with her during the same discussion, provided details about their conversation and stated she was very certain that a three-way conversation had occurred. The University has thus concluded there is no reason to question Jackson's clear recollections that a three-way conversation occurred during the three-way call.

In a January 29, 2008 interview conducted by the NCAA and attended by the University, [redacted] did not recall a three-way conversation occurring with Sampson and Senderoff and did not recall the information he had previously provided to Indiana University regarding a three-way conversation occurring during a three-way call. However, as noted below in the response to another aspect of Allegation No. 1-a and to Allegation 3-a-(1), [redacted] reported in his January

[20] Because the NCAA Enforcement Staff conducted this interview immediately upon making phone contact with Jackson, the University was not able to participate.

29 interview several instances when Senderoff would put Sampson on the phone. Because the University was not aware of these other calls and only knew about the three-way call when it questioned [redacted] in the summer of 2007, his responses were interpreted as being related to the three-way call, when he might have been recalling the speakerphone conversation referenced below. Thus, the University believes that it is reasonable to conclude that [redacted] was consistent in his recollection regarding a three-way conversation occurring, but that three-way conversation apparently did not occur during a three-way call.

In other interviews, the NCAA Enforcement Staff conducted after the submission of the University's October 2007 reports to the NCAA, several prospects recalled communications that would have alerted Sampson to the fact that Senderoff was on the line during the three-way calls. Specifically, although appearing confused as to the details and circumstances of specific telephone calls with Sampson and/or Senderoff, Blair reported during his December 11, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff,[21] that he recalled speaking with both coaches on a phone call after he decided he did not want to take an official visit to Indiana University. He thought the call occurred on the day his official visit was supposed to have occurred. When questioned as to how certain he was that both coaches were involved on the phone at the same time, whether it was by speakerphone or a three-way call, Blair responded "They were both on the phone. I'm, they was both on the phone talking, we all was on the phone." **(December 11, 2007 Blair Interview Transcript at p. 14, located on NCAA custodial website.)** He recalls speaking with Sampson about rescheduling his visit for mid-October. This call corresponds to the October 4, 2006 four-minute three-way call to Blair on the date of his home visit with

[21] Blair declined to allow the University to participate.

Senderoff and shortly before his scheduled official visit. Blair's description of the substance of the conversation is consistent with the explanations provided by Sampson and Senderoff that Blair had cancelled his scheduled visit.[22]

Further, another prospective student-athlete, Buford, remembered one phone call on his AAU coach's (McClure's) phone when they were driving in the car and when he spoke to the University's head and one assistant coach at the same time. Buford stated in his January 28, 2008 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff and in which the University participated, that the Indiana University assistant coach, whose name he did not recall, had called his coach's phone and then the assistant coach called the head coach (Sampson) and let him know that Buford was on the phone. Buford reported that he was "positive" the assistant coach had introduced him to the head coach but noted he did not remember the two coaches saying anything else to each other. Based on cell phone records, Indiana University believes that this call is consistent with the June 19, 2006 ten-minute three-way call Senderoff placed to McClure's phone. In addition, Buford's recollection provides context for why McClure did not recall speaking to Sampson when he spoke with the University in August 2007.[23]

In addition, in a December 19, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff,[24] Demetri McCamey ("McCamey"), a current student-athlete at the University of Illinois, reported

[22] It should also be noted, as detailed below in the next section and in the response to Allegation 3-a, Blair also recalled another conversation with Senderoff and Sampson on October 4 during his home visit by Senderoff. This phone call, which occurred via the speaker feature on Senderoff's cell phone, was admitted to by Senderoff. Although it is possible that Blair has confused the two calls, the University has determined it is reasonable to conclude that during at least one of the calls, if not both, Sampson and Senderoff were on the phone with Blair in the same conversation.

[23] McClure was the only one of the three individuals with whom the University was able to speak who did not recall talking to Sampson as part of a three-way call.

[24] McCamey declined to allow the University to participate in this interview.

that he placed a call to Senderoff and that Senderoff then patched Sampson into a three-way call and introduced him by stating something to the effect of "we've got Demetri on the phone" or "here is Demetri". **(December 19, 2007 McCamey Interview Transcript at pp. 8 and 13, located on NCAA custodial website.)** In an April 28, 2008 follow-up phone call with counsel for Sampson, the NCAA Enforcement Staff and counsel for the University, McCamey confirmed his recollection and clarified some of the details of the call. Although some information reported by McCamey could be interpreted as not completely consistent with other information, on balance, the University believes it is possible this call is one of the six so-far unidentified three-way incoming calls and, if so, it was likely to have been the May 31, 2006 seven-minute incoming call. **(See Attachment M of the October 3 report.)** Regardless of whether this call is tied to McCamey, the University has consistently assumed it to be a recruiting call and thus counted the call as impermissible.

Review of the Impermissible Use of a Speakerphone or Phone Passing (Allegation No. 1-a)

Information regarding the involvement of Sampson in recruiting calls initiated by Senderoff, which were not three-way calls, was first reported during a December 7, 2007 interview with Ayodele Coker ("Coker") conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by Indiana University. When Coker was questioned about his recollection of any phone calls with Senderoff where he also spoke with Sampson (in an attempt to garner more information regarding the circumstances of the October 4, 2006 three-way call identified in the phone records), Coker described an occasion when Senderoff visited him at his high school,

called Sampson on his (Senderoff's) cell phone, and handed the phone to Coker so he could speak to Sampson.

This information, which was revealed during one of the early NCAA interviews, presented a new line of inquiry for the subsequent interviews. Following this interview, several other individuals reported information regarding other (not three-way technology) recruiting phone calls involving both Sampson and Senderoff that were contrary to Penalty L of Infractions Report No. 250.[25] Several current and former prospects, and in one instance the mother of a prospect, reported that Sampson participated in recruiting calls initiated by Senderoff. Some ([redacted], Marcus Morris, Kenny Frease) recalled speaking with Sampson on a phone call after first having spoken with Senderoff during the same call. These instances were described as involving the use of a speakerphone or the passing of a phone from Senderoff to Sampson, who appeared to be in the same location. Others (Ayodele Coker, [redacted], Erica Mackey – mother of Jonathan "Bud" Mackey, and Blair) described occasions where Senderoff would be present with them, would use his cell phone to speak with Sampson and would then hand them the phone or use his cell phone's speaker function so they could talk to Sampson.

Following the receipt of the Notice of Allegations, Indiana University carefully reviewed the facts and circumstances of the information reported during each interview and then assessed whether these recollections could be confirmed with actual phone records or events where possible. The University's analysis regarding these calls is set forth in more detail in the

[25] The University notes that open-ended questions during the University's interviews did not prompt either Sampson or Senderoff to report information regarding these calls or conversations, even though Senderoff in a later interview recalled at least one of these calls.

response to Allegation Nos. 3-a-(1), (2), (3) and (4), and 4-a-(1), (2), (3) and (4) below, which relate to the conduct of Sampson and Senderoff. As a result of this analysis, the University determined that, although some information is more conclusive and credible than other, it is reasonable to conclude most if not all of these calls occurred, particularly given that some of the information was in fact corroborated. Moreover, the University gave consideration to the fact that testimony was received from several different, unrelated individuals who in separate interviews provided information and slightly differing accounts of similar incidents involving Senderoff initiating a recruiting call that Sampson joined. It seems unlikely all of these individuals would have fabricated or misremembered the circumstances of these phone calls, particularly since they would have had no reason to know such calls were the subject of the investigation as media accounts had focused on the three-way phone calls.

In general, the individuals reported the following:

- [redacted] reported in his January 29, 2008 interview conducted by the NCAA and attended by the University that on several (more than five) occasions, Senderoff would call him, tell him to hold on and then Senderoff would say Coach is right here and Sampson would be on the phone. [redacted] recalled at least one time where both Senderoff and Sampson were talking by speakerphone and Senderoff stated that he (Senderoff) was on speakerphone. [redacted] also remembered that on two occasions when Senderoff was visiting him, Senderoff called Sampson and [redacted] then spoke to Sampson on Senderoff's cell phone.
- Marcus Morris ("Morris") reported in his January 23, 2008 interview conducted by the NCAA and attended by the University that sometimes (approximately two

or three times) when Senderoff called, Sampson was in the room with Senderoff and that he spoke to both coaches on the same call.

- Kenny Frease ("Frease") reported in his January 14, 2008 interview conducted by the NCAA and attended by the University that on at least two occasions, Senderoff called his high school coach and then had Sampson speak to Frease, who assumed Senderoff had just handed the phone to Sampson. This information was corroborated by Frease's coach who also participated in the interview and in a follow-up interview on April 16, 2008.
- Coker recalled in his December 7, 2007 interview conducted by the NCAA and attended by the University that when Senderoff was visiting his high school, Senderoff called Sampson and handed Coker his phone so that Coker could speak with Sampson.
- Erica Mackey ("Erica") the mother of Jonathan "Bud" Mackey, in a February 2, 2008 interview conducted by the NCAA described with particularity the circumstances of two phone calls when she talked with Sampson with the assistance of Senderoff. One of these calls was substantiated by phone records and other information. Regarding this call, Erica stated that it occurred after Bud's team won the state championship, and she ran into Senderoff in the arena. Erica recalled that Senderoff was already on the phone as he approached her, that he handed her his cell phone and that Sampson was on the phone.
- Blair stated in his December 11, 2007 interview conducted by the NCAA that during Senderoff's home visit, Senderoff called Sampson and used his cell phone's speakerphone function so Blair's family (including his mother, father,

grandmother, sister and brother) could ask Sampson questions. Senderoff also recalled the circumstances of this phone call.

In his January 31, 2008 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff, Senderoff reported for the first time that he recalled calling Sampson during his home visit with Blair's family and then placing his cell phone on speakerphone so the family could ask Sampson some questions. He also stated that he might have done that with Coker, although he thought Coker's coach had called Sampson in that instance, and that it was possible the same thing had happened with [redacted] as well. Senderoff indicated he did not think these calls were impermissible. In his January 29, 2008 interview, Sampson stated he did not recall talking to any prospect via such methods.

These phone calls were not detectable by a review of phone records, which would only have revealed calls between Senderoff and Sampson or calls between Senderoff and prospects that at face value would have appeared permissible. As a result, these calls were not known to Indiana University prior to the December 7, 2007 interview with Coker and were not included in the October 3 or 25 reports submitted to the NCAA. Thus, following the discovery of these additional calls that were contrary to the sanctions, the University evaluated the penalties self-imposed in October to determine if any adjustments were warranted. In light of the fact that the University had decided to impose significant sanctions that more than compensated for the number of impermissible phone calls and any recruiting advantage that may have been gained, Indiana University determined these calls did not warrant the imposition of additional penalties. Further, since the University now has a new coaching staff that was not involved in any way with

these phone calls (or the other allegations) and since this staff already has to serve the remainder of the self-imposed penalties, the University continues to believe additional penalties are unnecessary.

Review of the Impermissible Phone Calls that Exceed the Sanction Limits (Allegation No. 1-b)

As noted above, during the review of the three-way calls in the summer of 2007, the University requested and received the home phone records of Sampson and Senderoff, even though there had been no information indicating the coaches were using their home phones. In addition, all of the coaches had reported on monthly forms that they did not use their home phones for recruiting. **(See Attachment G of the October 3 report.)** The University requested these home phone records to determine whether three-way calls had been placed from the home phones, to ensure the most complete review possible and to test the veracity of the coaches. Sampson's home phone records did not contain any recruiting (or three-way) calls during the time period of the sanctions. Senderoff's home phone records revealed a significant number of recruiting calls (approximately 75), none of which had been reported to the compliance office and a number of which were, or caused other phone calls to be, contrary to the sanctions. The home phone records of the two other men's basketball coaches, McCallum and Meyer, were immediately requested and reviewed for recruiting calls. Meyer placed ten recruiting calls from his home phone, three of which were contrary to the sanctions, and one of which was contrary to the sanctions and to NCAA rules. McCallum had one recruiting call from his home phone, which did not result in any issues with the sanctions or NCAA rules.

The University determined that these calls raised issues under revised Penalties E and F of Infractions Report No. 250, which are summarized as follows:

E. Reduced the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school through July 31 of the prospect's junior year in high school from one call per month to one call every other month concluding July 31, 2007.

F. Reduced the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after August 1 of the prospect's senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week concluding July 31, 2007.

Overview of Impermissible Calls. During its investigation, the University incorporated the recruiting calls made from the home phones of the three then assistant coaches into spread sheets, organized by prospective student-athlete, that included the other recruiting calls from cell and office phones. Indiana University carefully analyzed these calls to identify any issues with the sanctions or NCAA rules. Taking a conservative and strict approach that counted any potentially impermissible call, the University determined if an impermissible call occurred, it then rendered the ensuing calls impermissible until the requisite break (one month for juniors or one call per week for seniors) had occurred. Thus, a number of previously permissible calls were determined not to be permissible. For example, if there had previously been permissible phone calls in April and June to a junior prospect but it was then discovered that a coach had placed a call from his home phone to that prospect in May, the May and June calls were counted as impermissible, as well as any other calls that occurred until there was a month without a countable call. It should be noted, consistent with NCAA rules, only calls to the prospects or their relatives were counted in the impermissible calls as calls to coaches and other individuals did not fall within Penalties E and F. Further, unsuccessful attempts to reach a prospect or relative prior to a permissible call were not counted; however, once a permissible call with a

prospect or relative had occurred, any subsequent attempts to reach that prospect or a relative in the relevant time period were counted as improper even if no contact was made. Following its conservative and strict approach, the University also counted questionable calls as impermissible (e.g., a call to an unknown number in the area code of a prospect, which was made around the time of another call to that prospect's listed numbers). Thus, the total number of impermissible phone calls is the maximum number of potentially impermissible calls and the actual number of impermissible calls may in fact be lower.

The majority of the calls made from the then assistant coaches' home phones were permissible under NCAA rules. However, it was determined that a significant number of calls were contrary to, or resulted in other calls being contrary to, Sanctions E and F. Sometimes the calls made from the home phones were contrary to the sanctions or NCAA rules; sometimes they caused other, previously permissible, calls to become impermissible. **Attachment 7** contains charts summarizing the impermissible calls for each prospect in alphabetical order. Question marks ("?") indicate a few unresolved issues, which were either irrelevant to the determination of whether the call was permissible or which triggered the call to be assumed impermissible.

Following the submission of the October 3 report to the Committee on Infractions, the University discovered a few inaccuracies that do not alter the overall substance of the information reported. Some of this information was corrected for the October 25 report submitted to the NCAA Enforcement Staff but Indiana University noticed a few other corrections as a result of the University's continued review of phone records. The information and data reported in this Response reflect the most current and accurate information. **(Please see**

the response to subquestions 1-b and 2-b below for a summary of the information that has been added or modified.)

The phone calls made primarily by Senderoff, and to some degree by Meyer[26], from their home phones resulted in a total of 128 phone calls that were contrary to the sanctions or NCAA rules. Of these calls, 126 were contrary to the sanctions and 42 violated NCAA rules regarding phone calls (two involved only NCAA violations and were not contrary to the sanctions[27]). One hundred and eleven (111) of the phone calls were made to junior prospects contrary to Sanction E and 15 of the calls were made to senior prospects contrary to Sanction F. The following chart summarizes the impermissible calls that occurred by coach:

Coach	Total Impermissible Calls	Contrary to Sanctions	NCAA Violations
Senderoff	112	110	36
Meyer	10	10	6
Sampson[28]	2	2	0
Undetermined	4	4	0
Total	**128**	**126**	**42**

The following chart summarizes this information for each prospect:

[26] As discussed in more detail in the response to Allegation No. 2, the University does not believe that Meyer should be named in any finding made by the Committee or in any individual records file ("pink file") maintained at the NCAA office. Meyer's involvement – 10 impermissible calls, most of which have extenuating circumstances – does not seem to rise to the level of a stand-alone major violation, even though the University agrees that Meyer should have reported and documented all of his recruiting calls. It should also be noted that the University is not contesting that these impermissible calls occurred or that the University should be held accountable for the calls.

[27] These two calls related to Yancy Gates, whose father is his AAU coach and assistant high school coach. The calls occurred prior to the first permissible phone call date (June 15 of his sophomore year). According to Senderoff, the calls in question were with the father, but recruiting was discussed. Thus, consistent with its conservative approach, the University determined these calls to be contrary to NCAA rules.

[28] Sampson's two phone calls did not occur during the period when he was precluded him from making any recruiting phone calls. The calls were placed from his cell phone, not his home phone.

Prospective Student-Athlete	Coach	Total Impermissible Calls	Contrary to Sanctions	NCAA Violations
Yancy Gates	Senderoff	11	9	2
DeJuan Blair	Senderoff	9	9	2
	Sampson	1	1	0
Demetri McCamey	Senderoff	8	8	3
Marcus and Markieff Morris[29]	Senderoff	24	24	1
Evan Turner	Senderoff	1	1	1
Kenny Frease[30]	Senderoff	10	10	0
Phillip Jurick	Senderoff	8	8	3
Jonathon "Bud" Mackey	Senderoff	31	31	22
	Sampson[31]	1	1	0
	Undetermined	2	2	0
[redacted]	Meyer	2	2	0
Scott Martin	Meyer	2	2	1
Ayodele Coker[32]	Senderoff	8	8	2

[29] The number of impermissible calls listed for Marcus and Markieff Morris, who are twins, may be greater than the actual number. As both prospects were recruited by the University, counting the calls and determining the impermissible calls was more complex than with the other prospects. Under NCAA rules, the limits on the number of phone calls apply to each brother individually and allow coaches to call each brother during the same time period. However, several of the calls were to the twins' mother and Senderoff did not record whether the call concerned one or both brothers. The University, consistent with its conservative and strict approach to err on the side of caution, determined that each call with the mother thus counted as a countable call for both brothers. As a result of this approach, there was a multiplier effect on the number of impermissible calls due to the phone calls to the mother. Specifically, a permissible call to the mother in April was counted for both Marcus and Markieff, thereby rendering all attempted or actual calls in May to be impermissible under the sanctions, even though Senderoff was under the impression that at least some of the calls were permissible because there were two prospects in the family. Calls in June and July also then became impermissible as there was no required month off for either brother. It should be noted that the NCAA Enforcement Staff contacted the NCAA Membership Services Staff for an interpretation on how to count these calls and the response received confirmed the University's general approach. **(See Attachment 8 for March 13, 2008 email forwarding NCAA interpretation.)**

[30] The calls for Kenny Frease were counted as impermissible because a June 17, 2006 call lasted four minutes and was thus considered a (permissible) countable recruiting call, even though the recruiting-tracking system (Cybersports) indicated that only a message was left. This determination then caused calls in the subsequent months to become impermissible under Sanction E. The University determined it would err on the side of caution by presuming the June 17 call to be a countable recruiting call, even though it is possible for cell phone records to indicate a four-minute call when only a message had been left (because cell phone companies begin timing calls while the phone is dialing and round-up to the next minute, the duration of a cell phone call quickly adds up).

[31] Due to the failure of Senderoff to record in Cybersports calls made from his home phone, Sampson believed he had a recruiting call opportunity.

[32] These calls were identified after a December 7, 2007 interview with Coker where he reported that his uncle received recruiting calls from Senderoff. When the University realized in the preparation of this response, that the number Coker provided for his uncle had not been listed by the coaches as a recruiting number and thus had not been searched during the investigation, the University reviewed Senderoff's phone records and recently identified eight additional calls contrary to the sanctions, two of which were also in violation of Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2. The University reported these calls to the NCAA Enforcement Staff and accepts responsibility for them but notes that, due to the timing of their discovery, Senderoff has not had an opportunity to review or respond to the information.

Prospective Student-Athlete	Coach	Total Impermissible Calls	Contrary to Sanctions	NCAA Violations
Brett Thompson	Senderoff	2	2	0
	Undetermined	2	2	0
Robbie Hummel[33]	Meyer	6	6	5

As demonstrated in the chart below, most of the calls that were contrary to the sanctions were only one or two minutes in duration[34] and almost 80% were ten minutes or less:

Length of Call Contrary to Sanctions	Number of Calls	Percentage of Calls
Total Calls	126	100%
1 or 2 minutes	75	59%
3-10 minutes	24	19%
11-20 minutes	15	12%
Over 20 minutes	5	4%
Undetermined	7	6%

There are two additional phone calls that were contrary to the sanctions reducing the number of calls for the men's basketball staff. These calls were related to the three-way calls discussed above and not to the recruiting calls made from home phones. (**See Attachments M and N of the October 3 report and Attachment 11 regarding the three-way calls.)** Specifically, the return call to [redacted] on January 29, 2007 was not permissible according to an interpretation received from the Committee that did not allow the men's basketball coaches to return any dropped countable calls. In addition, the May 1, 2007 phone call to Jackson, the

[33] All six of these calls were recorded in Cybersports as "left message". However, because the University determined during the investigation that a four-minute call on June 29, 2006, was a countable call because it exceeded three minutes even though it was also listed as "left message", the University considered these six calls impermissible, five of which also violated Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2.

[34] These one or two minute phone calls were counted as impermissible calls because they occurred after a permissible call had occurred during the relevant time period. Nonetheless, it is worth noting, particularly given the fact that cell phone carriers begin timing the call while the phone is ringing and only report calls in whole minutes, it is likely that only a message was left and no conversation occurred during these calls.

mother of Ebanks, resulted in three phone calls to Ebanks or his relatives, one each in April, May and June, contrary to Sanction E.

Explanation Regarding Why the Impermissible Calls Occurred. The University's September 12, 2007 interview with Senderoff primarily concerned his unreported use of his home phone for recruiting phone calls. In that interview and in his November 16, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff, Senderoff did not deny the calls occurred but was unable to offer much of an explanation as to why he neither reported the use of his home phone for recruiting nor the actual recruiting calls he made from his home. He explained that when he reported information regarding his recruiting calls to be included in the compliance office's call-tracking system "Cybersports", he would scroll down the list of calls he made from his cell phone and list those related to recruiting. Senderoff used his cell phone for the vast majority of his recruiting calls. He made approximately 1300 calls from his cell phone each month and, in comparison, rarely used his home phone. Even though the phone log sheets included a column for the "phone number called from" **(see Attachment 17),** Senderoff reported he forgot to include the calls from his home phone since he submitted this information while in the office. Senderoff further stated that when submitting his monthly forms indicating the phones he used for recruiting, he forgot to include his home phone. (**See Attachment G of the October 3 report for the forms completed by Senderoff.)** He admitted this practice was sloppy and/or careless and he had obviously done a bad job in not logging all of his calls. In his November 16, 2007 interview with the NCAA, Senderoff provided some context for some of the impermissible calls, some of which Indiana University had previously taken into consideration and noted in

several footnotes to its October 3 and 25 reports. Senderoff also indicated he was disputing approximately five of the calls Indiana University had reported.

During his October 1, 2007 interview with the University, Meyer reported he primarily used his cell phone for recruiting calls and only occasionally made recruiting calls from his office or home phones. He stated he did not list his home phone on the monthly forms reporting the phones he used for recruiting purposes because he did not yet have a home phone when he initially completed the form the first few months of his employment. When asked why he did not include his home phone on later forms, Meyer stated he thought the forms were only a formality and thus did not change what he previously reported. He noted he had not realized at the time the importance of the monthly forms. **(See Attachment G of the October 3 report for the forms completed by Meyer.)** Meyer reported he initially tracked all of his recruiting calls in a notebook before submitting the information for inclusion in Cybersports. However, as he started to make more phone calls while traveling, he stopped recording the information in a notebook and relied on the call log in his cell phone to report his recruiting phone calls for monitoring purposes. Meyer also noted he used Vonage for his home phone and did not receive any details regarding his outgoing calls until the University requested his records during the course of this investigation. In his November 13 interview conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by the University, Meyer reported information consistent with his prior interview and provided additional context for some of the impermissible calls.

Some of the impermissible calls summarized above and detailed in **Attachment 7** did not result from the home phone calls. The vast majority of these calls were not discovered

previously because they or other calls were not reported in Cybersports. In a few instances (three calls and a few voice "message calls" left for Robbie Hummel), the impermissible calls and the calls that triggered these few calls to be impermissible were documented in Cybersports but the academic year review of the recruiting and phone records did not identify these calls as problematic. Thus, issues regarding these calls were first identified when thousands of phone calls from actual phone records were reviewed and cross-checked several times during this investigation.

It should also be noted that some of the issues with the sanctions occurred during the transition period prior to the release of the Committee's report in May 2006. Although Indiana University had adopted as its own the sanctions imposed by the University of Oklahoma, the assistant coaches stated that they were not aware there were recruiting phone call sanctions in effect prior to the Committee's report. Senderoff and Meyer that recalled Sampson was limited in his off-campus recruiting but neither remembered being restricted in their phone calls during the time prior to the issuance of the Committee's report. Thus, they made phone calls in April and May 2006 without regard to Sanctions E and F, which reduced the frequency of permissible recruiting phone calls. Nonetheless, on May 1, 2006, at least Senderoff was informed by email of the phone call sanctions. **(See Attachment 9 for an email exchange between the assistant director of athletics for compliance and Senderoff.)** Further, during a May 4, 2006 meeting with the compliance staff, the assistant coaches, the director of basketball operations and other members of the men's basketball staff were provided training on the use of Cybersports for recording and monitoring recruiting phone calls.

Indiana University is troubled by the disregard for University policies and procedures that is reflected by these impermissible calls, particularly as the assistant coaches' failure to notify the compliance office about the use of their home phones for recruiting calls and their failure to report the calls made from home prevented the compliance office from effectively monitoring these calls and identifying these issues earlier. These failures regarding the use of the home phone are even more disturbing because the director of basketball operations (Jerry Green) was specifically told on May 25, 2006, in response to a question he raised, that all records – for home, office or cell – would be required if the phone was used for recruiting. **(See Attachment 10 for the compliance staff's notes from the May 25, 2006 meeting with Green.)** As with other compliance information communicated to Green, this information was expected to be shared with the coaches. It should also be noted that, even though the recruiting phone logs included a column for recording the phone from which each call was made, the coaches did not list their home phones (or the calls made from home) when they completed the logs. **(See Attachment 17.)** The compliance office's ability to monitor recruiting calls was further hampered by the incomplete records submitted by the coaches for entry into Cybersports. The University's investigation revealed that the coaches were not documenting all of their calls, including some made on their cell phones as well as those from their home phones, and that these undocumented calls were then not entered into Cybersports. In addition, at least one phone number called by Senderoff but not reported to the University as a recruiting number – for the uncle of Coker – was identified during the investigation, and other phone numbers had not been correctly inputted into Cybersports by the men's basketball staff. Accordingly, the University imposed sanctions, as set forth below, that include reductions in the number of permissible calls by approximately seven to ten times the number of impermissible calls that occurred.

Also, please provide the following:

a. A chart outlining each impermissible call that includes the (1) identity of the person who placed the call; (2) identity of the prospective student-athlete, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s) telephoned; (3) date, time and duration of the call; and (4) reason the call is impermissible.

See **Attachment 11** for the impermissible three-way call chart.

See **Attachment 7** for the chart outlining the other impermissible recruiting calls.

b. A copy of the institution's report to the Committee on Infractions, dated October 3, 2007, including all attachments thereto. Please identify any information that has been added or amended since the submission of the October 3 report.

See **Attachment 1** for the October 3, 2007 report and the bound volume of its attachments (A-O).

As a result of the continued review of issues related to the impermissible phone calls, the University discovered a few inaccuracies that do not alter the overall context or substance of the information reported. Thus, included in this response are 17 additional phone calls contrary to sanctions E or F and seven additional calls that violated NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2, as compared to the information reported October 3. These numbers also account for calls incorrectly listed as contrary to the sanctions or NCAA rules in the October 3 report.

Following is a summary of these modifications, which are included in the information and attachments presented in this response:

- Due to a typo in Attachment O of the October 3 report, prospective student-athlete DeJuan Blair was mistakenly listed as a member of the class of 2008 when he is a member of the class of 2007. As a result, all 11 of the calls regarding him were counted as junior calls when in fact two calls occurred when he was a senior.

- Three calls (April 8, April 16 and July 17) to prospective student-athlete Jonathon "Bud" Mackey ("Mackey") were mistakenly counted as NCAA violations and listed as such in Attachment O. Per NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2, the coaching staff could call Mackey once a month. As the April 8 call was the first call to Mackey for the month and as it was only two minutes long, it should have been considered a noncountable and permissible call. The April 16 call was thus the permissible call for the month of April under NCAA rules. The July 17 call was the first call of the month of July to Mackey and was thus also permissible under NCAA rules. [Note: The University still

considers these three calls to be contrary to the sanction restricting phone calls to juniors to every other month because other calls to Mackey occurred in March, May, and June.]

- In reviewing the number of phone calls Senderoff made from home it was noticed that calls to an unidentified number had not been included in the October reports and a subsequent call to this number confirmed that it belonged to the mother of prospective student-athlete Phillip Jurick ("Jurick"). Accordingly, there were three additional calls regarding Jurick that were contrary to the sanctions and that violated NCAA rules.

- In reviewing phone records regarding Robbie Hummel prior to the NCAA Enforcement Staff's interview with him, it was noticed that, although all of his calls in Cybersports were recorded as "left message", several of those calls were three or more minutes in duration. As a result of the University's decision to count any call three minutes or greater as a countable call – even if it was recorded as a message – six impermissible calls were identified, five of which were NCAA violations.

- A typo in Attachment O regarding Kenny Frease ("Frease") incorrectly listed as September 5 a phone call that occurred on October 11. [Note: There were no other changes to the information reported regarding Frease.]

- Following further review of phone calls made to Marcus and Markeiff Morris, it was noticed that, due to the University's conservative approach of counting any phone call to the mother as a call for both brothers, two additional impermissible calls to the mother had occurred on October 6 and 13, 2006 each for two minutes.

- Eight additional impermissible calls for Ayodele Coker ("Coker") were discovered after Coker confirmed during his December 7, 2007 interview that Senderoff had called his uncle. Coker provided that phone number, which had not been previously reported by the coaches as a recruiting number. Two of those eight calls were also NCAA violations.

- Impermissible three-way phone calls to DeJuan Blair and Coker on October 4, 2006 had been incorrectly also included as impermissible calls under Penalty F and listed in Attachment O. Because these calls occurred on the date of an off-campus contact, they did not exceed the impermissible calls to the prospects, although they remain contrary to Penalty L as three-way recruiting calls involving Sampson.

c. A copy of the institution's report to the Committee on Infractions, dated August 1, 2006, which detailed the institution's monitoring of and rules-education sessions for Sampson and his staff, and included

documentation of Indiana's compliance with all penalties adopted by and transferred to the institution.

See **Attachment 12.**

d. Copies of any written or electronic correspondence with the men's basketball staff concerning compliance with the Committee on Infractions' recruiting restrictions that were not included in the institution's previous reports to the Committee on Infractions.

See Attachment 13 for e-mail correspondence specifically related to the compliance and monitoring of the recruiting sanctions from NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.

See Attachment 14 for a sample of e-mail correspondence generally related to rules compliance.

e. A statement indicating the reason the impermissible telephone calls were made in light of the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions' prohibition of such conduct.

See the response to the Allegation above.

f. A detailed description and explanation of all disciplinary actions taken against members of the men's basketball staff based on their involvement in or knowledge of violations of Committee on Infractions' restrictions, as determined by the institution and as set forth in this allegation. In that regard, please provide an explanation as to the reasons the institution believes these actions were appropriate, indicate the dates that any disciplinary actions were taken and submit copies of all correspondence from the institution to members of the men's basketball staff describing the disciplinary actions taken.

See **Attachment 15** for letters of reprimand for Meyer and Sampson and for a letter for McCallum's personnel file. [A letter of reprimand was being drafted for Senderoff at the time of his resignation on October 29, 2007.]

See **Section D** later in this response for the corrective actions and penalties self-imposed by the University and see the response to the Allegation above.

2. [NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2]

It was reported that from May 7, 2006, through July 17, 2007,[35] Jeff Meyer, assistant men's basketball coach, and Rob Senderoff, then assistant men's basketball coach, placed at least 25 impermissible telephone calls to multiple prospective student-athletes, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s). Specifically, it was reported that:

a. From May 31, 2006, through June 7, 2006, Senderoff placed two impermissible telephone calls to prospective student-athlete Yancey Gates, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s), prior to June 15 of his sophomore year in high school.

b. Senderoff made the following impermissible telephone calls after he had already made a permissible call to that individual during that month (one call per month permitted on or after June 15 of a prospective student-athlete's sophomore year in high school, through July 31 of his junior year in high school):

(1) On May 11, 2006, Senderoff placed an impermissible call to then prospective student-athlete Evan Turner, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s).

(2) During May 2006, Senderoff placed three impermissible calls to then prospective student-athlete Demetri McCamey, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s).

(3) On June 29, 2006, Senderoff placed an impermissible call to prospective student-athlete Markieff Morris, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s).

(4) During July 2006, Senderoff placed two impermissible calls to then prospective student-athlete DeJuan Blair, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s).

(5) From March 1 through July 17, 2007, Senderoff placed 22 impermissible calls to prospective student-athlete Jonathan "Bud" Mackey, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s).

[35] It is the University's understanding the NCAA Enforcement Staff intends to amend the allegation to change the ending date to June 27, 2007 in this stem paragraph and in paragraph 2-b-(5). The University concurs this revised date is accurate.

(6) From March 26 through April 15, 2007, Senderoff placed three impermissible calls to prospective student-athlete Philip Jurick, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s).

c. Meyer made the following impermissible telephone calls after he had already made a permissible call to that individual during that month (one call per month permitted on or after June 15 of a prospective student-athlete's sophomore year in high school, through July 31 of his junior year in high school):

(1) On July 18, 2006, Meyer placed an impermissible call to then prospective student-athlete Scott Martin, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s).

(2) From June 29 through July 17, 2006, Meyer placed six[36] impermissible calls to then prospective student-athlete Robbie Hummel, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s).

Please indicate whether this information is substantially correct and whether the institution agrees that a violation of NCAA legislation occurred. If the institution agrees that a violation of NCAA legislation occurred, please indicate whether the institution believes the violation to be a major or secondary violation. Submit evidence to support your response.

Overview of the University's Position

The University agrees the information set forth in Allegation No. 2 is substantially correct and a violation of NCAA legislation has occurred. For the reasons set forth below and in the October 25 report to the NCAA, the University believes this violation should be considered secondary in nature pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.02.2.1 in that it was isolated; provided at most a minimum, if any recruiting, competitive or other advantage; and did not include any recruiting

[36] It is the University's understanding that the NCAA Enforcement Staff intends to amend the allegation to change the number of impermissible calls from six to five. The University concurs that this revised number is accurate.

inducement or extra benefit. In addition, there is case precedent to support finding this violation to be secondary.[37]

The NCAA Notice of Allegations indicates there were at least 25 impermissible telephone calls to multiple prospective student-athletes. As a result of the ongoing review of phone call records in this matter, the University initially reported in the October 3 report to the Committee that there were 35 calls in violation of NCAA rules, then revised that number to 32 in the October 25 report to the NCAA Enforcement Staff, and is now reporting that there were 42 impermissible calls. These numbers have changed in large part because as new information was reported by the prospects, the University received information not previously available and thus reviewed phone records with a different perspective that sometimes triggered new analysis. For example, following the December 7, 2007 interview with Coker, the University reviewed phone records for calls to his uncle at a phone number provided by Coker that had not been previously checked because the coaches had not reported it as a recruiting number and had not included the phone number in Cybersports. As a result, two additional calls were identified as contrary to NCAA rules.[38] Further, in conducting its investigation in the summer and fall of 2007, the University was mindful of the balance between submitting the report to the Committee that had been due on August 31, 2007 as close as possible to that date even though an extension of the deadline had been granted, while still ensuring a thorough and accurate review of information. It should be noted that as the University identified the additional calls, it notified the Enforcement Staff when the impermissibility of these calls was confirmed. Further, in determining that there

[37] As detailed below, in the event the Committee determines this violation to be major, the University wishes to note it does not believe that Meyer should be named individually or have an individual records file ("pink file") maintained in the NCAA office as a result of his limited involvement in this violation.
[38] These two calls also were contrary to Penalty E. Six other calls were contrary to Penalty F.

were 42 impermissible calls under NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2, the University erred on the side of caution and continued to count potentially questionable calls as improper. As detailed below, the number of calls that were clearly in violation of NCAA rules is actually lower than the 42 reported by the University.

Discussion

The University incorporates all of the relevant information included in the response to Allegation No. 1.

Summary of the Impermissible Calls. To determine which of the calls that were contrary to the Committee's penalties also violated NCAA rules and whether any other calls violated NCAA rules, the University analyzed spreadsheets that incorporated for each prospective student-athlete the recruiting calls made from the home phones of the three assistant coaches with the other recruiting calls made from men's basketball coaching staff's cell and office phones. The University in conjunction with Ice Miller carefully reviewed these calls to identify any calls that might be contrary to NCAA rules.

As noted above in the response to Allegation No. 1 and consistent with NCAA rules, only calls to the prospects or their relatives were counted in the impermissible calls, as calls to coaches and other individuals are not considered countable calls. Further, unsuccessful attempts to reach a prospect or relative prior to a permissible call were not counted; however, once a permissible call with a prospect or relative had occurred, any subsequent attempts to reach that prospect or a relative in the relevant time period were counted as improper even if no contact

was made. Following its conservative and strict approach, the University also counted questionable calls as impermissible (e.g., a call to an unknown number in the area code of a prospect, which was made around the time of another call to that prospect's listed numbers). In addition, on a number of occasions, the University counted as countable a call marked as a message because the time for the call was three minutes or greater.

Thus, the total number of impermissible phone calls reported below appears to be the maximum number of potentially impermissible calls and the actual number of impermissible calls may in fact be lower. **Attachment 7** contains charts outlining the impermissible calls by prospect, with the calls violating NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 shaded in gray.

The following chart summarizes the total number of calls and their durations.

Length of Call Contrary to NCAA Rules	**Number of Calls**	**Percentage of Calls**
Total Calls	42	100%
1 or 2 minutes	24	57%
3-10 minutes	12	29%
11-20 minutes	5	12%
Over 20 minutes	0	0%
Unknown	1	2%

Of the 42 calls reported as an NCAA violation, 24 were only one or two minutes in duration and there is a good chance no conversation occurred. It is thus apparent that at most 18 phone calls resulted in a conversation of three or more minutes. The following chart summarizes this information for each prospect:

Prospective Student-Athlete	Coach	Total NCAA Violations	3 Minutes or Longer
Yancy Gates	Senderoff	2	0
DeJuan Blair	Senderoff	2	0
Demetri McCamey	Senderoff	3	1
Marcus and Markieff Morris	Senderoff	1	1
Evan Turner	Senderoff	1	1
Phillip Jurick	Senderoff	3	1
Jonathon "Bud" Mackey	Senderoff	22	9
Scott Martin	Meyer	1	1
Ayodele Coker[39]	Senderoff	2	1
Robbie Hummel	Meyer	5	3

There are circumstances attached to the phone calls for three of the prospects – Yancy Gates ("Gates"), Robbie Hummel ("Hummel") and DeJuan Blair ("Blair") – that should be considered as the University's decision to count questionable calls as impermissible caused at least eight calls to be reported as contrary to NCAA rules when it is possible that no violation occurred. Specifically, two calls to Gates (for 31 seconds and two minutes, respectively) were reported as impermissible even though the calls were under three minutes and were to his father who is also his AAU coach and assistant high school coach, Tony Dees ("Dees"), and thus the calls could have been considered permissible. **(See Attachment 7, p. 4.)** These two calls are unique as they are the only phone calls that occurred prior to the first permissible calling date (June 15 after a prospect's sophomore year in high school) and they are the only phone calls that resulted in an NCAA violation without also being contrary to the Committee's sanctions. The University reported them as a violation because Senderoff, in his September 12, 2007 interview with the University, stated recruiting was discussed. Subsequently, Senderoff explained to the University in informal discussions that he said recruiting was discussed because he had discussed

[39] See the discussion above and in footnote 32 regarding the discovery of these two calls involving Coker.

more than one prospect on the father's team, not just Gates, similar to his conversations with other fathers who also were coaches and in contrast to conversations with fathers who were not coaches. The University carefully considered Senderoff's position on this issue prior to the submission of the October reports to the NCAA and ultimately determined it should err on the side of caution and report the two phone calls as a potential violation since Senderoff had stated recruiting was discussed.[40] During his November 16, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff, Senderoff explained he thought he could generally discuss recruiting with Dees as a coach. It should be noted that in a January 9, 2008 interview of Gates and Dees conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by the University, Dees stated he did not recall Senderoff discussing any other player besides Gates, although Senderoff did inquire as to when open gyms would be occurring. Nonetheless, the University would have no objection if the Committee determines there is insufficient information to determine that one or both of these two calls were impermissible.

In addition, as noted on Page 4 of Attachment 7, a four-minute (permissible) call to Hummel on June 17, 2006, which was recorded in Cybersports with a notation that a message was left, was considered a countable call under the University's stringent methodology of counting any call three minutes or longer even if only a message was left, despite the fact it is possible that no recruiting conversation occurred. As a result of this methodology regarding "message calls", at least four calls to Hummel were considered to be impermissible under NCAA rules that might actually have been permissible. One other "message call" to Hummel was eight

[40] A 34-second call on May 19, 2006 from Sampson's office to Dees' home was not deemed to be a violation because there was no information reported that recruiting was discussed and it is likely that, at most, only a message was left, given the short duration of the call.

minutes in duration and the University believes, given the length of the call, it is more likely than not that a recruiting call occurred, although it is feasible there was no such recruiting conversation.[41] Without these four (or five) calls, there would only be two (or one) call contrary to NCAA rules involving Meyer.

Similarly, due to this "message call" methodology, the University reported two other phone calls as impermissible, each lasting two minutes. These calls were placed by Senderoff to Blair on July 19 and 22, 2006 **(see Attachment 7, p. 1)** and were determined to be impermissible because a three-minute call earlier that month on July 18 was considered a countable call, even though a notation in Cybersports indicated only a message had been left. Although the calls on the 19th and 22nd could be considered permissible since they were only two minutes in duration and would have been permissible attempts if the initial three-minute call had been classified as a noncountable message, the University included the two subsequent calls in the reported violation consistent with its conservative approach of counting questionable calls as impermissible.

Explanation Regarding Why the Violation Is Secondary in Nature. The University, with the assistance of its outside counsel, concluded when it submitted the October 25, 2007 report that this violation was secondary in nature because it was isolated; provided at most a minimum, if any, recruiting, competitive or other advantage; and did not include any recruiting inducement or extra benefit. In addition, case precedent supported classifying the violation as secondary.

[41] This call was placed from Meyer's cell phone to Hummel's cell phone and it should be noted that cell phone companies begin timing a call as soon as it is dialed and round up to the next minute to determine the duration of the call, and that voicemail messages can be lengthy, potentially resulting in message calls that exceed the length of a typical message call.

It is understood that multiple secondary violations can be considered a major violation. However, the Notice classified this allegation as a stand-alone major violation. Such a finding would not be appropriate in this case for the reasons discussed below and based on case precedent where multiple incidents of similar violations were classified as secondary in nature. Specific to recruiting, Case Nos. 33572, 32041, 30418 and 30669 concerned repeated violations involving several prospects and were determined to be secondary in nature. **(See Attachment 16.)** Three of these cases involved repeated impermissible phone calls, 57 in Case No. 33572 (to 48 prospects), 24 in Case No. 32041 and 28 in No. 30418, and the other case (No. 30669) involved 57 prospects.[42] The University also has analyzed the recent Committee on Infractions decision regarding Texas Christian University ("Texas Christian") in which the Committee noted in the introduction of the report that:

> Whether viewed as a continuation of a major violation that began in 2002 or standing alone, the [more than 20] impermissible calls after September 22, 2005, are a major violation that occurred within five years of the start of the penalties in Case No. M240. (February 28, 2008 Texas Christian University Public Infractions Report, Page No. 2.)

Recognizing the Committee may have deemed that 20 impermissible phone calls could constitute a major violation in that case, the University seriously reevaluated its determination that the violation at issue here should be classified as secondary. However, the University ultimately

[42] See also Case Nos. 32391 and 27263 for two additional cases classified as secondary despite numerous violations that occurred over several years.

concluded, due to the factors detailed below and the existing secondary case precedent, this violation should be considered secondary in nature.[43]

The calls in this case were isolated as they involved only one sport and one bylaw. Moreover, the vast majority of the calls in this case (22) were between one coach and one prospect (Mackey) during a four-month period (from March through June 2007) and were not designed to solicit a commitment from the prospective student-athlete to attend Indiana University.[44] Of the remaining 20 calls to nine other prospects, only nine calls presumably resulted in a recruiting conversation of three minutes or longer.

The majority of phone calls at issue here were of limited duration, resulting in little, if any substantive conversation. Even though 42 calls were placed, it is probable that at most only 18 resulted in actual conversations. Almost 60% (24) of the phone calls lasted only one or two minutes, 86% (36) were ten minutes or less and there were no calls exceeding twenty minutes. The one or two minute phone calls were counted as impermissible calls because they were placed after a permissible call had occurred during the relevant time period. Nonetheless, it is worth noting, particularly given the fact that cell phone carriers begin timing the call while the phone is ringing and only report calls in whole minutes (rounded up), it is likely that at most a message was left and no conversation occurred during these one or two minute calls.

[43] The University also notes, although it is not privy to the details and context of the phone calls in the Texas Christian case and thus is unable to determine if as many were for such a short period of time (i.e., less than three minutes), the phone calls that comprised the University's violation are distinguishable from those in the Texas Christian case. For example, Texas Christian involved two bylaws, versus one in this case, and more calls to 24 prospects.

[44] The prospect had orally committed to the University in the fall of 2006. Senderoff reported the calls occurred because the prospect was not doing well in school and the prospective student-athlete's mother asked him to encourage the prospect with his academics.

As noted above, over half (22) of the phone calls were to one prospective student-athlete, who the University ceased recruiting in September 2007. Further, of the 22 calls to this prospect, 13 were less than three minutes in duration and likely resulted in no discussion. In addition, none of the involved prospects committed to or are attending Indiana University. There was thus no recruiting advantage gained from these violations. Moreover, during the NCAA Enforcement Staff's interviews, none of the prospects, their parents or their coaches reported anything unusual or excessive about the recruiting calls from the University's men's basketball staff as compared to the coaches from other universities.

The University identified and self-reported all 42 phone calls discussed in this response and these calls likely constitute the maximum possible number of violations. Indiana University believes its conservative approach of reporting questionable calls in all likelihood has inflated the number of calls reported as violations. Therefore, the context of these calls should be evaluated rather than only the number of calls reported. For example, every apparently impermissible one or two minute call (24 calls) was counted as impermissible, even though it was likely no substantive conversation had occurred. In addition, as noted above, two calls to the father (Dees) of a prospect (Gates) were presumed to be impermissible because Senderoff reported recruiting was discussed during calls with the father, even though the calls could have

been considered permissible because the father is also a high school and AAU coach.[45] Although it appears that no substantive conversation occurred during these two calls, which were 31 seconds and at most two minutes in duration, the University reported these calls as part of the violation consistent with its approach of counting as impermissible questionable calls. Also as noted above, the University's "message call" methodology resulted in a total of six or seven otherwise permissible calls to Hummel and Blair being considered impermissible. Further, the impermissible call reported regarding Marcus and Markieff Morris was a violation only because the University adopted a very conservative approach in counting any call to the mother as a call to both brothers, even though only one prospect might have been discussed in any individual call. Thus, the University could have reasonably reported significantly fewer violations.

Explanation Regarding Why the Impermissible Calls Occurred. The explanations provided by Senderoff and Meyer regarding the use of their home phones for recruiting phone calls and their failure to document all recruiting phone calls, as set forth above in the response to Allegation No. 1-b, also apply to the phone calls at issue in Allegation No. 2. In brief, Senderoff reported he forgot to include the calls from his home phone when he reported recruiting phone calls from his cell phone for inclusion into Cybersports since he submitted this information while in the office. Senderoff further stated when submitting his monthly forms indicating the phones

[45] It should be noted that Senderoff explained in informal conversations with the University prior to the submission of the October reports that when he reported in his interview that recruiting was discussed, it was because when conversations occurred with the father he had discussed more than one prospect on the father's team, not just the father's son. He further explained these conversations were consistent with the general nature of other conversations with fathers who were also coaches, and were in contrast to conversations with fathers who were not coaches. In his November 16, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff, he stated he thought he could generally discuss recruiting with a coach. It should also be noted that in a January 9, 2008 interview, Dees stated he did not recall Senderoff discussing any other player besides his son.

he used for recruiting, he forgot to include his home phone. He admitted this practice was sloppy and/or careless.

As to the majority of the calls that violated NCAA rules, Senderoff also explained that he had not been careful about tracking these calls because the prospect (Jonathon "Bud" Mackey) had orally committed in the fall of 2006. Further, regarding Gates, as noted above, he believed the calls to the father were permissible because the father was the prospect's coach. Senderoff also thought additional calls to the Morris twins were allowed as there were two prospects being recruited.[46] Despite these explanations, the University reported the calls as part of the violation.

Meyer stated that he did not list his home phone on the monthly forms reporting the phones he used for recruiting purposes because he did not yet have a home phone when he initially completed the form and did not include his home phone on later forms because he thought the forms were only a formality and thus did not change what he previously reported. Meyer reported that after initially tracking his recruiting calls in a notebook before submitting the information for inclusion in Cybersports, he began relying on the call log in his cell phone to report his recruiting phone calls for monitoring purposes after he started making more recruiting calls while traveling.

[46] In fact, under NCAA rules, the limits on the number of phone calls do apply to each brother individually and allow coaches to call each brother during the same time period. However, several of the calls were to the twins' mother and Senderoff did not record whether the call concerned one or both brothers. In a January 23, 2008 interview, the twins' mother stated that she thought Senderoff had discussed both brothers when he called her. The NCAA Membership Services Staff recently provided an interpretation that was consistent with the University's approach to err on the side of caution and count each call with the mother as a countable call for both brothers if both prospects were discussed. **(See Attachment 8 for the March 13 email forwarding the interpretation.)**

As detailed above, at least four, if not five, of the six NCAA violation calls involving Meyer were determined to be in violation because of the University's strict approach to count all "message calls" three minutes or longer as a countable call.[47] Further, the other impermissible call involving Meyer had extenuating circumstances. Meyer called a prospect's (Scott Martin's) home for nine minutes; however, he was on hold the majority of this time waiting for other family members to ask the prospect to come to the phone. He reported that, while waiting, he chatted briefly with the young man's mother before she told the coach the prospect was not home. Meyer ended the call and then called the prospect the next day, believing that the first call should not count.

As set forth above, the University believes this violation should be classified as secondary. However, in the event that the Committee disagrees with the University and determines that the violation is major, the University does not believe that Meyer should be named in any finding made by the Committee or in any individual records files ("pink files") maintained at the NCAA office. The University is not contesting that the phone calls involving Meyer occurred or that the University should be held accountable for his impermissible calls. However, Meyer made only six of the 42 impermissible calls and there are extenuating circumstances surrounding these calls, as noted above. Thus, the University believes, given the limited number of impermissible phone calls and the mitigating circumstances, Meyer's involvement should not be treated as a stand-alone major violation.

[47] See Page No. 2-7 for the discussion of the calls to Hummel.

Nonetheless, Indiana University remains troubled by the disregard for University policies and procedures, particularly as the assistant coaches' failure to notify the compliance office about the use of the home phones for recruiting, the failure to report the calls made from home and the failure to report all recruiting phone numbers prevented the compliance office from effectively monitoring these calls and identifying these issues earlier. Out of the 42 impermissible phone calls detailed in this allegation, only one phone call (to Demetri McCamey or "McCamey") and five "message calls" to Hummel were recorded in the University's recruiting database "Cybersports". Although the compliance office could have identified one of the violation calls to McCamey, it would not have known about the other two violation calls to him as they were not recorded in Cybersports. Further, since short voicemail messages are not considered countable calls in most circumstances, it is understandable that calls to Hummel with a message notation might not be questioned by the compliance staff, particularly given the thousands of calls reviewed. Regardless, even if these isolated calls had been identified, it would not have deterred the continuation of or resulted in earlier detection of the calls that were not recorded in Cybersports, particularly those that were made from the assistant coaches' home phones.

Procedures for the Monitoring of Recruiting Phone Calls. In addition, the University is disappointed the coaches did not show more attention to the policies and procedures for recording and monitoring recruiting phone calls and did not comply with the information provided during numerous rules education sessions. During the period of the sanctions, the University focused its monitoring of men's basketball recruiting records on phone calls and

particularly the assistant coaches' phone logs and actual phone records. As set forth in the October 3 report, the compliance protocol for monitoring phone records was as follows:

- Coaches were required to keep handwritten logs of all countable recruiting calls on a weekly basis. [Note: Sampson did not have any phone logs as he was prohibited from making any recruiting phone calls.] These phone logs included a column for the coaches to indicate for each call the phone that was used. **(See Attachment 17 for sample handwritten logs.)**
- Each Monday morning, the director of basketball operations collected these handwritten logs and gave them to the men's basketball administrative assistant.
- The men's basketball administrative assistant entered each coach's countable recruiting phone calls into Cybersports after receiving the handwritten logs.
- A report was produced weekly by the men's basketball administrative assistant from the Cybersports data. **(See Attachment F of the October 3 report for sample Cybersports recruiting phone call reports and Attachment 18 for a sample page from a report of recruiting phone calls generated by Cybersports.)**
- The Cybersports reports as well as the coaches' handwritten logs were then forwarded to the compliance office on a weekly basis.
- The director of compliance checked the Cybersports reports and handwritten logs each week for compliance with NCAA regulations as well as the sanctions adopted and imposed by the Committee on Infractions.
- In addition, each member of the coaching staff signed monthly statements indicating what phone(s) (i.e., cell, office, home or other) he had utilized for recruiting purposes.

(See Attachment G of the October 3 report for the monthly signed statements of phone usage for recruiting purposes from Sampson, the three assistant coaches and the director of basketball operations.)

- Each month, the director of compliance was then responsible for cross-referencing the calls listed on the phone bills for all phone lines the coaches reported using for recruiting with the Cybersports records to assure compliance with NCAA rules, as well as the sanctions. This review included checking phone records for phone calls to any known recruiting number. Initially, this entailed receiving electronic copies of office bills directly from the athletics business office each month, but having to collect hard copies of cell phone bills from the assistant coaches. However, by mid-fall 2006 the system was improved whereby the director of compliance was directly receiving electronic copies of both cell and office phone bills for all men's basketball coaches each month.
- Since Sampson was not permitted to make any recruiting phone calls and did not submit recruiting logs, the director of compliance was responsible for cross-referencing Sampson's office and cell phone lines against the recruiting information in the Cybersports database to ensure that no recruiting calls were made (regardless of whether they were countable or non-countable calls).

As should be expected, the record-checking system benefited from regular enhancements throughout the year as the director of compliance evaluated the most thorough yet efficient manner in which to conduct these checks. This culminated in the comprehensive protocol used to conduct the year-end phone record checks in May and June 2007. **(See Attachment H of the**

October 3 report for documentation of the evolution of this comprehensive protocol for monitoring men's basketball recruiting activities, focusing on phone calls. Sample e-mails concerning the review of phone records are also included.)

Further, information regarding the use of Cybersports for recruitment monitoring and the procedures for monitoring phone calls was regularly reviewed during compliance meetings with the men's basketball staff. Beginning as early as April 25, 2006, the compliance staff met with the director of basketball operations, Green, who was responsible for coordinating the collection of recruiting information from the coaches, to specifically discuss the process for tracking recruiting phone calls. Regular meetings continued, including the required weekly meetings with the director of basketball operations and other meetings with him and the assistant coaches as needed. At the weekly meetings, some of which were also attended by the assistant coaches, the compliance staff reviewed the specific penalties imposed and covered information regarding the use of handwritten phone logs and Cybersports to monitor phone calls. **(See the October 3 report, Attachment 1, pp. 8-12 for a listing of the formal weekly meetings; Attachment D of the October 3 report for the agendas and materials reviewed; and Attachment 10 for the compliance staff's notes regarding these and other meetings with the coaching staff.)** In addition, on several occasions, including May 25 and June 16, 2006, the potential use of home phones for recruiting was discussed with the director of basketball operations, including confirmation by the compliance staff on May 30 that home phone records would be required to be submitted if a home phone was used for recruiting. **(See Attachment 10.)** Moreover, the University reviewed the details of the Committee's penalties at a May 30, 2006 meeting with the men's basketball coaching staff, which resulted in the June 12, 2006 clarification from the

Committee on Infractions in response to questions raised by the coaches during the meeting. **(See Attachment 3.)** Further, Green reported in his December 13, 2007 interview with the NCAA and attended by the University that the coaches were provided enough information to keep them from making a major mistake.

In light of the actions of the men's basketball coaches and the calls that were contrary to NCAA rules and to the University's monitoring procedures, the University imposed significant corrective actions and sanctions, as set forth in **Section D** later in this response. These penalties were designed to directly impact the coaches involved as well as the men's basketball program as a whole. In fact when Senderoff resigned at the end of October, the University transferred his penalty to another assistant coach and functioned without a director of basketball operations for the remainder of the season. The University believes the corrective actions and penalties send a strong message that complete commitment to NCAA compliance is expected and required of all coaches and staff. It should be noted that in evaluating the extent of the self-imposed sanctions, the University more than compensated for the total number of impermissible phone calls.

Also, please provide the following:

a. A chart outlining each impermissible call that includes the (1) identity of the person who placed the call; (2) identity of the prospective student-athlete, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s) telephoned; (3) date, time and duration of the call; and (4) reason the call is impermissible.

See **Attachment 7** for the chart containing the calls that violated NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2. Note: The 42 calls that violated the NCAA bylaw are highlighted in gray.

b. A copy of the institution's October 25, 2007, self-report to the NCAA of the violations detailed in this allegation. Please identify any information that has been added or amended since the submission of the October 25 report.

See **Attachment 2.**

As a result of the continued review of issues related to the impermissible phone calls, the University has discovered a few inaccuracies that do not alter the overall context or substance of the information reported. Thus, included in this response there are ten additional phone calls that violated NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2, as compared to the information reported October 25. This number also accounts for the calls that were incorrectly listed as contrary to NCAA rules in the October 25 report.

Following is a summary of these modifications regarding only the NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 violations, which are included in the information and attachments presented in this response:

- In reviewing the number of phone calls Senderoff made from home it was noticed that calls to an unidentified number had not been included in the October reports and a subsequent call to this number confirmed that it belonged to the mother of prospective student-athlete Phillip Jurick ("Jurick"). Accordingly, there were three additional calls regarding Jurick that were contrary to the sanctions and that violated NCAA rules.

- In reviewing phone records regarding Robbie Hummel prior to the NCAA Enforcement Staff's interview with him, it was noticed that, although all of his calls in Cybersports were recorded as "left message", several of those calls were three or more minutes in duration. As a result of the University's decision to count any call three minutes or greater as a countable call – even if it was recorded as a message – six impermissible calls were identified, five of which were NCAA violations.

- Additional impermissible calls for Ayodele Coker ("Coker") were discovered after Coker confirmed during his December 7, 2007 interview that Senderoff had called his uncle. Coker provided that phone number, which had not been previously reported by the coaches as a recruiting number. Two of the additional impermissible calls were also NCAA violations.

c. An overview of the NCAA rules education related to telephone contacts that the institution provided to the men's basketball program, including the dates of the education sessions.

See the response to the Allegation above.

As outlined above and set forth in the October 3 report to the Committee, Indiana University conducted weekly meetings with the men's basketball staff, consistent with its self-imposed sanction. These were generally standing meetings with the director of basketball operations, who was required to attend. Interim meetings were held as needed due to time-sensitive materials. The men's basketball coaches often attended these meetings as well, as noted below and in the October 3 report. In addition, during the preparation of this response, the University located in the files of the former director of compliance a record of his notes from these standing meetings, as well as other meetings that occurred. **(For the full list of compliance rules education meetings with the men's basketball staff during the time period of the sanctions and the information covered see the October 3 report, pp. 8-12, Attachment 1 for a summary listing of the formal meetings; Attachment D of the October 3 report for agendas and other materials covered during these meetings; and Attachment 10 for the compliance staff's notes of these and other meetings with the basketball staff.)**

As requested, the following list includes the rules education issues reviewed during these compliance meetings that specifically involved telephone contacts, beyond the customary and regular review of the Committee's sanctions and collection of forms, which occurred during the weekly meetings:

1. Meeting with Director of Basketball Operations to Discuss Recruiting Methodology and Issues from the Oklahoma Infractions Case (4/25/06). Attendees: Jerry Green (then director of basketball operations) and Christian Pope (then director of compliance).

2. Recruiting Methodology and Cybersports Meeting to Spot Check Progress in Using the Software (5/4/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

3. Cybersports Training Meeting (5/9/06). Attendees: Green, McCallum, Meyer, Senderoff, BJ McElroy and Beth McLaughlin (basketball staff responsible for entering information into Cybersports), and Pope.

4. Review of Phone Logs, Phone Usage (including Home Phones, as well as Cell and Office Phones), and the Need for Contact Numbers for All Prospects (5/25/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

5. Men's Basketball Administration and Compliance Staff Meeting to Review the Penalties (05/30/06). Attendees: Sampson; Green, Meyer, McCallum, Senderoff, Rick Greenspan (athletics director), Bruce Jaffee (faculty representative), Grace Calhoun (associate athletics director), Mary Ann Rohleder (associate athletics director), Tim Fitzpatrick (associate athletics director and liaison for the director of athletics to men's basketball), Jennifer Brinegar (assistant athletics director – compliance),

and Pope. [NOTE: This was the meeting that precipitated the June 12, 2006 clarification from the Committee on Infractions in response to questions from the men's basketball staff, including one regarding three-way calls.]

6. Procedures for Data Collection and Compliance Statements regarding Recruiting Use of Home or Cell Phones (5/31/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

7. Review of Clarification from the Committee on Infractions (6/13/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

8. Review of Items Needed for Recruitment Tracking (6/16/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

9. Contact Restrictions and Recruiting Coordination Functions (07/18/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

10. Fall Contact Recruiting Rules Reminder and Telephone Call Rules Reminder (08/08/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

11. Fall Recruiting Period Reminders (8/29/06). Attendees: Sampson, Meyer, McCallum, Senderoff, Green, Brinegar, Pope.

12. Review of Accuracy of Entries Into Cybersports (9/20/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

13. Discussion of Communications from Director of Basketball Operations to Basketball Coaches (9/27/06). Attendees: Green, Calhoun, Brinegar and Pope.

14. Telephone Calls to Prospects During Competition-Related Activities Bylaw 13.1.7.2 (01/04/07). Attendees: Green and Pope.

15. Phone Calls and the Lifting of Sampson's Off-Campus and Calling Restrictions as of May 25, 2007 (05/17/07). Attendees: Meyer, Brinegar and Ian Rickerby (current director of compliance).

The men's basketball coaches also attended a Men's Basketball New Coaches Compliance Meeting on April 3, 2006. Those in attendance were: Sampson, Green, Meyer, McCallum, Brinegar and Pope. The three assistant coaches (Meyer, McCallum and Senderoff) also were present for the April 11, 2006 men's basketball spring compliance meeting with all of the returning student-athletes.

In addition to the men's basketball-specific meetings, the men's basketball staff attended the monthly compliance meetings (for all coaches and sport-specific staff), received the monthly compliance newsletters that covered current and relevant NCAA and Big Ten rules and reminders, and received the compliance questions of the week that were sent out via email – again with timely and relevant information regarding NCAA rules. **(See Attachment K of the October 3 report for sample monthly compliance newsletters and questions of the week.)** In total, Indiana University believes that the men's basketball staff received a significant rules education opportunity specific to coaches approximately twice each week during the period of the sanctions.

Further, the coaches were required to attend all meetings that the compliance staff held with the men's basketball student-athletes. These meetings occurred in August, November, January, and April of the 2006-07 academic year. The first meeting covered all of the information in the 15-page NCAA Summary of Rules for Student-Athletes. The second meeting was specific to the sport of men's basketball and covered recruiting rules and expectations, publicity rules, agents, extra benefits and gambling. The January meeting contained a quiz on the rules education provided to date that academic year, both in team meetings and in the monthly Student-Athlete Newsletter. The April meeting covered more men's basketball specific issues, such as outside competition and other summer activities, employment, and again a review of agents, extra benefits and gambling.

d. An overview of the institution's compliance procedures for monitoring telephone calls to prospective student-athletes during the relevant time period of March 2006 through July 2007.

See the response to the Allegations above.

In addition to the monitoring of recruiting calls set forth above in the response to the Allegation, the University took significant steps to also monitor the off-campus recruiting activities of the assistant coaches and the off-campus appearances and speaking engagements by Sampson, as detailed in the October 3 report, Page Nos. 7-8, Attachment 1. In particular, the approval process, review of and monitoring of Sampson's off-campus public appearances and speaking engagements required regular and careful attention and accommodations to ensure that no prospects would be in attendance. **(See Attachment I of the October 3 report for a chart summarizing all of Sampson's off-campus speaking engagements that occurred during the period of the sanctions, as well as samples of the compliance monitoring efforts that took place leading up to, during and after each event to ensure compliance with the sanction.)** Throughout the year, the compliance staff also handled requests for clarification from the men's basketball coaching staff regarding the application of the sanctions and other NCAA rules. **(See Attachment J of the October 3 report for a sampling of written reminders, clarifications and interpretations**

specific to the men's basketball staff's compliance with the sanctions and NCAA rules not necessarily related to the sanctions.)

e. A copy of any telephone logs the men's basketball program produced covering the weeks when the impermissible telephone calls occurred.

See **Attachment 17** for copies of handwritten telephone logs during the weeks impermissible calls occurred.

f. A statement indicating the reason the impermissible calls were made to the prospective student-athletes in light of NCAA legislation prohibiting such conduct.

See the response to the Allegation above.

g. A detailed description and explanation of all disciplinary actions taken against members of the men's basketball staff based on their involvement in or knowledge of violations of NCAA legislation, as determined by the institution and as set forth in this allegation. In that regard, please provide an explanation as to the reasons the institution believes these actions were appropriate, indicate the dates that any disciplinary actions were taken and submit copies of all correspondence from the institution to members of the men's basketball staff describing the disciplinary actions taken.

See **Attachment 15** for letters of reprimand for Meyer and Sampson and for a letter for McCallum's personnel file. [A letter of reprimand was being drafted for Senderoff at the time of his resignation on October 29, 2007.]

See **Section D** later in this response for all the corrective actions and penalties self-imposed by the University and see the response to the Allegation above.

3. [NCAA Bylaws 10.1, 10.1-(d) and 11.1.2.1]

It is alleged that (a) during the period of time beginning May 25, 2006, through May 24, 2007, Kelvin Sampson, head men's basketball coach, acted contrary to the NCAA principles of ethical conduct when he knowingly violated recruiting restrictions imposed by the NCAA Committee on Infractions, as penalty for Sampson's prior involvement in violations of NCAA legislation; (b) Sampson failed to deport himself in accordance with the generally recognized high standard of honesty normally associated with the conduct and administration of intercollegiate athletics by providing the institution and the NCAA enforcement staff false or misleading information; and (c) Sampson failed to promote an atmosphere for compliance within the men's basketball program and failed to monitor the activities regarding compliance of one or more of his assistant coaches. Specifically:

a. Concerning Sampson's knowing violation of recruiting restrictions, on a number of occasions from May 25, 2006, through May 24, 2007, Sampson was present while a member of his coaching staff made telephone calls related to recruiting. Sampson was prohibited from doing so pursuant to penalty L, NCAA Infractions Report No. 250; as adopted by and transferred to Indiana University, Bloomington. [NCAA Bylaw 10.1]

Specifically, on a number of occasions from May 31, 2006, through May 1, 2007, Sampson knowingly participated in three-way telephone conversations between himself, then assistant men's basketball coach Rob Senderoff, and prospective student-athletes Yancey Gates and William Buford Jr. Sampson also participated in three-way conversations between himself, Senderoff, and then prospective student-athletes DeJuan Blair, Demetri McCamey and [redacted]. Furthermore, Sampson participated in three-way conversations between himself, Senderoff, and Yvonne Jackson, mother of prospective student-athlete Devin Ebanks. Sampson participated in the three-way telephone conversations despite being instructed not to do so by the institution's compliance staff and despite receiving specific clarification from the Committee on Infractions that three-way calls were prohibited.

Additionally, on a number of occasions from May 25, 2006, through May 24, 2007, Sampson participated in recruiting calls made by Senderoff in the following ways:

(1) Sampson participated by speakerphone in recruiting calls placed by Senderoff to [redacted] and prospective student-athlete Marcus Morris.

(2) Sampson was present during one or more recruiting calls placed by Senderoff to prospective student-athlete Kenny Frease. Senderoff then handed Sampson the phone and allowed Sampson to speak with Frease.

(3) While Senderoff was in the presence of then prospective student-athletes Blair, Ayodele Coker and [redacted], the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s) during off-campus recruiting contacts; Senderoff called Sampson and allowed Sampson to speak with the prospective-student athlete, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s).

(4) Sampson spoke with Erica Mackey, mother of prospective student-athlete Jonathan "Bud" Mackey, via Senderoff's cell phone, while Senderoff was in the presence of Ms. Mackey.

Concerning Sampson's provision of false or misleading information, Sampson repeatedly provided the institution and the enforcement staff false information regarding his involvement in violations of the Committee on Infractions' recruiting restrictions. [NCAA Bylaw 10.1-(d)]

Specifically, during a November 13, 2007, interview with the institution and the enforcement staff, Sampson stated that at the time of the violations, he was unaware that Senderoff was using three-way calls to allow him to speak with prospective-student athletes the prospective student-athlete's parents, legal guardian(s) or coaches. Sampson further stated that he did not engage in three-way conversations with prospective student-athletes or their relatives during the period of recruiting restrictions. Additionally, Sampson stated that there was never an instance when he was on the phone with a prospective student-athlete when Senderoff also spoke. Finally, Sampson stated that he never spoke with Buford.

In fact, Sampson engaged in three-way telephone conversations with multiple prospective student-athletes, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s), as set forth in this allegation, including a June 19, 2006, three-way telephone conversation between himself, Senderoff and Buford. In addition, Sampson participated in speakerphone conversations involving himself, Senderoff and prospective student-athletes, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s), as set forth in this allegation.

b. Concerning Sampson's failure to promote an atmosphere for compliance within the men's basketball program and failure to monitor the activities regarding compliance of one or more of his assistant coaches, Sampson (1) failed to promote compliance with the recruiting restrictions imposed by the Committee on Infractions, (2) failed to promote compliance with applicable NCAA legislation concerning telephone recruiting calls and (3) failed to monitor the documentation of recruiting calls by the men's basketball staff required to ensure compliance. [NCAA Bylaw 11.1.2.1]

Specifically, Sampson failed in these three regards, as evidenced by the facts and circumstances set forth in Allegation Nos. 1 and 2 of this notice.

Please indicate whether this information is substantially correct and whether the institution agrees that a violation of NCAA legislation occurred. Submit evidence to support your response.

Overview of the University's Position

The University agrees the information set forth in Allegation No. 3 is substantially correct, and a violation of NCAA legislation has occurred. As with most allegations of unethical conduct, the review of this allegation involves an assessment of credibility as well as documentary evidence. As detailed below, although the University was unable to confirm each aspect of the allegation with phone records or other concrete evidence, such corroboration was available in a number of instances. Further, the testimony of approximately ten individuals with detailed and specific recollections of recruiting calls with Sampson that were initiated by Senderoff and that included statements by Senderoff that would have alerted Sampson to his involvement in the calls, taken in totality, is difficult, if not impossible, to completely refute. It is recognized that some of this testimony will likely be challenged. Nonetheless, the University has concluded that, on balance, there is sufficient information and evidence to support the majority of the specific information alleged, as well as the general charges that Sampson:

- Knowingly violated recruiting restrictions imposed by the Committee on Infractions;
- Provided the University and NCAA Enforcement Staff with false or misleading information; and
- Failed to promote an atmosphere of compliance within the men's basketball program and failed to monitor the compliance activities of one or more of his assistant coaches.

The University notes that most of the information, testimony and evidence supporting this allegation was developed as a result of the Enforcement Staff's ability to schedule and conduct a significant number of follow-up interviews with individuals mentioned in Indiana University's October 3 and 25 reports to the NCAA. Although Indiana University attempted to and did conduct a few such interviews, its ability to arrange more interviews was hampered by the need to submit a timely report to the Committee after receiving an extension to the report that was originally due August 31, as well as the fact that a number of the individuals ultimately interviewed were enrolled at other NCAA institutions.[48] Prior to the submission of the October reports to the NCAA, the University had evaluated some of these issues that are the subject of this allegation but there was insufficient evidence at that time to conclude that Sampson had acted contrary to the principles of ethical conduct or the responsibility of a head coach.

Review of Sampson's Knowing Violation of Recruiting Sanctions (Allegation No. 3-a)

The University incorporates all of the relevant information included in the response to Allegation No. 1.

The University agrees, based on the totality of the information, evidence and testimony available, it is reasonable to conclude that, on a number of occasions Sampson knowingly violated Penalty L of Infractions Report No. 250, which prevented him from being present when

[48] Due to the need to keep the investigation confidential, the University did not contact other NCAA institutions other than one university where a prospect who had received multiple three-way calls was enrolled as a student-athlete. After an initial exchange of voicemails with that institution, an interview was unable to be arranged due to the University's tight timetable for the submission of the report.

his assistant coaches made recruiting calls from May 25, 2006 through May 24, 2007. These violations included knowing participation in at least some of the impermissible three-way recruiting calls, speakerphone calls, and "phone passing" calls initiated by Senderoff, which were referenced in Allegation No. 1-a and the University's response above.

Knowing Participation in Impermissible Three-Way Recruiting Calls. Sampson participated in 10 (or 12) to 18 impermissible three-way phone calls, as described above in the response to Allegation No. 1 and as noted in **Attachments M and N of the October 3 report and in Attachment 11.** He admitted to knowing participation in at least one of these three-way calls and the University has determined it is reasonable to conclude that he knew at least three other calls were three-way calls that had been initiated by Senderoff.

October 4, 2006 Three-Way Call with DeJuan Blair. On a number of occasions, Sampson admitted to knowing that Senderoff had connected him into a three-way phone call with Blair. In his August 23, 2007, interview with Indiana University, Sampson recalled that Senderoff had connected him into the October 4, 2006 three-way call with Blair because earlier that day Blair had cancelled his scheduled official visit to the University and Senderoff called stating that Sampson needed to speak with Blair. **(See Attachments M and N of the October 3 report and Attachment 11 for information regarding this three-way call.)** Moreover, during the October 30, 2007 recorded telephonic press conference conducted by Indiana University regarding the reports submitted to the NCAA, Sampson commented, "[o]ther than one call, I was not aware that it was a three way call." In response to a follow-up question regarding "what happened with the one call that [he was] aware was a three way call", Sampson explained:

> That was a situation where a kid had committed to come on campus for a visit. One of our assistant coaches, Coach Senderoff, was doing a home visit, some things were said . . . a kid was [canceling] his visit, the kid tried to call, couldn't get in touch, and the call was transferred and I tried to clear some matters for him.

(See Attachment 6 for a transcript of the press conference at p. 5.) It should also be noted, in regards to Sampson's comment that Blair had been trying to reach him, in his December 11, 2007 interview with the NCAA, Blair stated he never called Sampson. Further, Senderoff noted in his January 31, 2008 interview, he had trouble getting Blair to call Sampson directly **(January 31, 2008 Senderoff Interview Transcript at p. 18, located on NCAA custodial website)**.

In addition, both Senderoff and Blair corroborated the circumstances surrounding this call. Although a bit uncertain as to whether this call occurred via three-way technology or a speakerphone, in his December 11, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff, Blair was sure that both Senderoff and Sampson were on the phone when he talked to Sampson after he had cancelled his official visit. When questioned as to how certain he was that both coaches were involved on the phone at the same time, whether it was by speakerphone or a three-way call, Blair responded "They both were on the phone. I'm, they was both on the phone talking, we all was on the phone." **(December 11, 2007 Blair Interview Transcript at p. 14, located on NCAA custodial website.)** In his interviews, Senderoff recalled the circumstances of the call and admitted to placing the three-way call to Sampson but consistently denied, or stated he did not recall, any actual three-way conversation.

Given this testimony and Sampson's own statements – despite his subsequent statement in his November 13, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff, that he did not know

that Senderoff had initiated any three-way calls, including the one to Blair – the University has concluded Sampson knew that Senderoff initiated the October 4, 2006 three-way phone call with Blair.

May 1, 2007 Three-Way Call with Yvonne Jackson. In addition, on two separate occasions, Jackson, the mother of Devin Ebanks, reported that both Senderoff and Sampson participated in the conversation at the same time during the May 1, 2007 three-way call. **(See Attachment N of the October 3 report and Attachment 11 for information regarding this three-way call.)** In her conversation with the University during the late summer of 2007, Jackson was specific as to her recollection that Senderoff was involved throughout the call as opposed to speaking only during the first portion and then remaining silent when Sampson was on the phone. Similarly, in her November 27, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff, Jackson corroborated the information she had reported to the University, provided details about their conversation that accounted for the length of the call, and stated she was very certain that a three-way conversation had occurred. She also recalled that Senderoff let Sampson know that she was on the phone and that they all said good-bye at the end of the call. In their interviews, Sampson and Senderoff reported they did not recall an actual three-way conversation with Jackson. Sampson conceded she had no reason to not tell the truth but noted she might be confused by Senderoff's earlier participation in the call. Senderoff stated in his August 23, 2007 interview with the University that he would not refute her recollection. In light of Jackson's detailed and consistent testimony and the fact that at the time of these statements, her son was still planning to attend Indiana University (he has since been released from his NLI), the University has determined that it is reasonable to conclude an actual three-way conversation

occurred and that Sampson thus knew Senderoff had initiated the call, contrary to the Committee's penalty.

June 19, 2006 Three-Way Call with Wil Buford. In his January 29, 2008 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by Indiana University, Wil Buford ("Buford") reported that he recalled a phone call on his coach's (Keith McClure's) phone while they were driving in the car. Buford stated the assistant coach (Senderoff), whose name he did not remember, had called his coach's phone and then the assistant coach called the head coach (Sampson) and let him know that Buford was on the phone. Buford stated he was "positive" that the assistant coach had introduced him to Sampson, although he did not recall the two coaches saying anything else to each other. Further, Buford's recollection that the call lasted five to ten minutes matches the actual length of the ten-minute three-way call to McClure's phone on June 19, 2006. **(See Attachments M and N of the October 3 report and Attachment 11 for information regarding this three-way call.)** The fact that Buford offered McClure's name, when he was asked if the coach he was with was his high school coach (Leroy Bates), adds credibility to his statements and provides further evidence that this call was the June 19 three-way call on McClure's phone. Buford's statement provides context for why, when questioned by the University, McClure did not recall ever speaking to Sampson. When Buford's recollection of the call was shared with Senderoff during his January 31, 2008 interview with the NCAA, Senderoff responded that he guessed that is what happened, although he did not remember. He added he would not say that Buford was lying. Sampson reported in several interviews, including his November 14, 2007 and January 29, 2008 interviews with the NCAA and attended by the University, that he never talked to Buford. During his January interview, when told about

Buford's account of the call, Sampson stated he did not recall any three-way conversations. Given the specificity of Buford's recollection and the fact that his account is supported by the phone records, the University determined that it is reasonable to conclude a three-way phone call with Buford occurred and that Sampson was aware of Senderoff's involvement in the call.

February 7, 2007 Three-Way Call with Yancy Gates. In his January 9, 2008 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by Indiana University, Yancy Gates ("Gates") recalled that both Sampson and Senderoff had participated in the three-way call at the same time. Gates explained Senderoff called him and they had a conversation, for about five to ten minutes, before Senderoff added Sampson to the call. Telephone records support this recollection as Senderoff connected Sampson into the call 16 minutes after he phoned Gates. Gates stated he heard the line click when Sampson was added and thought Senderoff introduced him to Sampson by stating "Coach Sampson Yancy's on the line" **(Gates' January 9, 2008 Gates Interview Transcript at p. 9, located on NCAA custodial website)**. Gates then provided a fairly detailed account of the three-way conversation that ensued, noting that Senderoff would chime in with specifics of Gates's "game" when Sampson made a general comment. Sampson reiterated in his January 29, 2008 interview, his prior statements that he hardly recalled any conversation with Gates and did not remember any three-way conversation. When questioned about Gates's account of the call, Senderoff responded during his January 31, 2008 interview with the NCAA that he did not remember that, but he would not say it did not happen or that Gates was wrong. The University has determined that it is reasonable to conclude Sampson would have been aware

of Senderoff's involvement in the three-way call, given the specificity of Gates's recollection of the conversation and the limited number of times Gates spoke to Sampson on the phone.[49]

Other Information Supporting Sampson's Knowing Involvement in Impermissible Three-Way Calls. In addition to these four calls that the University has determined Sampson knew were impermissible, there are at least two other calls where some, if not conclusive, evidence exists that Sampson knowingly participated in an impermissible three-way recruiting call. During the University's investigation, [redacted], a current student-athlete at Indiana University, reported that Senderoff was involved in the conversation with Sampson. **(See Attachments M and N of the October 3 report and Attachment 11 for information on the January 29, 2007 and April 5, 2007 three-way calls with [redacted].)** The University was careful to clarify that [redacted] recalled both coaches in the conversation at the same time, rather than Senderoff speaking only during part of the call and then remaining silent when Sampson was on the line. However, because the University was not aware at that time of several other instances when Senderoff would put Sampson on the phone with [redacted], as reported by [redacted] in his January 29, 2008 interview conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by the University, and only knew about the three-way call, his responses were interpreted as being related to the three-way call, when he might have been recalling the speakerphone conversation referenced below. Thus, the University believes that, when [redacted] did not recall during his January 29 interview a three-way call with Sampson and Senderoff and did not remember the information he had previously reported about a three-way conversation

[49] It should be noted that Gates recalled the phone call occurring in November (versus February) and in the afternoon (versus 9:28pm).

occurring during a three-way call, it is reasonable to conclude [redacted] was consistent in his recollection regarding a three-way conversation occurring, because the three-way conversation he recalled was apparently not during the three-way call. Rather, it occurred during the speakerphone conversation discussed below. It is also possible that the various conversations have become intermingled in [redacted]'s memory. Nonetheless, the University notes [redacted]'s initial recollection was closer to the occurrence of the phone calls and thus a presumably fresher memory. Neither Senderoff nor Sampson recalled a three-way conversation with [redacted].

Similarly, Demetri McCamey ("McCamey") reported in his December 19, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff detailed and specific information regarding two phone calls that involved both Sampson and Senderoff, although these specifics tended to get jumbled together as he explained the calls in that interview. In an April 28 follow-up phone interview with counsel for Sampson, the NCAA Enforcement Staff and counsel for the University, McCamey clarified the circumstances of the two calls. McCamey reported that he placed a phone call to Senderoff who then patched Sampson into a three-way call and that this phone call occurred while he was at home, a couple of weeks after the King James tournament and prior to his unofficial visit. McCamey recalled Senderoff mentioning to Sampson that he (Demetri) was on the phone and that there was a "regular three-way conversation" about the type of food he likes to eat, Sampson having just built his house and the barbecue pit that Sampson was going to have in his backyard. McCamey stated he was certain Sampson was talking to Senderoff while he was on the phone. McCamey also described a second call that involved both Sampson and Senderoff and occurred the day of his unofficial visit (June 15, 2006). He recalled calling Senderoff's cell phone to say he was on his way and that Senderoff passed the phone to

Sampson who appeared to be in the office.[50] In his January 31, 2008 interview with the NCAA, Senderoff stated he did not remember a three-way call with McCamey, but if that is how McCamey remembered it, he was not going to say he was wrong. Sampson, in his January 29, 2008 interview, recalled talking to McCamey with his AAU coach but did not remember any three-way calls involving Senderoff.

Although some of the information reported by McCamey is not completely consistent with other information, he provided specifics, including when the phone calls occurred, the fact the three-way call happened following his participation in a tournament (King James Classic, which was April 28-30, 2006) and prior to his unofficial visit (June 15), the involvement of Senderoff and Sampson in the conversations, and the substance of the conversations. He appeared to genuinely recall these conversations. It is possible one of these phone calls was the unidentified seven-minute three-way phone call that occurred on May 31, 2006 **(see Attachment M of the October 3 report),** particularly since the night before at 11:23 p.m. and 11:24 p.m., Senderoff attempted to reach McCamey, placing two one-minute calls to his home and cell phone numbers, respectively. It is also possible the calls involved phone passing or the use of a speakerphone rather than the use of three-way technology. In short, although the University is unable to conclusively prove that the calls described by McCamey occurred, it believes the detailed nature of his testimony regarding Senderoff's and Sampson's joint participation in two conversations, plus the pattern of calls noted in the response to this allegation, provide support that some type of impermissible recruiting call occurred.

[50] McCamey's unofficial visit was recorded as having occurred on June 15, 2006. On that date, there were no phone calls from Senderoff to McCamey. The only incoming calls to Senderoff's cell phone during the day ranged from one to three minutes. There were two calls in the evening that lasted for four and seven minutes, but would have been presumably after the unofficial visit.

Sampson's Knowledge that His Involvement in Three-Way Recruiting Calls was Impermissible. There is no that dispute the three-way recruiting calls initiated by Senderoff and involving Sampson were impermissible under Penalty L of Infractions Report No. 250 and that the coaches knew these calls would be impermissible. As a result of questions and issues raised during a May 30, 2006 meeting between the men's basketball coaching staff and the compliance staff, the University sought and obtained a number of clarifications from the Committee regarding the application of the sanctions. In response to a question asked after the compliance staff informed the coaches that connecting Sampson by three-way technology into a recruiting call placed by an assistant coach would not be permissible, one of these requests specifically related to the permissibility of three-way recruiting phone calls and whether an assistant coach could add Sampson to a call that was initiated by a high school or AAU coach who then included a prospect via three-way call. The response from the Committee, which was received on June 12 and communicated to the coaching staff on June 13 by email and memorandum, was that such a call would not be permissible. **(See Attachments 3 and 4.)**

The compliance staff has reported that the coaches were told at the conclusion of the May 30 meeting to assume incoming three-way recruiting calls involving Sampson were impermissible and therefore should not be made, pending a response from the Committee. Nonetheless, on May 31, the day after the meeting, an incoming three-way phone call occurred when Senderoff received an unknown call and connected Sampson to the call. As noted above, it is possible this call involved McCamey. Regardless of who the call was from, it is troubling that this apparently impermissible call was not reported to the compliance office once the

interpretation prohibiting incoming three-way calls involving Sampson was received from the Committee. More troubling, however, is the fact that the majority of the impermissible three-way calls occurred after the Committee's clarification was distributed on June 13, 2006.

It is undisputed Sampson was aware, at least by June 13, 2006, that he could not participate in three-way phone recruiting calls involving his assistant coaches. In fact Sampson readily admitted in each of his interviews he knew he could not participate in three-way calls. For example, on July 16, 2007, in the first meeting with athletics department officials regarding the three-way calls, Sampson stated he would have told an assistant coach he was not able to accept a three-way call should they have attempted to connect him. Similarly, in his July 20, 2007 interview conducted by Ice Miller and attended by representatives of Indiana University, Sampson said he understood that an assistant coach could not patch him into a call with a prospect, coach or family member, even if that individual made the request. Further, in his November 13, 2007 interview conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by Indiana University, Sampson stated, "I knew I could not accept a three-way call. If I had thought that was a three-way call I would have hung up and reported it." **(November 13, 2007 Sampson Interview Transcript at p. 30, located on NCAA custodial website.)**

Nonetheless, despite these statements and his knowledge that his involvement in three-way recruiting calls with an assistant coach was impermissible, Sampson did not stop or report to compliance the one such call to Blair he admitted he knew Senderoff had initiated.

Knowing Participation in Impermissible Speakerphone Recruiting Calls (Allegation No. 3-a-(1)). The University has determined it is reasonable to conclude Sampson participated in two phone calls initiated by Senderoff in which he and Senderoff talked to a prospect via speakerphone.

[redacted]. As noted above, when [redacted] was interviewed on January 29, 2008, although he did not appear to recall a three-way phone call, he provided information regarding several phone calls where Senderoff arranged for Sampson to participate. In regards to this allegation, he recalled one phone call when Senderoff called him and told him he was on speakerphone with Sampson. [redacted] stated it was a conversation like they normally talked, where one coach talked, then the other. In his January 31, 2008 interview with the NCAA, Senderoff stated he did not remember using a speakerphone with anyone. Sampson, in his January 29, 2008 interview also did not recall any such conversation. The University finds the testimony from [redacted] regarding this phone call to be credible, particularly given that [redacted] was and is an Indiana University student-athlete with no reason to provide such information if it were not true. Thus, the University has concluded that Sampson was involved in a recruiting call with Senderoff and [redacted] and that he would have been aware this phone call was impermissible due to Senderoff's involvement, as evidenced by the conversation that [redacted] recalled.

Marcus Morris. In addition, it is reasonable to conclude Sampson participated by speakerphone in at least one other recruiting phone call initiated by Senderoff. This call involved Marcus Morris ("Marcus"), one of two twins Indiana University was recruiting, and the

brother who generally handled more of the recruiting calls. In his January 23, 2008 interview conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by the University, Marcus reported there were approximately two or three times when he spoke to both Sampson and Senderoff at the same time by speakerphone. He recalled that when he mentioned to Senderoff that he wanted to speak with Sampson, Senderoff would state Sampson's right here and he wants to speak with you. Marcus reported that the coaches were both on speakerphone. When asked how certain he was that both coaches were on the phone at the same time, Marcus replied "100%". **(January 23, 2008 Marcus Morris Interview Transcript at p. 8, located on NCAA custodial website.)** When provided a description of Marcus's statement, during their respective January 29 and 31, 2008 interviews, neither Sampson nor Senderoff recalled such phone calls occurring.

Knowing Participation in Impermissible Phone Passing (Allegation No. 3-a-(2)). On one or two occasions, Sampson was present when Senderoff called a prospect through his coach and then handed the telephone to Sampson so he could speak with the prospect. In his January 14, 2008 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by Indiana University, Kenny Frease ("Frease") reported that on at least two occasions Senderoff phoned his high school coach and then had Sampson speak to Frease, who assumed Senderoff had handed the phone to Sampson since only about five seconds had elapsed. Frease and his coach, Rob Toth ("Toth"), were specific in their recollections of the phone calls (e.g., that to get better reception they had to change floors and one time Frease had to lay down) that they believed likely occurred in the fall of 2006, since Frease committed to another institution in March 2007. Frease noted that he spoke to one coach at a time, which is consistent with his understanding the phone was passed from Senderoff to Sampson. In a follow-up interview with Toth on April 16, 2008,

he confirmed that, although he never heard Sampson speak to Frease, he was present when Frease spoke to Sampson on these calls and that Frease told him when he got off the phone that he had spoken to Sampson. Toth stated Frease liked Sampson and he would not lie about speaking to him. It should also be noted, Senderoff's cell phone records contain several phone calls to Toth's phone number, which could be the calls in question, including an eight-minute call on October 23, 2006 at 7:04 p.m. and a 17-minute call on January 29, 2007 at 6:58 p.m., as well as a three-minute call on September, 11, 2006 at 11:43 a.m. When provided a description of Frease's and Toth's statements, during their respective January 29 and 31, 2008 interviews, neither Sampson nor Senderoff recalled such phone calls occurring. Given the specific information provided by Frease and Toth and the fact that Senderoff's cell phone records show several phone calls to Toth, it is reasonable to conclude that one or more of these calls occurred and that Sampson would have been aware Senderoff had initiated his involvement in the call.

Knowing Participation in Impermissible Recruiting Calls Placed by Senderoff (Allegation Nos. 3-a-(3) and (4)). Sampson participated in several impermissible phone calls in which Senderoff was present with a prospect or the relatives of a prospect, called Sampson, and then handed the phone to the prospect or mother so they could speak with Sampson. The University has determined, based on the information and testimony provided by the prospects and the mother of a prospect, some of which was corroborated by phone records or other independent evidence, it is reasonable to conclude that these calls occurred and that Sampson knew of Senderoff's involvement.

Ayodele Coker. In his December 7, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by the University, Ayodele Coker ("Coker"), when questioned about his recollection of any phone calls with Senderoff where he also spoke with Sampson (in an attempt to garner more information regarding the circumstances of an October 4, 2006 three-way call identified in the phone records), described an occasion when Senderoff visited him at his high school, called Sampson on his (Senderoff's) cell phone, and handed the phone to Coker so he could speak to Sampson. Coker recalled that after class his coach told him the Indiana University coach (Senderoff) was coming to see him and that when Senderoff arrived, they talked and Senderoff mentioned he wanted Sampson to say hi. Coker was specific as to the details in that he remembered the call was during the day, after class, and Sampson mentioned he would cook chicken for Coker when he made his visit as he liked cooking chicken. Coker thought the call lasted approximately two or three minutes. A review of Senderoff's cell phone records revealed several phone calls to Sampson's cell phone or the basketball office on two days when Senderoff had an off-campus evaluation or contact with Coker. On September 18, 2006, a day where Senderoff reported an evaluation for Coker, there is a 2:01 p.m. four-minute call to the basketball office and a 5:30 p.m. three-minute call to Sampson's cell. On September 27, 2006, a day listed with a contact for Coker, there is an 8:01 a.m. five-minute call and a nine-minute 5:25 p.m. call, both to Sampson's cell phone. Any of these phone calls could have been the call Coker described, although the 8:01 a.m. call would appear to be too early. In his January 29, 2008 interview, Sampson did not recall an occasion when Senderoff was visiting Coker and called Sampson to let him speak to Coker. In his January 31, 2008 interview, Senderoff reported he thought Coker's coach called Sampson from his office phone and Coker then spoke to Sampson. It is possible the call occurred as Senderoff recalled, but as incoming phone numbers

are not listed on his cell phone records, it is impossible to confirm Senderoff's statement. Thus, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary and with evidence supporting that Senderoff placed the calls, and particularly since Senderoff appears to recall at least some call with Sampson when he was visiting Coker, the University has determined it is reasonable to conclude that this call occurred, consistent with Coker's recollection, and that Sampson would have known about Senderoff's presence and involvement in the recruiting call.

[redacted]. In his January 29, 2008 interview, [redacted] also reported, in addition to the speakerphone call set forth above, that on approximately two separate occasions, when Senderoff visited him at school, Senderoff called Sampson and then allowed [redacted] to use his phone to speak to Sampson. [redacted] reported he and his roommate spoke to Sampson on the phone for approximately five to ten minutes. [redacted] recalled they were in the hallway of his junior college gym when the calls occurred. A review of Senderoff's cell phone records reveals several phone calls to Sampson on days in which he visited [redacted] at his junior college. On October 7, 2006, the date of an evaluation, there were three consecutive attempts to reach Sampson on his cell phone for one-minute each at 3:01 p.m. and then two attempts at 3:02 p.m., followed by a four-minute call to Sampson's home at 3:03 p.m. and a six-minute call, also to his home at 3:20 p.m. Either of these two latter calls could have been one of the phone calls described by [redacted]. In addition, on October 18, 2006, the date of another evaluation, there was an eight-minute call to the men's basketball office at 1:24 p.m. from Senderoff's cell phone. Further, on April 5, 2007, the date of a contact, there was an eight-minute call at 2:53 p.m. and then two consecutive nine-minute and five-minute calls at 7:16 p.m. and 7:25 p.m., all to Sampson's cell phone. Any of these calls could have been the calls [redacted] describes,

particularly the ones in the afternoon. When Sampson was asked during his January 29, 2008, interview about calls with [redacted], he noted that Senderoff would visit the junior college to make sure his and his roommate's grades were in order and that Sampson would talk to [redacted] when his junior college coach called Sampson. Senderoff stated in his January 31, 2008 interview that, although he did not remember doing so, he might have been in the coach's office when the coach used the coach's phone to call Sampson. Given that it is not possible to confirm Senderoff's statement that the junior college coach might have placed the calls, as incoming phone numbers are not listed on his cell phone records, and given that Senderoff's cell phone records support [redacted]'s recollections that calls to Sampson occurred on the dates of two of Senderoff's visits to the junior college, the University believes it is reasonable to conclude these calls occurred and Sampson knew of Senderoff's involvement.

Erica Mackey. In a February 2, 2008 interview of her son, Jonathan "Bud" Mackey ("Bud"), which was conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff, Erica Mackey ("Erica") provided a very detailed account of an occasion where Senderoff was present and handed her his cell phone so she could speak to Sampson. Erica recalled that Senderoff was present for the Kentucky "sweet sixteen"/state basketball championship and that she ran into him after the championship game, which Bud's team won. Erica stated that as she was going down the steps from the area where the parents sit, Senderoff was coming up talking on his cell phone. She reported that Senderoff said congratulations and noted "coach" was on the phone and he wanted to congratulate her too. Erica said that Senderoff handed her his cell phone and she spoke with someone who she believed to be Sampson. She stated he said congratulations and "our boy did it. You know, I heard it was a great game. You know, blah, blah, blah." **(February 2, 2008**

Mackey Interview Transcript at p. 19, located on NCAA custodial website.) She then handed the phone back to Senderoff and proceeded down to find Bud. The University confirmed the 2007 Kentucky Boys' Sweet Sixteen State Basketball Tournament was conducted on March 23 and 24, with the semifinals and final games played on March 24. From the bracket, the championship game, which was scheduled to begin at 8 p.m., would have likely ended sometime after 10 p.m. **(See Attachment 19.)** Senderoff's cell phone records for March 24 include a six-minute call to Sampson's home phone at 10:34 p.m. Further, Cybersports lists an evaluation for Mackey on March 24, 2007 by Senderoff in Lexington, KY. **(See Attachment 20 for Cybersports printout.)** Because this interview with Erica occurred after the last interviews with Sampson and Senderoff, they have not, as of the date of this response, had an opportunity to address her recollections. Nonetheless, given Erica's detailed recollection of this special evening in her son's basketball career, and the fact that there is independent evidence and phone records that confirm her account, the University has determined it is reasonable to believe that this call occurred and that Sampson would have known that Senderoff handed the phone to Erica.

DeJuan Blair. In his December 11, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff, Blair reported that during a home visit by Senderoff, he and his family (mother, father, brother, sister and grandmother) were gathered around the kitchen table and Senderoff called Sampson and placed his cell phone on speaker so that they could talk with Sampson. Blair recalled Sampson mentioning how good a player he was and thought the conversation lasted 45 minutes to one hour. Although Blair recalled this visit occurred after the basketball season, records indicate that Senderoff made a home visit on October 4, 2006 and that a 12-minute phone call was placed from his cell phone to Sampson's cell at 8:03 p.m. Further, in his January 31, 2008

interview when asked about any calls Senderoff might have made in the presence of a prospect where he used his cell phone's speaker function so Sampson could speak to the prospect, Senderoff reported that he was pretty sure he had called Sampson at the end of his home visit with Blair's family so they could ask Sampson some questions. Senderoff did not think this call was impermissible as he had done that before when he made home visits and the head coach was not present. In his January 29, 2008 interview, Sampson did not recall speaking to Blair or his family by speakerphone and noted he had so many calls that individual calls did not stand out for him. Although Blair's testimony had some inconsistencies when compared to the phone records, given Senderoff's admission that this call likely occurred, the University has concluded Sampson would have known that Senderoff had placed the call during this home visit. It should also be noted that it appears this call occurred just under two hours prior to an impermissible three-way call with Blair.

Discussion of Allegation Regarding Sampson's Provision of False and Misleading Information (Allegation No. 3-b)

The University incorporates all of the relevant information included in the response to Allegation No. 1 and Allegation No. 3-a. The University agrees Sampson provided false and misleading information to Indiana University as demonstrated by the numerous inconsistencies found in his five interviews in which the University participated and conducted, as well as his direct contradiction of credible statements by individuals who had no motivation to provide inaccurate information regarding the impermissible calls described in Allegation Nos. 1 and 3-a.

Specifically, Sampson stated on several occasions during his various interviews he never knowingly participated in any violation of NCAA sanctions. Further, on July 16, 2007, during his first meeting with University personnel regarding the three-way calls he stated he did not participate on three-way calls and all phone call activity due to recruitment was always initiated by the prospect, family or coach calling him. Then during his July 20, 2007 interview with the University, Sampson stated the only time he recalled three-way calling happening, he knew the prospect had been trying to reach him or a call had been dropped. In fact, little, if any corroboration regarding dropped calls was developed during the review of phone records or the interviews with various prospects. Further, only a few prospects indicated they called Sampson.

Following these earlier denials, in his August 23, 2007 interview with the University, Sampson admitted to recalling one three-way call with Blair where Senderoff connected the call. During an October 30, 2007 telephonic press conference he again admitted to remembering one three-way call. **(See Attachment 6 for the transcript of the press conference.)** However, in his November 13, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff and the University, just after commenting that he recalled talking to Blair, Sampson stated he did not engage in a three-way conversation and did not know Senderoff was connecting him into three-way calls:

MN[51]: It's my understanding that you said that you did not know that these were three-way phone calls?
KS: Absolutely.
MN: I wanna be specific about this. Is that, by that statement do you mean that you did not engage in a three-way phone conversation or you had no knowledge that Senderoff was connecting you to a prospect or connecting a prospect to you via a three-way call?
KS: Both. My first knowledge of the three-way call was in July, uh, when I went into, uh, Mr. Greenspan's office.

[51] MN refers to Mark Neyland, NCAA assistant director of enforcement.

(November 13, 2007 Sampson Interview Transcript, p. 29, located on NCAA custodial website.) These denials from his November 13 interview are not credible given the information and testimony outlined in the response to Allegation No. 3-a, they are also contrary to Sampson's own testimony.

Sampson also stated in the November 13 interview, that at no point would he have thought these were three-way calls because he knew he could not accept a three-way call and that if he had received a three-way call, he would have hung up and reported it. **(November 13, 2007 Sampson Interview Transcript, p. 30, located on NCAA custodial website.)** However, as detailed above, Sampson admitted to knowing about one three-way call and would have been aware of at least three other three-way calls. Yet he neither hung up the phone nor reported the calls. Sampson also did not take any known steps to ensure that such impermissible calls would not recur. And, in fact, the calls continued to occur.

In addition, Sampson consistently denied that he ever was on the phone with a prospect or any recruiting call when Senderoff spoke. In his July 20, 2007 interview with the University, he stated there was never any three-way talking on the patched-in calls. In the August 20, 2007 interview with the University, he did not recall any three-way conversations and did not recall Senderoff introducing the calls. Further, in his November 13, 2007 interview conducted by the NCAA and attended by Indiana University, Sampson stated "[b]ut there was never, there was never an instance where I was on the phone with a kid where Rob Senderoff talked." **((November 13, 2007 Sampson Interview Transcript, p. 26, located on NCAA custodial**

website.) He reiterated that position in his January 29, 2008 interview, stating on several occasions there were no three-way conversations and he had not been on a recruiting call when Senderoff talked. However, given the information, evidence and testimony set forth in the response to Allegation No. 3-a, specifically regarding the phone calls involving three-way conversations (e.g., [redacted], Marcus, Jackson, Blair, Buford, Gates, Coker), these statements by Sampson that he was never on the phone when Senderoff also spoke are not plausible.

In regards to his statements regarding Buford, as noted in the allegation, during Sampson's November 13, 2007 interview, he stated he never saw Buford, never talked to him, and only knew that he signed with Ohio State University. **((November 13, 2007 Sampson Interview Transcript, p. 34, located on NCAA custodial website.)** In his January 29, 2008 interview, Sampson reiterated he never met Buford, but stated he did not recall speaking with Buford. **(January 29, 2008 Sampson Interview Transcript, p. 9, located on NCAA custodial website.)** However, as detailed in the response to Allegation No. 3-a, the evidence supports a conclusion that Sampson did, in fact, participate in a June 19, 2006 ten-minute three-way call with Buford, that was initiated by Senderoff to Buford's coach's phone.

Thus, after careful evaluation of the totality of the available evidence and information, Indiana University has concluded the repeated denials provided by Sampson are not credible or supported.

Discussion of Sampson's Failure to Promote an Atmosphere for Compliance or to Monitor Compliance (Allegation No. 3-c)

The University incorporates all of the relevant information included in the response to Allegation Nos. 1, 2 and 3-a.

Failure to Promote Compliance with the Recruiting Penalties. The University agrees Sampson failed to promote compliance with the Committee's recruiting restrictions as evidenced by the information contained in Allegation Nos. 1 and 3-a regarding the occurrence of phone calls that were contrary to the Committee's sanctions. This failure is best illustrated by the fact that even though Sampson admittedly knew he had participated in a three-way recruiting call with Blair (on October 4, 2006), he did nothing to stop that call or to prevent other similar calls from occurring and he did not report the call to the compliance office. In fact, after this call, there were four or five other impermissible three-way calls, as well as a number of other calls that were contrary to the Committee's sanctions, as set forth above (e.g., those with [redacted], Erica Mackey, Frease).

Failure to Promote Compliance with NCAA Legislation. The fact the violations listed in Allegation No. 2 occurred, particularly during a time when the men's basketball staff should have been especially attentive to rules compliance is evidence of this failure to promote compliance with NCAA legislation. NCAA Bylaw 11.1.2.1 specifically requires a head coach to

promote an atmosphere of compliance within the program supervised by the coach.[52] The occurrence of the violations and the repeated failure of at least two assistant coaches to report the use of their home phones for recruiting and their failure to adequately document all of their recruiting calls further illustrates this failure. Instead of embracing the need for compliance during a time when the program was under NCAA sanctions, the two assistant coaches treated these forms as formalities. Further, former director of basketball operations, Green, reported in his December 13, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by the University that in his opinion he did not see how the issues with the sanctions could have occurred accidentally and that they had to have occurred purposely because the coaches had too much information. **(December 13, 2007 Green Interview Transcript, p. 18, located on NCAA custodial website.)**

Perhaps the best example of how Sampson failed to accept responsibility for the actions of his assistant coaches and the need to promote an atmosphere of compliance is the following exchange from his November 13, 2007 interview:

> MN: And again, uh, I guess the question becomes it's, in, in looking at that, the, the very first call on there is dated May 31, 2006. It is my understanding from talking to Ms. Brinegar that your assistant coaches were specifically told on May 30th, just one day before that three-way phone calls were impermissible yet the next day you begin impermissible three-way phone calls. So, did you --
>
> KS: Not me.
>
> MN: -- Did you call --
>
> KS: Not me, them.

[52] This bylaw was specifically addressed with coach Sampson on April 3, 2006, at the new men's basketball coaches' compliance meeting **(see Attachment 12, referencing Attachment M at pp. 21-28)**.

(November 13, 2007 Sampson Interview Transcript, p. 27, located on NCAA custodial website.)

Failure to Monitor Documentation of Recruiting Calls. Sampson completely delegated to other members of the coaching staff, particularly his director of basketball operations and the basketball administrative staff, the responsibility for tracking and coordinating the documentation of recruiting calls, including the paperwork and data entry required for effective monitoring by the compliance office. Further, the occurrence of impermissible phone calls as detailed in Allegation Nos. 1-b and 2, which were contrary to NCAA sanctions and Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2, provides further evidence that Sampson did not ensure that the men's basketball coaching staff maintained an appropriate level of and accurate documentation of recruiting phone calls. This failure included not supervising recruiting phone calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to be in a position to know and understand how his coaches made and recorded recruiting calls; not ensuring the assistant coaches properly reported the use of their home phones for recruiting purposes as well as all recruiting calls made; and not ensuring the assistant coaches reported any phone calls contrary to the sanctions or NCAA bylaws.

NCAA Bylaw 11.1.2.1 sets forth the expectation that head coaches are responsible for the control and monitoring of their programs. Thus, Sampson's hands-off approach during this time when there should have been a heightened attention and awareness regarding NCAA compliance – with NCAA rules and the Committee's sanctions – was not appropriate and not effective, as evidenced by the occurrence of phone calls that were contrary to the sanctions and/or in violation of NCAA rules, as set forth in the response to Allegation Nos. 1 and 2 above.

Also, please provide the following:

a. A detailed description and explanation of all disciplinary actions taken against Sampson based on his involvement in or knowledge of violations of Committee on Infractions restrictions, as determined by the institution and as detailed in this inquiry. In that regard, please provide an explanation as to the reasons the institution believes these actions were appropriate, indicate the dates that any disciplinary actions were taken and submit copies of all correspondence from the institution to Sampson describing the disciplinary actions taken.

See the response to the Allegation above, as well as **Attachment 15** for Sampson's letter of reprimand and **Section D** later in this response for the penalties imposed.

b. A statement indicating Sampson's dates of employment at the institution and positions held by Sampson at the institution.

Start Date:	March, 29, 2006
End Date:	February 22, 2008
Position:	Head Men's Basketball Coach

c. A list of all of the dates Sampson was interviewed by the institution or provided information to institutional administrators about his knowledge of or involvement in the violations set forth in this allegation. Please include a statement detailing the information reported by Sampson to the institution and athletics department staff members concerning the violations set forth in this allegation.

Dates of Formal Communication with Sampson

July 16, 2007: Meeting with athletics administrators

July 20, 2007: Interview with University administrators and outside counsel

August 23, 2007: Interview with University administrators and outside counsel

November 13, 2007: Interview with NCAA Enforcement Staff, University administrators and outside counsel

January 29, 2008: Interview with NCAA Enforcement Staff, University administrators and outside counsel

See the response to the Allegations above for the relevant information reported by Sampson.

4. [NCAA Bylaws 10.1 and 10.1-(d)]

It is alleged that (a) during the period of time beginning May 25, 2006, through May 24, 2007, Rob Senderoff, then assistant men's basketball coach, acted contrary to the NCAA principles of ethical conduct when he knowingly violated recruiting restrictions imposed by the NCAA Committee on Infractions, as penalty for head men's basketball coach Kelvin Sampson's prior involvement in violations of NCAA legislation; and (b) Senderoff failed to deport himself in accordance with the generally recognized high standard of honesty normally associated with the conduct and administration of intercollegiate athletics by providing the institution false or misleading information. Specifically:

a. Concerning Senderoff s knowing violation of the Committee on Infractions' restrictions, on a number of occasions from May 25, 2006, through May 24, 2007, Senderoff placed telephone calls related to recruiting while in the presence of Sampson. Sampson was prohibited from being present while members of his staff placed telephone calls related to recruiting, pursuant to penalty L, Infractions Report No. 250; as adopted by and transferred to Indiana University, Bloomington. [NCAA Bylaw 10.1]

Specifically, on multiple occasions from May 31, 2006, through May 1, 2007, Senderoff knowingly used three-way telephone calls to connect Sampson to then prospective student-athletes DeJuan Blair, Ayodele Coker and [redacted], the prospective student-athlete's parents, legal guardian(s) or coaches; and to prospective student-athletes William Buford Jr., Devin Ebanks and Yancey Gates, the prospective student-athlete's parents, legal guardian(s) or coaches.

Additionally, on a number of occasions from May 31, 2006, through May 1, 2007, Senderoff knowingly participated in three-way telephone conversations between himself, Sampson, and Gates and Buford. Senderoff also participated in three-way conversations between himself, Sampson and then prospective student-athletes Blair, Demetri McCamey and [redacted]. Furthermore, Sampson participated in three-way conversations between himself, Sampson, and Yvonne Jackson, Ebanks' mother. Senderoff participated in the three-way telephone conversations despite being instructed not to do so by the institution's compliance staff and despite receiving specific clarification from the Committee on Infractions that three-way calls were prohibited.

Furthermore, on a number of occasions from May 25, 2006, through May 24, 2007, Sampson participated in the following recruiting calls made by Senderoff:

(1) Senderoff allowed Sampson to participate by speakerphone in telephone calls he placed to prospective student-athlete Marcus Morris and [redacted].

(2) Senderoff placed one or more recruiting calls to prospective student-athlete Kenny Frease. Senderoff then handed Sampson the phone and allowed Sampson to speak with Frease.

(3) While in the presence of Blair, Coker and [redacted], the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s) during off-campus recruiting contacts, Senderoff called Sampson and allowed Sampson to speak with the prospective-student athletes, the prospective student-athlete's parents or legal guardian(s).

(4) While in the presence of Erica Mackey, mother of prospective student-athlete Jonathan "Bud" Mackey, Senderoff allowed Sampson to speak with Ms. Mackey via Senderoff's cell phone.

b. Concerning Senderoff's provision of false or misleading information, on multiple occasions, Senderoff submitted false telephone recruiting call documentation to the institution's compliance staff. [NCAA Bylaw 10.1-(d)]

Specifically, Senderoff provided the institution with signed monthly statements indicating that he had not used his home telephone to place recruiting calls during the months of June, July and September 2006; and during the months of February through July 2007. Senderoff also provided the institution weekly recruiting logs corresponding with those same months, which also indicated that he had not used his home telephone to place recruiting calls. In fact, Senderoff placed at least one recruiting call from his home telephone in each of the months identified. The institution reported that Senderoff placed at least 30 telephone calls from his home phone that were violations of the recruiting restrictions imposed on the men's basketball staff by the Committee on Infractions, as set forth in Allegation No. 1; and at least 15 telephone calls placed from Senderoff s home phone that were violations of NCAA legislation, as set forth in Allegation No. 2.

Please indicate whether this information is substantially correct and whether the institution agrees that a violation of NCAA legislation occurred. Submit evidence to support your response.

Overview of the University's Position

The University agrees that the information set forth in Allegation No. 4 is substantially correct, and that a violation of NCAA legislation has occurred. Specifically, the University has concluded that Senderoff knowingly violated recruiting restrictions imposed by the Committee on Infractions and provided the University with false and misleading information.

Review of Senderoff's Knowing Violations of Recruiting Sanctions (Allegation No. 4-a)

The University incorporates all of the relevant information included in the response to Allegation Nos. 1, 2 and 3, particularly the detailed information set forth in the response to Allegation No. 3-a. Because Allegation No. 4-a is almost identical to Allegation No. 3-a and involves the same information, testimony and evidence, in the interest of brevity, the University has not repeated the information presented above, which applies equally to this allegation.

As with most allegations of unethical conduct, the review of this allegation involves an assessment of credibility as well as documentary evidence. As detailed above in the response to Allegation No. 3-a, although the University was unable to confirm each aspect of the allegation with phone records or other concrete evidence, such corroboration was available in a number of instances. Further, the testimony of approximately ten individuals with detailed and specific recollections of recruiting calls with Sampson that were initiated by Senderoff, particularly when combined with Senderoff's various admissions, is difficult, if not impossible, to completely refute. It is recognized that some of this testimony will likely be challenged. Nonetheless, the

University has concluded that, on balance, there is sufficient information and evidence to support the majority of the specific information alleged against Senderoff.

Knowing Use of Impermissible Three-Way Recruiting Calls. (Allegation No. 4-a). Given the evidence and testimony set forth in the responses to Allegation Nos. 1-a and 3-a and Senderoff's own testimony in several interviews, it is apparent that Senderoff knowingly used three-way telephone calls to impermissibly connect Sampson to Blair, Coker, [redacted], Buford, Jackson and Gates, and to some of the prospect's parents, legal guardian(s) or coaches, as set forth in **Attachment M of the October 3 report and in Attachment 11**. In his various interviews, Senderoff readily admitted to placing the three-way calls identified from a review of his phone records and to connecting Sampson so that he could speak to the prospects, their parents, legal guardian(s) or coaches. In his initial meeting with the University on July 16, 2007, Senderoff acknowledged that he made the three-way calls and that he knew the three-way phone calls were impermissible when he placed the calls.

In his July 20, 2007 interview with the University, he also stated that he would have received the June 13 memorandum clarifying that involving Sampson in a three-way phone call would be impermissible. Senderoff further explained that he thought this was a "gray area" and that as long as he was not a participant in the conversation, the call would be okay. He explained that in his mind he was the "operator" when an individual was trying to reach Sampson and he did not think at the time that he was putting Sampson in a bad spot. Even though the compliance staff had informed the coaches at the May 30, 2006 meeting that outgoing three-way recruiting calls that included Sampson would not be permissible, Senderoff stated he did not think to ask

the compliance staff for clarification as to this "gray area". During his August 23, 2007 interview with the University, Senderoff reported that although there were some dropped calls with Sampson, he recalled that individuals wanting to reach Sampson was the primary reason for the three-way calls. When asked why, in light of the June 13, 2006 clarification received from the Committee concerning three-way recruiting phone calls, Senderoff would presume it would be permissible to connect Sampson into three-way calls, he responded that in retrospect it was "stupid" for him to not have checked with the compliance staff. He further noted that by remaining silent on the line he thought he was abiding by the spirit of the sanction.

During his November 16, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff, Senderoff again admitted that he received the June 13, 2006 clarification from the Committee regarding three-way recruiting phone calls with Sampson. In response to a question regarding why the majority of impermissible three-way calls occurred after receiving the email, Senderoff responded "That's a good question. It's a mistake I made." **(November 16, 2007 Senderoff Interview Transcript at p. 31, located on NCAA custodial website.)** He further explained that when somebody was trying to reach Sampson and did not get him successfully or a call was dropped, Senderoff tried to help. Senderoff stated that he did not know if Sampson was aware that he was connecting him via three-way technology.

Knowing Participation in Impermissible Three-Way Telephone Conversations (Allegation No. 4-a). In light of the evidence and testimony set forth in the responses to Allegation Nos. 1-a and 3-a, it is apparent that Senderoff knowingly participated in impermissible three-way telephone conversations between himself, Sampson, prospects and their

parents, legal guardian(s) or coaches, despite being instructed not to do so by the University's compliance staff and despite receiving specific clarification from the Committee on Infractions.

In his July 16 initial meeting with the University regarding the three-way calls, Senderoff stated that he did not announce the calls and that he never participated in the conversations or made Sampson aware that he was on a call. In his July 20 interview with the University, Senderoff again reported that he could not recall anytime that anything he said would have alerted Sampson to his presence on the call. These unequivocal denials shifted slightly during his next interview with the University on August 23 when he stated that he had no recollection of ever participating in any of the three-way conversations and that he did not recall ever introducing the prospects. Although he was not 100% certain that he had never introduced Sampson onto a call, he said he did not believe he ever did. Senderoff also noted that he would not refute what others said, but that he would be surprised if their recollection differed from his own. Similarly, in his November 16, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff, Senderoff explained how he operated silently, sort of as an operator, but noted that if others recalled that they all communicated, he would not argue with them. In response to further questioning, Senderoff stated that he thought Sampson knew that Senderoff had transferred one call from Blair.

From the discussion of the testimony and evidence presented in the response to Allegation No. 3-a above, it is reasonable to conclude that despite these denials, Senderoff, in fact did participate in some of the three-way conversations and also introduced some of the

prospects to Sampson, in violation of Penalty L (Gates, Buford, Blair, Jackson, McCamey and [redacted]).

Knowing Participation in Impermissible Speakerphone Recruiting Calls (Allegation No. 4-a-(1)). Based on the information discussed above in response to Allegation No. 3-a-(1) and the testimony, information and evidence regarding the calls to Marcus and [redacted], the University has determined that it is reasonable to conclude that Senderoff knowingly participated in the calls.

Knowing Participation in Impermissible Phone Passing (Allegation No. 4-a-(2)). Based on the information discussed above in response to Allegation No. 3-a-(2) and the testimony, information and evidence regarding the calls to Frease, it is reasonable to conclude that one or more of these calls occurred and that Senderoff knew that passing the phone to Sampson so that he could speak to Frease was impermissible under Penalty L.

Knowing Participation in Impermissible Recruiting Call Placed by Senderoff (Allegation Nos. 4-a-(3) and (4)). The University has determined that based on the information discussed above in response to Allegation No. 3-a-(3) and (4), and the information and testimony provided by the prospects and the mother of a prospect, some of which was corroborated by phone records or other independent evidence, it is reasonable to conclude that Senderoff, when present with prospects or their relatives (Blair, Coker, [redacted] and Erica), called Sampson so that he could speak to the prospects and relatives. The University has also determined that it is

reasonable to conclude that Senderoff knew that calling Sampson and allowing him to engage in the recruiting calls was impermissible under Penalty L.

Discussion of Allegation Regarding Senderoff's Provision of False and Misleading Information (Allegation No. 4-b)

The University incorporates all of the relevant information included in the response to Allegation No. 1 and 2 and Allegation No. 3-a.

The University agrees that Senderoff did not submit accurate documentation regarding the phones he used for recruiting on numerous occasions and that this failure constitutes a violation of the principles of ethical conduct in that he repeatedly furnished the University with false and misleading information. Specifically, Senderoff never reported the use of his home phone for recruiting on any of the monthly sheets that he submitted from April 2006 through May 2007, despite the fact that he made approximately 75 recruiting calls from home during that time frame and during most of those months. **(See Attachment G of the October 3 report for these forms.)** Further, he failed to then report the calls he made from home so that they could be entered into the athletics department recruiting database "Cybersports" for monitoring by the compliance staff. As a result, approximately 40 phone calls that were placed from his home phone were contrary to the sanctions and approximately 23 were in violation of NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2. **(See Attachment 7.)** In addition, these unrecorded calls from his home phone also triggered other, previously permissible calls to be counted as impermissible after the home calls were properly logged during the University's investigation.

The University's September 12, 2007 interview with Senderoff primarily concerned his unreported use of his home phone for recruiting phone calls. In that interview and in his subsequent November 16, 2007 interview with the NCAA Enforcement Staff, Senderoff offered little explanation as to why he neither reported the use of his home phone for recruiting nor the actual recruiting calls that were made. He explained that when he reported information regarding his recruiting calls to be included in Cybersports, he would scroll down the list of calls he made from his cell phone and list those that were related to recruiting. Even though the phone log sheets included a column for recording the phone used for each recruiting call **(see Attachment 17),** Senderoff reported that he forgot to include the calls from his home phone since he submitted this information while in the office. Senderoff further stated that when submitting his monthly forms indicating the phones he used for recruiting he forgot to include his home phone. He admitted that this practice was sloppy and/or careless and that he had obviously done a bad job in not logging all of his calls.

Although Senderoff used his cell phone for the vast majority of his recruiting calls and the 1300 calls from his cell phone each month far exceeded the number of phone calls he made from home, it is apparent that the use of his home phone for unreported recruiting calls was problematic. In fact over half of the recruiting calls that he made from home were contrary to the Committee's sanctions or NCAA rules. Further, these calls from Senderoff's home phone account for over half of the phone calls that violated NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 and a significant percentage (approximately 30%) of the calls that were contrary to the sanctions. And that does not include the calls that triggered other previously permissible calls to now be counted as impermissible. Thus, had Senderoff properly reported all of his recruiting calls and the use of

his home phone, many of the phone calls discussed in Allegation Nos. 1-b and 2 would not have occurred.

Also, please provide the following:

a. A detailed description and explanation of all disciplinary actions taken against Senderoff based on his involvement in or knowledge of violations of the Committee on Infractions' restrictions, as determined by the institution and as detailed in this inquiry. In that regard, please provide an explanation as to the reasons the institution believes these actions were appropriate, indicate the dates that any disciplinary actions were taken and submit copies of all correspondence from the institution to Senderoff describing the disciplinary actions taken.

See the response to the Allegations above and **Section D** later in this response for information regarding the disciplinary actions taken.

When Senderoff resigned from his employment at the University, a letter of reprimand regarding his conduct was incomplete, was in draft form and was thus never finalized or transmitted to him.

b. A statement indicating Senderoff s dates of employment at the institution and positions held by Senderoff at the institution.

Start Date:	April 17, 2006
End Date:	October 29, 2007
Position:	Assistant Men’s Basketball Coach

c. A list of all of the dates Senderoff was interviewed by the institution or provided information to institutional administrators about his knowledge of or involvement in the violations set forth in this allegation. Please include a statement detailing the information reported by Senderoff to the institution and athletics department staff members concerning the violations set forth in this allegation.

<u>Dates of Formal Communication with Senderoff</u>

July 16, 2007: Meeting with athletics administrators

July 20, 2007: Interview with University administrators and outside counsel

August 23, 2007: Interview with University administrators and outside counsel

September 12, 2007: Interview with University administrators and outside counsel

November 16, 2007: Interview with NCAA Enforcement Staff

January 31, 2008: Interview with NCAA Enforcement Staff

See the response to the Allegations above for the relevant information reported by Senderoff.

5. [NCAA Bylaws 13.12.1.3 and 13.2.2-(b)]

On June 30, 2007, Kelvin Sampson, head men's basketball coach, and Jeff Meyer, assistant men's basketball coach engaged in an impermissible recruiting contact with a prospective student-athlete. On July 1, 2007, Meyer provided the prospective student-athlete with an impermissible benefit.

a. Concerning Sampson's and Meyer's impermissible recruiting contact, it was reported that Sampson and Meyer impermissibly recruited prospective student-athlete Derek Elston (Tipton, Indiana) during Elston's participation in the institution's two-day sports camp held June 30 and July 1, 2007. [NCAA Bylaw 13.12.1.3]

Specifically, on June 30, 2006, Meyer arranged a meeting between himself, Sampson, Elston and Elston's coach, Travis Daugherty, head boys' basketball coach at Tipton High School. The meeting took place on the evening of June 30 in the men's basketball coaches' locker room in Assembly Hall after Elston's team had finished competition for the day. During the meeting, Elston was told that he was the type of player they would like to have playing basketball at the institution. At the conclusion of the meeting, Meyer told Daugherty that the institution planned to offer Elston a scholarship at a later date. At the time of the meeting, Elston had not concluded all camp activities, and in fact, Elston participated in camp activities the following day, July 1, 2007.

b. Concerning Meyer's provision of an impermissible benefit, it is alleged that Meyer provided Elston a gift of clothing and equipment prior to Elston's departure from this institutional camp. [NCAA Bylaw 13.2.2-(b)]

Specifically, after Elston had concluded camp activities July 1, 2007, but prior to Elston's departure from the institution's campus, Meyer again spoke with Elston and Daugherty. During the conversation, Meyer retrieved at least one drawstring backpack and at least one T-shirt from an area where Indiana University, Bloomington, merchandise was being sold. Meyer then handed the items to Daugherty while in the presence of Elston and made a statement indicating that Daugherty should give the items to Elston on their return home. On returning home, Daugherty gave the backpack and T-shirt to Elston.

Please indicate whether this information is substantially correct and whether the institution agrees that violations of NCAA legislation occurred. If the institution agrees that violations of NCAA legislation occurred, please indicate whether the institution believes that the violations are major or secondary violations. Submit evidence to support your response.

Overview of the University's Position

The University agrees the information set forth in Allegation No. 5 is substantially correct, and that violations of NCAA legislation have occurred. For the reasons set forth below and in an October 26 report to the NCAA, the University believes these violations should be considered secondary in nature pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 19.02.2.1 as they were each isolated; provided at most a minimum, if any recruiting, competitive or other advantage; and did not include any significant recruiting inducement or extra benefit.

Review of Impermissible Recruiting Contact (Allegation No. 5-a)

The University reported the information that is the subject of Allegation No. 5-a in a December 18 secondary violation report and student-athlete reinstatement request, which revised some information previously reported in an October 26 report/request. **(See Attachments 21 and 22 for the December 18 and October 26 secondary reports/reinstatement requests, respectively.)** The context of the violation reported was modified due to the receipt of clarifying information from the involved prospect, his high school coach, Meyer and Sampson. Although some of the supporting information changed, the substance of the violation remained the same.

Specifically, a violation of NCAA Bylaw 13.12.1.3 occurred when prospective student-athlete Derek Elston ("Elston") was invited into the coaches' lockerroom for a recruiting meeting (i.e., an unofficial visit) on the evening of June 30, his first day of participation in a two-day

institutional camp. Because this recruiting meeting occurred during the time period that the camp was conducted, it was not permissible.

Facts of the Violation. The prospect's high school team participated in an institutional team camp on June 30 and July 1. Most of his team's games took place in the University's HPER gym on Saturday, June 30; however, his team's last game took place in Assembly Hall. After the last game, Elston stayed with a teammate who was getting treatment in Assembly Hall for an injury that was sustained during the last game. The rest of the team and one of the team's assistant coaches went back to their off-campus hotel. At some point that evening, Elston and his head coach, Travis Daugherty ("Daugherty"), went into the coaches' locker room in Assembly Hall to meet with Sampson and Meyer. They did not leave campus or Assembly Hall between the end of their game and this meeting. Further, the next day, Elston returned with his team to campus to participate in the second and final day of the two-day team camp; thereby rendering the meeting on June 30 contrary to Bylaw 13.12.1.3.

Meyer was the main organizer of the meeting. According to his statement and testimony, he realized the morning of June 30 that the coaches could not meet with the prospect following the camp's conclusion on July 1, as would have been permissible if the camp had occurred earlier in June, due to the impermissibility of unofficial visits during July. He reported he believed that NCAA rules would allow a meeting with the prospect if the prospect had been dismissed from the camp and team obligations at the end of the day on June 30. During the afternoon or evening of June 30, Meyer informed Daugherty that the University's coaches would

like to meet with him and Elston but that the prospect had to be dismissed from camp prior to the meeting.

Meyer thought if he suggested that the prospect leave campus after the last game on June 30, because all camp activity for the day had been completed, this would constitute dismissal from the camp. He apparently did not understand that dismissal was not possible until the camp was over or the team had finished its participation. In trying to avoid an issue with the "no July unofficial visit rule" Meyer did not take enough care to ensure the accuracy of his understanding of what would be considered dismissal from camp. In retrospect, Meyer admitted he should have contacted the compliance office for an interpretation regarding what they could do. Sampson reported he believed this meeting was permissible based on the information Meyer shared with him regarding his incorrect understanding that Elston had been dismissed from the camp.

No scholarship was directly offered at the meeting on June 30. However, as they left the meeting, Daugherty asked Meyer if a scholarship had been offered. Meyer responded they could not make an offer while the prospect was on campus but that was what they planned to do. Elston reported in his January 17, 2008 interview conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by the University, that he was not aware of this conversation. It should be noted the statement that he submitted to the University **(see Attachment 21)**, which does reference a scholarship offer, was drafted by Daugherty and that Elston stated several times in his interview that he did not recall a scholarship offer following the July 30 meeting.

Penalties and Corrective Actions. In response to this violation, the University limited the men's basketball staff to six recruiting opportunities for Elston during his junior year and six during his senior year, with only two of those for off-campus contacts. Meyer and Sampson were issued letters of reprimand. (**See Attachment 15** for the letters issued to Sampson and Meyer.) The University also discussed the relevant legislation with Meyer in September and with Sampson in October. It was also reviewed with the entire men's basketball staff on October 23, 2007.

Review of Provision of T-Shirts and Drawstring Backpack (Allegation No. 5-b)

During the January 17, 2008 interviews of Daugherty and Elston, which were conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by the University, both individuals reported that Meyer provided Daugherty with at least one drawstring backpack, containing at least one T-shirt. The University has determined the T-shirts would each be valued at $12 and the drawstring backpacks at $20. Thus, assuming that at most there were two backpacks and two T-shirts, the total value of the merchandise provided was at most $64.

Summary of Interview Testimony. Daugherty reported in his interview that on the second day of the camp on July 1, he recalled Meyer talking with him and Elston. He recounted that after Elston had noticed [redacted] keeping score at a nearby court and commented that he was tempted to get his autograph for his sister's boyfriend, Meyer joked that Elston might someday be better. Daugherty also stated that Meyer gave him two bags that he thought contained T-shirts, stating that Daugherty should give them to Elston when they returned

home. Daugherty thought the intent was for the items to be given to Elston's sister and her boyfriend. Daugherty stated that when he subsequently became concerned that he had violated an Indiana High School Athletic Association (IHSAA) rule, he called Meyer and asked him if he could send him money to pay for the shirts and then sent him a $20 check. Daugherty reported that Meyer stated if he felt like that's what he needed to do, then he should do it.

In his interview, which was conducted by the NCAA Enforcement Staff and attended by Indiana University and Daugherty, Elston provided information that corroborated Daugherty's statements. Specifically, he reported that as [redacted] passed by and Elston commented about getting his autograph, Meyer commented that [redacted] should be getting Elston's autograph. He also remembered Meyer handing Daugherty one bag and two shirts. Elston reported Meyer stated that Elston could not take the bag and shirt but that he was going to give them to Daugherty and that whatever Daugherty did with them was up to him. Elston said he received the bag and T-shirts when he returned to his school and gave them to his sister's boyfriend.

Meyer was consistent in reporting both in his written statement **(see Attachment 21)** and in his January 29, 2008 interview conducted by the NCAA and attended by the University, that he did not recall watching Elston play or meeting with him on Sunday. Further, Meyer reported in his interview that he did not remember providing Daugherty with the drawstring backpacks or T-shirts. In response to the information Daugherty reported regarding the conversation he had with Meyer about his concerns with IHSAA rules, Meyer recalled Daugherty raising the issue but stated he told Daugherty at that time he did not recall providing him with a backpack or T-

shirts. It was not clear from Meyer's interview whether he remembered telling Daugherty to do whatever he felt he needed to do in this subsequent conversation.

Discussion of the Bylaw Citation. The NCAA Enforcement Staff has cited NCAA Bylaw 13.2.2-(b), which specifically prohibits providing a prospect or a prospect's relatives or friends with gifts of clothing or equipment. If the T-shirts and drawstring backpack(s) were intended for Elston or his sister or her boyfriend, this citation is appropriate.

However, it is possible that Meyer intended to provide the items to Daugherty, which would be a violation of NCAA Bylaw 13.8.2, precluding an institution from providing the coach of a prospect with material benefits, including a gift such as a tangible item bearing the institution's insignia. It should also be noted Meyer and Daugherty have a pre-existing relationship as a result of Meyer's close relationship with Daugherty's father who was his college roommate and teammate.

The University raises this issue only to ensure that the appropriate bylaw is cited. The University believes a secondary violation occurred regardless of the bylaw citation and defers to the Committee regarding the determination of the appropriate citation.

Also, please provide the following:

a. A detailed description and explanation of all disciplinary actions taken against Meyer based on his involvement in or knowledge of violations of NCAA legislation, as determined by the institution and as detailed in this inquiry. In that regard, please provide an explanation as to the reasons the institution believes these actions were appropriate, indicate the dates that

any disciplinary actions were taken and submit copies of all correspondence from the institution to Meyer describing the disciplinary actions taken.

See the response to the Allegation above. See **Attachments 21 and 22** for the University's self-report, which included the corrective actions taken, and **Attachment 15** for Meyer's November 1, 2007 letter of reprimand.

b. The reason the impermissible recruiting contact occurred, in light of NCAA legislation prohibiting such conduct.

See the response to the Allegation above.

c. The reason the impermissible benefit was provided to Elston, in light of NCAA legislation prohibiting such conduct.

See the response to the Allegation above.

d. The identities of all athletics department staff members involved in or having knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit by Elston. Also, provide a description of this involvement or knowledge prior to, at the time of and subsequent to the receipt of the impermissible benefit.

No members of the University's athletics administration had any knowledge of the violation regarding the impermissible benefit (T-shirt and drawstring backpack) until the January 17, 2008 interviews with Elston and Daugherty. See the response to the Allegation above regarding Meyer's role in the allegation. The University has no information regarding the knowledge of any other member of the men's basketball staff.

e. A statement summarizing the institution's efforts to reinstate Elston's eligibility. Please include copies of the institution's October 26, 2007, reinstatement request for Elston; the institution's December 18, 2007, revised reinstatement request for Elston; and the reinstatement staffs decision letter. Please include copies of all written statements obtained from Sampson, Meyer, Elston and Daugherty during the institution's efforts to reinstate Elston's eligibility.

See **Attachments 21 and 22** for the October 26 and December 18, 2007 reinstatement requests for Elston, which include the requested statements from Sampson, Meyer, Elston and Daugherty. See the response to the Allegation above for information regarding the University's reinstatement requests on behalf of Elston. See **Attachment 23** for the NCAA Student-Athlete Reinstatement Staff's decision.

D. CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AND PENALTIES.

The University remains troubled by the fact that the impermissible calls detailed in this response occurred and that they happened during a time when the men's basketball program, particularly the coaching staff, should have had a heightened awareness of and commitment to total compliance with NCAA rules and sanctions. Instead, in addition to the occurrence of impermissible three-way recruiting calls initiated by a then assistant coach and involving Sampson, the University's then assistant men's basketball coaches made recruiting calls from home, despite reporting on monthly forms that home phones were not used for recruiting. The fact these calls were then not reported and were not able to be monitored or reviewed by the compliance office caused concern as well. The University was also disappointed in the information discovered during its investigation and finds the new information revealed during the Enforcement Staff's investigation at least as troubling, including the additional impermissible calls and the unethical conduct.

It must be noted, however, of the 126 phone calls contrary to the sanctions, 59% (75 calls) were one or two minutes in duration.[53] Further, almost 80% (99 calls) were less than ten minutes and only five calls (4%) lasted more than 20 minutes.[54] Similarly, with the calls that resulted in NCAA violations, approximately 57% lasted one or two minutes, 86% were ten minutes or less and there were no calls longer than 20 minutes. In addition, as noted above, the University took a very conservative and strict approach to identify all potentially impermissible phone calls and include them in the determination of the appropriate sanctions. This methodology resulted in a multiplier effect as, for example, one phone call placed in an "off month" would then cause many previously permissible phone calls in the next month (including attempts to contact a prospect as well as the actual phone conversation) to become impermissible. The University recognized that this approach would increase the number of calls deemed contrary to the sanctions, but determined it was important to identify and present the maximum scope of the issues.

In light of the actions of the men's basketball coaches and the calls that were contrary to the sanctions and to NCAA rules, the University determined in mid-September 2007 that significant additional sanctions were necessary. These penalties were designed to directly impact the coaches involved as well as the men's basketball program as a whole. Following the receipt of the February 8, 2008 Notice of Allegations, the University carefully reassessed the penalties in light of the new information that had been developed during the NCAA Enforcement Staff's investigation. The University determined the penalties that were initially imposed were sufficient to respond to the violations that had occurred, even with the new information and violations. For example, Penalty 2-c below, which reduces by half the number of permissible calls to prospects during their senior year of high school, results in a reduction of 700 calling opportunities plus an additional reduction of 350 calls for Sampson and the subsequent head coaches.

[53] As noted above, these one or two minute calls, although impermissible, did not likely result in any substantive conversation, particularly given the fact that cell phone companies begin counting minutes while the phone is still ringing and round-up calls to the next minute (e.g., a one minute, ten second call counts as two minutes).
[54] Seven calls were for an unknown duration.

Further, the University left its original penalties largely intact despite the complete turnover in the coaching staff. When Senderoff resigned on October 29, 2007, the University transferred Penalty 2-a to another assistant coach. Similarly, when Sampson resigned on February 22, 2008, the subsequent two head coaches operated subject to Penalties 2-c and 2-d. All of the penalties regarding phone calls have remained unchanged.

In April 2008, however, the University determined that it was necessary and appropriate to adjust two of its initial penalties, which, because of the coaching staff changes, were going to have far greater detrimental and harmful impacts than were anticipated upon their imposition last fall. The University thus made the modifications indicated below to Penalty 2-f that limited the off-campus recruiting days for Sampson and to Penalty 2-g that reduced the number of permissible official visits. It should be noted these penalties were modified and not withdrawn; thus, penalties in these areas remain. In addition, the University has added an additional penalty that reduces by two the number of recruiting days in July 2008 – one day during each evaluation segment – where none of the men's basketball coaches will be allowed to recruit off campus.

The University believes, although these limited adjustments provide necessary relief for the current men's basketball coaching staff, all of whom were completely uninvolved in the violations, they do not alter the strength of the initial penalties in any material way, particularly since the phone call restrictions remain intact. In addition, the four off-campus recruiting days used by the interim head coach had no impact and brought no benefit to the men's basketball program or the University. Further, in large part because the University carefully evaluated the need for these modifications, the men's basketball coaching staff missed 22 days of off-campus recruiting and the head coach was not able to recruit off-campus for 14 permissible recruiting days (i.e., this number does not include the dead periods), until April 26.

Indiana University took and continues to take this matter very seriously and understands the ban on Sampson making recruiting calls was intended to limit his and the basketball program's ability to recruit prospects, as were the other sanctions reducing the number of permissible calls. Accordingly, Indiana University has designed the following sanctions to address any impact from the impermissible calls and to send a strong message that complete commitment to NCAA compliance continues to be expected and required of all coaches and staff.

1. Corrective Actions

a. Sampson voluntarily agreed in September 2007 to forego, over the next twelve-month period, his scheduled $500,000 raise for this current contract year.

b. Senderoff and Meyer were not entitled to any bonuses for the 2007-08 academic year and would not have been entitled to any salary increases for the 2008-09 academic year had they remained employed at the University.

c. Letters of reprimand were issued to Sampson and Meyer on November 1, 2007. **(See Attachment 15.)** [Note: Senderoff's letter of reprimand was never issued due to his resignation on October 29, 2007.]

d. A letter was included in the personnel file for McCallum on November 1, 2007.

e. Had he remained employed at the University, Senderoff would have been required to sign a form each month reminding him of these corrective actions and sanctions, and would have been required to submit his monthly home phone records for review, in addition to his cell and office phone records.

f. The compliance office will conduct mandatory compliance meetings every other week for the full men's basketball coaching staff (i.e., head coach, assistant coaches, and director of basketball operations) for one year beginning September 17, 2007.

g. Had they remained employed at the University, Sampson and Senderoff would have been required to attend at their own expense the same 2008 NCAA Regional Rules Seminar as a member of the University's compliance staff. Meyer and McCallum would also have been required to attend the seminar had they remained employed.

h. The University ceased the recruitment of prospective student-athlete Jonathon "Bud" Mackey, the subject of the majority (22) of the NCAA violations.

i. In response to the impermissible contact with a prospect, as set forth above in the response to Allegation No. 5-a, the University discussed the relevant legislation with Meyer in September 2007 and with Sampson in October 2007. The legislation was also reviewed with all of the then men's basketball staff on October 23, 2007.

2. Self-Imposed Sanctions

a. The University, effective September 17, 2007, reduced the number of coaches allowed to be involved in recruiting by one through July 31, 2008. Specifically, Senderoff was prohibited from: (i) making ANY phone calls that relate in any way to recruiting (whether or not they are countable under NCAA rules); and (ii) engaging in any off-campus recruiting activities. Upon Senderoff's resignation, another assistant coach is serving the remainder of this sanction.

b. The University will reduce by one the number of men's basketball financial aid awards for the 2008-09 academic year.

c. The University will reduce the number of permissible calls to prospects on or after August 1 of their senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week from September 17, 2007, through the end of the regular National Letter of Intent signing period (May 21, 2008). Further, Sampson and the subsequent head coaches were only eligible to make every other one of these phone calls.

[Note: With approximately 20 senior recruits and a 35-week period, this sanction reduces calling opportunities by approximately 700 phone calls, including an additional reduction of 350 calls for Sampson and the subsequent head coaches].

d. The University will reduce the number of phone calls Sampson and the subsequent head coaches are permitted to make to junior prospective student-athletes to every other one of the monthly calls to junior prospects beginning September 17, 2007, and ending July 31, 2008.

[Note: With approximately 177 junior recruits and a 10-month period, this sanction reduces Sampson's and the subsequent head coaches' calling opportunities by approximately 885 phone calls.]

e. The University limited Sampson to four (4) off-campus recruiting contact days during the fall 2007 contact period.

f. The University limited Sampson to no more than ten (10) additional off-campus recruiting days to be used from the conclusion of the fall contact period (October 5, 2007) through July 31, 2008.

[Note: Sampson's typical practice was to divide the off-campus recruiting person-days by the four coaches. Therefore, since there are 130 recruiting person-days during the academic year and 20 person-days by three coaches during the July recruiting period, his off-campus recruiting days were reduced from approximately 48 (130 + (20 x 3) = 190 ÷ 4 coaches = 48) to 14, a 71% reduction.]

April 2008 Revision. Because the ten off-campus recruiting days allotted to Sampson in this penalty were all used (six by Sampson and four by the interim head coach, Dan Dakich) prior to the hiring of Tom Crean, the current head men's basketball coach, the University determined that he should be allowed 10 off-campus recruiting days through July 31, 2008. Limiting the current head coach to 10 off-campus recruiting days through July 31, 2008 is still a penalty as the number of days a head coach may

recruit off-campus is not normally limited other than the 130 person-day-limit for off-campus recruiting. The University imposed this revised penalty even though it could have taken the position that the initial penalty was intended for Sampson personally and not for the position of head men's basketball coach.

g. The University will reduce the number of permissible official paid visits from 12 to six (6) during the 2007-08 academic year.

April 2008 Revision. Because all six of the official visits permitted under this penalty were used by the prior men's basketball coaching staffs, the University decided to allow the current men's basketball coaching staff to award two additional official visits for the remainder of the current academic year.[55] This modified limit of eight official visits is still below the NCAA limit of 12 and the University's four-year average of 9.25.

h. Indiana University will submit a report to the Committee on Infractions by September 30, 2008, documenting the University's compliance with these additional sanctions.

i. Additional self-imposed penalty. The University will reduce by two the number of recruiting days allowed in July 2008 under NCAA Bylaw 30.10.1-(g) and (i), with one evaluation day being reduced in each evaluation segment. None of the men's basketball coaches will be allowed to recruit off campus on those two days.

j. In response to the impermissible contact with a prospect, as set forth above in the response to Allegation No. 5-a, the University will limit the men's basketball staff to six recruiting opportunities for the prospect during his junior year and six during his senior year, instead of the permissible seven each year. In addition, the number of off-campus contacts allowed during his senior year will be reduced from three to two.

[55] This increase from six to eight official visits is consistent with the waiver available under NCAA Bylaw 13.6.2.7 that allows institutions to provide additional official visits after a new head coach is hired if the prior coach has used 75% or more of the permitted official visits.

E. REQUESTED INFORMATION

6. Please provide all information concerning other possible violations of NCAA legislation discovered by the institution as a result of its review of this matter. In this regard, please indicate the means by which the information was discovered and the institution's position regarding whether a violation of NCAA legislation occurred.

As discussed in the response to the Allegations above, during the investigation, additional impermissible phone calls were found by the University that were not included in its October 3, 2007 report to the Committee on Infractions. Also as set forth above, additional information regarding the violations was revealed during the NCAA Enforcement Staff's investigation.

7. Please 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 why the institution believes these actions to be appropriate and identify the violations on which the actions were based. Additionally, indicate the date(s) that any corrective or punitive actions were implemented.

See **Section D** above for the corrective actions and penalties self-imposed by the University.

8. Please 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 that 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.

See **Section D** above for the disciplinary actions taken and **Attachment 15** for the letters issued to the coaching staff.

9. Please provide a statement indicating the dates and titles of all positions at the institution held by individuals identified during the inquiry as allegedly having significant involvement in violations of NCAA legislation, as well as a brief overview of each position. Additionally, provide the dates, title and employer of all positions held by such individuals during the five years prior to the dates of the alleged violations. Furthermore, provide a brief review of the previous major infractions case history for the identified individuals.

Coach	Institution	Dates	Position	Responsibilities
Sampson	Indiana University	March 2006-February 2008	Head Men's Basketball Coach	Oversaw Men's Basketball program
	Oklahoma University	1994-March 2006	Head Men's Basketball Coach	Oversaw Men's Basketball program
Senderoff	Indiana University	April 2006-October 2007	Assistant Men's Basketball Coach	Recruiting; other game/practice activities.
	Kent State University	2002-2006	Assistant Men's Basketball Coach	Recruiting; other game/practice activities.
Meyer	Indiana University	2006-2008	Assistant Men's Basketball Coach	Recruiting; worked with guards
	University of Missouri	2004-2006	Assistant Men's Basketball Coach	Recruiting; other game/practice activities.
	Butler University	2001-2004	Assistant Men's Basketball Coach	Recruiting; other game/practice activities.

10. Please provide a short summary of every major infractions case involving the institution or individuals named in this notice. In this summary, provide the date of the infractions report, a description of the violations found by the Committee on Infractions, the individuals involved, and the penalties and corrective actions. Additionally, please provide a copy of any major infractions reports involving the institution or individuals named in this notice that were issued by the Committee on Infractions within the last 10 years.

Indiana University Major Infractions History

Date	Description of Violations	Individuals/ Sport involved	Penalties and Corrective Actions
4/27/1960	Improper recruiting inducements and lodging.	Football Assistant Coach Boosters	No NCAA voting and committee privileges during probationary period; postseason (all); television ban (all sports).
10/15/1957	Improper recruiting inducements.	Football Head Coach	Probation.

Kelvin Sampson Major Infractions History

Date	Description of Violations	Individuals/ Sport involved	Penalties and Corrective Actions
5/25/2006 **(See Attachment 24 for the public infractions report)**	Violations of NCAA legislation governing impermissible telephone contacts with prospective student-athletes.	Basketball Men's Basketball coaching staff (head coach and two assistance coaches)	Penalties imposed on Sampson by the committee were: show cause order for a period of one-year for the former head men's basketball coach; and a restriction on recruiting phone calls and contacts.

11. Please provide a chart depicting the institution's reporting history of secondary violations for the past five years. In this chart, please indicate for each academic year the number of total secondary violations reported involving the institution or individuals named in this notice. Also, please include the applicable bylaws for each violation, and then indicate the number of secondary violations involving just the sports team(s) named in this notice for the same five-year time period.

See **Attachment 25.**

12. Please provide the institution's overall NCAA division and conference affiliation, as well as the institution's total enrollment and the number of men's and women's sports programs sponsored by the institution.

Indiana University

Division:	Division I – Bowl Championship Subdivision
Conference:	Big Ten Conference
Total Enrollment:	38,990 (Fall 2007)
Men's Sports:	11
Women's Sports:	13

13. Please 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 athletics programs during the previous four years, and whether the institution conducts a systematic review of NCAA and institutional regulations for its athletics department employees. If yes, identify the agency, individual or committee responsible for this review and describe the responsibilities and functions of each identified.

As can be seen on the attached organizational chart **(See Attachment 26)**, the director of athletics has eight senior staff members who manage the daily operations of all facets of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. Three of these senior staff members currently have supervisory responsibilities for the Olympic sports (Janet Kittell, Chris Reynolds, and Jack Garrett). This structure has been consistent for the past two years. For the two years prior, Olympic sports were supervised by Chris Reynolds and Mary Ann Rohleder, also part of the department's senior staff.

Director of Athletics Rick Greenspan supervises football and men's and women's basketball, and has done so since arriving at Indiana University four years ago. For the past two years, Senior Associate Athletic Director Tim Fitzpatrick has served as the liaison to these programs, coordinating sport operational and scheduling issues.

The institution conducts a systematic and regular review of institutional and NCAA regulations for its athletics department employees. Extensive rules education has been

the hallmark of the Indiana University compliance program since the 1960's. As of 2008, the assistant athletic director for compliance and the director of compliance share equally in rules education responsibilities, with assistance by the director of eligibility and systems, the director of eligibility and program planning, the financial aid officer, and the initial eligibility officer.

The rules education program begins each year in August with a department-wide staff meeting where the institution's commitment to rules compliance is overviewed by the faculty athletics representative, and where all current departmental employees sign the Institutional Certification of Compliance form. Monthly compliance meetings are held throughout the regular academic year for all head and assistant coaches. In addition, operational area (e.g., ticket office, training room, academic support, etc.) or sport-specific compliance meetings are held annually, and additional meetings are scheduled as needed or prior to key events (e.g., recruiting periods, camps, winter and summer breaks, etc.) with coaches, administrators, and professional and clerical support personnel. Further, the compliance office sends out an email update weekly, and produces a monthly compliance newsletter, both distributed to all departmental employees.

14. Please provide the following information concerning the men's basketball program identified in this inquiry:

a. The average number of initial and total grants-in-aid that have been awarded during the past four academic years.

Grants-in-aid: Men's Basketball

Year	Total	Initial
2006-07	11	4
2005-06	13	5
2004-05	13	6
2003-04	12	2
Average	12.25	4.25

b. 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 being in effect for the following academic year.

Grants-in-aid: Men's Basketball

Year	Total	Initial
2007-08	13	7
2008-09	10*	7

*plus a reduction of one scholarship as a self-imposed penalty, and a reduction of two additional scholarships as a result of an APR contemporaneous penalty.

c. The identities of all student-athletes anticipated to be on athletically related financial aid as of the first semester of the next academic year who will have four years of remaining eligibility and the identities of those individuals who have five years of enrollment (per the NCAA's five-year rule) to complete those four years; the identities of all student-athletes who have three years of remaining eligibility and the identities of those individuals who have four years of remaining enrollment to complete those three years; the identities of all student-athletes who have two years of remaining eligibility and the identities of those individuals who have three years of remaining enrollment to complete those two years; and the identities of all student-athletes who have one year of remaining eligibility and the identities of those individuals who have two years of remaining enrollment to complete that year.

Projections for Four Years of Eligibility Remaining as of fall 2008-09[56]:

Four Years of Eligibility in Five years as of fall 2008-09 (If NCAA Qualifiers)
Incoming Freshmen 2008-09 who have signed the National Letter of Intent[57]:

1. [redacted]
2. [redacted]
3. [redacted]

Three Years of Eligibility in Four Years as of fall 2008-09:

1. [redacted]
2. [redacted]

Two Years of Eligibility in Three Years as of fall 2008-09:

1. [redacted] (4-2-4 transfer; initial full-time collegiate enrollment was Fall 2006)

One Year of Eligibility in One Year as of fall 2008-09:

1. [redacted] (redshirt walk-on 2004-05; 2005-06; 2006-07. Received athletics aid in 2007-08. Aid undetermined for the 2007-08 academic year.)

[56] The grants-in-aid reported above in 13.b included three additional anticipated signees, who are not listed below because they have not, as of the date of this response, signed a National Letter of Intent.
[57] Note: The University released two other signed prospects, Terrell Holloway and Devin Ebanks, from their National Letters of Intent on March 20, 2008 and March 26, 2008, respectively.

d. The average number of student-athletes during the previous four years who have redshirted and the number of student-athletes redshirting during the current academic year (or upcoming academic year if regular academic year is not in session).

Average number of student-athletes redshirted over four previous years: **0.75**
Number of student-athletes redshirted during current year 2007-08: **0**

e. The number of student-athletes in each of the previous four years who were awarded athletically related financial aid but withdrew from the squad for reasons other than graduation or loss of eligibility.

Year	No. of Athletes
2007-08	4 Number is not final
2006-07	3
2005-06	2
2004-05	3
2003-04	1

f. A list of the institution's win-loss record for the past four seasons and the dates and results of all postseason competition in which the institution has participated during those years. If there was a postseason competition, please indicate how this was earned; i.e., conference automatic bid, at-large bid.

Year	Record	Postseason	Postseason Earned	Date/Opponent
2007-08	25-8	NCAA Tournament	At-Large Bid	3/21/08: Arkansas L (86-72)
2006-07	21-11	NCAA Tournament	At-Large Bid	3/15/07: Gonzaga W (7057) 3/17/07: UCLA L (54-49)
2005-06	19-12	NCAA Tournament	At-Large Bid	3/16/06: San Diego State W (87-83) 3/18/06: Gonzaga L (80-90)
2004-05	15-14	NIT Tournament	At-Large Bid	3/15/05: Vanderbilt L (67-60)

g. The average number of official paid visits provided by the institution to prospective student-athletes during the past four years.

Year	Number of Official Visits
2007-08	Ongoing, no final number yet, but limited to 8 per self-imposed sanction
2006-07	9
2005-06	11
2004-05	10
2003-04	7
Average	9.25 (not including 2007-08)

h. The cost of room, board, books and tuition at the institution for the past four academic years.

Year	Tuition	Room	Board	Books	Total
2007-08	In-State: $7,837 Out of State: $22, 316	$4,179	$3,360	$400	In-State: $15,775 Out of State: $30,255
2006-07	In-State: $7,460 Out of State: $20,472	$3,891	$3,328	$400	In-State: $15, 079 Out of State: $28,091
2005-06	In-State: $7,112 Out of State: $19,508	$3,649	$3,328	$400	In-State: $14,489 Out of State: $26,885
2004-05	In-State: $6,777 Out of State: $18,590	$3,523	$3,200	$400	In-State: $13,900 Out of State: $25,713

i. Copies of the institution's squad lists for the past four academic years.

See Attachment 27.

j. Copies of the institution's media guides for the past four academic years.

Please see the media guides enclosed.

k. A review of the institution's obligations (contractual or otherwise) concerning live telecasts of contests during the next three seasons. These should include, but not be limited to, contractual agreements negotiated by the institution's conference and opponent, or through its sports network affiliations.

Effective July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2027, Big Ten Conference member institutions – including Indiana University – granted an Assignment of Rights for television to the conference, which includes the telecast rights to all games in all varsity sports – including men's basketball – worldwide, live and delayed, and in any and all forms of media and distribution technology. Thus, Indiana University's appearances on live telecasts are governed through the Big Ten Conference and specifically through the conference's contracts with CBS, ABC/ESPN and the Big Ten Network (BTN). Big Ten institutions are not permitted to decline or refuse the decision of ABC, ESPN, CBS or The Big Ten Network to produce and telecast a game. The CBS agreement lasts through the 2009-10 season, with an option for CBS to extend for three additional years through the 2012-13 season. The ABC/ESPN contract runs through 2016-17 and requires each men's basketball program to appear in at least one game each season, with a limit of eight or nine such appearances. The Big Ten Tournament is televised by CBS and ABC/ESPN.

All men's basketball games not telecast or distributed by ABC, ESPN or CBS will be produced and distributed by the Big Ten Network. Distribution of men's basketball games on the Big Ten Network may be through traditional television, internet or alternative media. The Big Ten Network will telecast over 100 men's basketball games next season. Thus, the University expects that similar to the 2007-08 season, most, if not all, of its games will be televised through one of these networks during the next three years.

Indiana University's known television commitments for the 2008-09 men's basketball season, beyond those covered generally by the Big Ten Conference are as follows:

November 24-26, EA Sports Maui Classic (3 games), ESPN
December 3, at Wake Forest (Big Ten/ACC Challenge), ESPN

December 6, vs. Gonzaga, Hall of Fame Showcase, ESPN
December 13, at Kentucky, CBS

l. A statement indicating whether the provisions of NCAA 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.

The provisions of NCAA Bylaws 31.2.2.3 and 31.2.2.4 do not apply in this case.

m. A statement indicating whether the provisions of NCAA Bylaw 19.5.2.2-(e) apply to the institution as a result of the involvement of student-athletes in violations noted in this inquiry.

The provisions of NCAA Bylaw 19.5.2.2-(e) do not apply in this case.

List of Attachments to Response

1. October 3, 2007 report to the Committee on Infractions (see other binder for the Attachments)
2. October 25, 2007 self-report and attachments
3. June 12, 2006 clarification letter from Committee on Infractions
4. June 13, 2006 clarification e-mail and memorandum to the men's basketball staff
5. Sample phone bill showing three-way call notations (3W) adjacent to local calls
6. October 30, 2007 Indiana University press conference transcript
7. Summary of impermissible recruiting calls as requested in subquestions 1-a and 2-a
8. March 13, 2008 e-mail containing the interpretation regarding recruiting calls to twins
9. May, 1, 2006 clarification e-mail to Senderoff, including the phone call restrictions
10. Compliance staff notes from men's basketball recruiting meetings
11. Impermissible three-way call chart
12. August 1, 2006 report to the Committee on Infractions
13. E-mails sent to the men's basketball staff specific to the recruiting sanctions
14. E-mails sent to the men's basketball staff concerning general compliance matters
15. Letters of reprimand sent to the involved men's basketball staff
16. Secondary case precedent
17. Men's basketball staff recruiting phone logs during weeks of impermissible calls
18. Cybersports sample of a report regarding recruiting phone calls
19. 2007 Kentucky boys basketball sweet sixteen bracket
20. Cybersports printout containing March 24, 2007 evaluation of Mackey
21. December 18, 2007 revised secondary report and reinstatement request for Elston
22. October 26, 2007 secondary report and reinstatement request for Elston
23. February 29, 2008 reinstatement decision on Elston
24. May 25, 2006 Infractions report No. 250
25. Summary of secondary violations reported by Indiana University in the last five years
26. Indiana University athletics department organizational chart
27. Squad lists from last four years
28. May 31, 2006 Letter to Committee on Infractions Seeking Clarification about the Sanctions

PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL

Indiana University

Report to the Committee
On Infractions

October 3, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ATTACHMENTS

A. Compliance Agreement dated April 19, 2006.

B. Revised Compliance Agreement dated June 9, 2006 and e-mail amendment dated May 7, 2007.

C. Signed statements by the three assistant coaches and a signed declaration by Sampson regarding the sanctions.

D. Agendas and miscellaneous materials covered in the weekly compliance meetings.

E. Sample handwritten phone logs from each assistant coach.

F. Sample Cybersports recruiting phone call and other reports.

G. Monthly signed statements from men's basketball coaches regarding the phones used for recruiting purposes.

H. Documentation of the protocol for and sample e-mails concerning the review of phone records.

I. Summary of Sampson's off-campus speaking engagements and samples of the compliance monitoring efforts in this area.

J. Samples of written reminders, clarifications and interpretations regarding NCAA rules.

K. Sample of monthly compliance newsletters and questions of the week.

L. June 13, 2006 e-mail and memorandum clarifying the impermissibility of three-way calls.

M. Summary of three-way calls chart.

N. Summary of known outgoing recruiting three-way calls chart.

O. Summary of impermissible calls for each prospect chart.

I. Review of Penalties

A. Original Self-Imposed Penalties.

The University of Oklahoma self-imposed a number of penalties on its men's basketball program. Indiana University (or the "University") believes that when violations occur, regardless of the intent, appropriate penalties must follow. Therefore, Indiana University adopted those penalties that related directly to Head Men's Basketball Coach Kelvin Sampson ("Sampson") and placed additional requirements on the men's basketball program. The following are the *original* penalties the University imposed on Sampson and the men's basketball program:

1. The director of compliance will meet, on a weekly basis, with the head coach or the director of men's basketball operations to review men's basketball recruitment activities and documentation for the previous and upcoming weeks. Furthermore, Indiana University will file a written report with the NCAA not later than August 31, 2007[1], detailing the implementation and fulfillment of the penalties which were transferred to Coach Kelvin Sampson upon his employment at Indiana University.

2. Indiana University will reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school through July 31 of the prospect's junior year in high school from one call per month to one call every other month for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

3. Indiana University will reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after August 1 of the prospect's senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

4. Indiana University will restrict the number of days which Coach Kelvin Sampson may recruit off-campus to a maximum of four (4) during the period of March 29, 2006, through June 30, 2006. (Sampson used 15 of the 19 recruiting-person days he was permitted pursuant to the University of Oklahoma's self-imposed penalties while still employed at the University of Oklahoma).

[1] An extension was initially requested and granted on August 22, 2007 on behalf of Indiana University by Ice Miller through Mr. Shep Cooper. Status updates were periodically provided to Mr. Cooper leading up to the filing of this report.

meetings were in addition to the monthly all-sport compliance meetings regularly attended by all members of the men's basketball coaching staff.

The following topics were reviewed at each weekly compliance meeting with the basketball staff:

1. Review of sanctions.

2. Handwritten phone logs from each coach.

3. Recruiting database ("Cybersports") phone call reports signed by each coach.

4. Handwritten contact/evaluation logs from each coach.

5. Cybersports contact/evaluation reports signed by each coach.

6. Sampson's personal schedule for the current and subsequent months.

7. Rules education supplement.

These weekly meetings were informative, thorough, and provided a conduit for both the men's basketball coaching and office staffs and the compliance office staff to express concerns and voice questions for consideration by each staff. The director of basketball operations was charged with ensuring that all information covered in the weekly sessions was communicated to and understood by Sampson and the assistant coaches who were not in attendance. In addition, the director of basketball operations, in conjunction with the director of compliance, was charged with the creation of operating policies and administrative protocols for the men's basketball program to ensure full compliance with all sanctions.

(See Attachment D for copies of the agendas and other materials covered in the majority of these weekly compliance meetings.)

B. Monitoring of Recruiting Phone Calls.

The University focused its monitoring of men's basketball recruiting records on phone calls and particularly the assistant coaches' phone logs. Following is the compliance protocol used each month to collect and monitor phone records:

1. Coaches were required to keep handwritten logs of all countable recruiting calls made each week. **(See Attachment E for a sample handwritten log from each assistant coach.)** [NOTE: Sampson did not have any phone logs as he was prohibited from making any recruiting phone calls.]

2. Each Monday morning, the director of basketball operations collected these handwritten logs and gave them to the men's basketball administrative assistant.

3. Indiana University utilizes a recruiting software program ("Cybersports") to maintain its recruiting records. The men's basketball administrative assistant entered each coach's countable recruiting phone calls into Cybersports after receiving the handwritten logs.

4. A report was produced weekly by the men's basketball administrative assistant from the Cybersports data. **(See Attachment F for sample Cybersports recruiting phone call reports.)**

5. The Cybersports reports as well as the coaches' handwritten logs were then forwarded to the compliance office on a weekly basis.

6. The director of compliance checked the Cybersports reports and handwritten logs each week for compliance with NCAA regulations as well as the sanctions adopted and imposed by the Committee on Infractions.

7. In addition, each month each member of the coaching staff signed a statement indicating what phone(s) (i.e., cell, office, home or other) he had utilized for recruiting purposes. **(See Attachment G for the monthly signed statements of phone usage for recruiting purposes from Sampson, the three assistant coaches and the director of basketball operations.)**

8. The director of compliance was then responsible for cross-referencing phone bills for all phone lines the coaches reported using for recruiting with the Cybersports records to assure compliance with NCAA rules, as well as the current sanctions being imposed. Initially, this entailed receiving electronic copies of office bills directly from the athletics business office each month, but having to collect hard copies of cell phone bills from the assistant coaches. However, by mid-fall 2006 the system was improved whereby the director of compliance was directly receiving electronic copies of both cell and office phone bills for all men's basketball coaches each month.

9. Since Sampson was not permitted to make any recruiting phone calls, he did not submit recruiting logs. Therefore, the director of compliance was responsible for cross-referencing Sampson's office and cell phone lines against the recruiting information in the Cybersports database to ensure that no recruiting calls were made (regardless of whether they were countable or non-countable calls).

As should be expected, the record-checking system benefited from regular enhancements throughout the year as the director of compliance evaluated the most thorough yet efficient manner in which to conduct these checks. This culminated in the comprehensive protocol used to conduct the year-end phone record checks in May and June 2007. **(See Attachment H for documentation of the evolution of this comprehensive protocol for monitoring men's basketball recruiting activities, focusing on phone calls. Sample e-mails concerning the review of phone records are also included.)**

C. Monitoring of Off-Campus Recruiting by the Assistant Coaches.

Even though there were no sanctions regarding the off-campus recruiting of the assistant coaches, contact and evaluation logs were also a focus in the monitoring of recruiting data. Following is the compliance protocol used each month to monitor contacts and evaluations:

1. Each coach produced handwritten records of contacts and evaluations for the administrative assistant to input into the Cybersports software.

2. A Cybersports report was generated and signed by each coach monthly.

3. Both the handwritten records as well as the software reports were collected by the compliance office.

4. Those reports were reviewed by the compliance staff to assure compliance with NCAA rules.

5. Because Sampson was not permitted to recruit off-campus, his schedules were reviewed at the weekly compliance meetings with the basketball staff to ensure that no recruiting activities occurred at those events or that no individuals of prospect age would be in attendance. The next section describes this monitoring in more detail.

D. Monitoring of Off-Campus Appearances and Speaking Engagements by Sampson.

The compliance staff closely reviewed Sampson's off-campus appearances and speaking engagements to ensure full compliance with the Committee on Infractions sanction prohibiting Sampson from engaging in any off-campus recruiting, and particularly the clarification received from the Committee precluding attendance by prospects at such events. All of Sampson's off-campus appearances and speaking engagements had to be forwarded to the compliance office for approval prior to booking the appearance/engagement. In order for an event to be approved by the compliance staff, the following information was required:

1. The name of the event, function or outing.

2. The purpose of the event, function or outing.

3. The location of the event, function or outing.

4. The date of the event, function or outing.

5. Information from the event/function/outing organizers detailing how the organizer intended to ensure that no prospective-aged students attended the event.

It should be noted that the compliance staff closely reviewed each of the frequent speaking engagement and appearance requests received by Sampson. In addition, in a number of

instances a member of the compliance staff actually attended the event, function or outing and monitored the registration area to ensure no prospect-aged individuals attempted to attend the event. **(See Attachment I for a chart summarizing all of Sampson's off-campus speaking engagements that occurred during the period of the sanctions, as well as samples of the compliance monitoring efforts that took place leading up to, during, and after each event to ensure compliance with the sanctions.)**

E. Other Communications Regarding Compliance with the Sanctions.

Any and all requests for clarification from the men's basketball coaching staff regarding the application of the sanctions precipitated further meetings during the week, both at the discretion of the compliance office as well as the men's basketball staff. Every effort was made to assure full and complete compliance on all levels. In-person and email communication throughout the period of the sanctions was voluminous. **(See Attachment J for a sampling of written reminders, clarifications and interpretations specific to the men's basketball staff's compliance with the sanctions and other NCAA rules not necessarily related to the sanctions.)**

III. Rules Education Program for the Men's Basketball Staff by Indiana University

A. Weekly Men's Basketball Compliance Meetings.

Indiana University conducted weekly meetings with the men's basketball staff, consistent with its self-imposed sanction. These were generally standing meetings with the director of basketball operations, who was required to attend. Interim meetings were held as needed due to time-sensitive materials. The men's basketball coaches often attended these meetings as well, as noted below.

Indiana University has taken and will continue to take advantage of each opportunity to educate thoroughly every coaching staff member. As this applied to the men's basketball staff, the weekly required meetings proved to be an opportune time to broach timely subjects in an effort to be proactive and avoid potential future infractions. Moreover, the meetings provided the opportunity to address supplemental data. This gave the basketball staff a chance to review and become familiar with new or relevant information and provided them the opportunity to ask questions and attempt follow-through on any items which may have needed clarification.

The following issues were reviewed during these weekly meetings[2] in addition to the other standing agenda items:

1. Men's Basketball Administration and Compliance Staff Meeting (05/30/06). Attendees: Kelvin Sampson (head coach), Jerry Green (director of basketball Operations), Jeff Meyer, Ray McCallum and Rob Senderoff (assistant coaches), Rick Greenspan (athletics director), Bruce Jaffee (faculty representative), Grace Calhoun (associate athletics director), Mary Ann Rohleder (associate athletics

[2] Copies of agendas and other materials covered in these weekly meetings are included in Attachment D.

director), Tim Fitzpatrick (associate athletics director and liaison for the AD to MBB), Jennifer Brinegar (assistant athletics director – compliance), and Christian Pope (director of compliance).

2. Indiana University Official Visits procedures and NCAA regulations (06/07/06). Attendees: Green, Meyer, Senderoff, McCallum, Chip Armbruster (assistant compliance and eligibility officer) and Pope.

3. Camps and Media Activities (06/13/06). Attendees: Green, Sampson, Pope and Brinegar.

4. Camp Initial-Eligibility Education Component (06/20/06). Attendees: Green, Senderoff and Pope.

5. Camp Initial-Eligibility Education Component (06/27/06). Attendees: Sampson and Brinegar.

6. Noninstitutional/ Private Camps Restrictions (06/27/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

7. July Dead and Evaluation Periods (06/30/06). Attendees: Green, Meyer, Senderoff, McCallum, Armbruster and Pope.

8. Dead Periods and July Evaluation Clarifications (07/11/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

9. Contact Restrictions and Recruiting Coordination Functions (07/18/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

10. Bylaw 13.1.7.2.2 and July 24, 2006 Educational Column update (07/25/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

11. Bylaw 13.1.8.8 – Evaluation Days (08/01/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

12. Fall Contact Recruiting Rules Reminder and Telephone Call Rules Reminder (08/08/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

13. Competition Against Prospective Student-Athletes (8/22/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

14. IU Recruiting Policy and Institutional Procedures for Official Visits (8/28/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

15. Fall Recruiting Period Reminders (8/29/06). Attendees: Sampson, Meyers, McCallum, Senderoff, Green, Brinegar, Pope.

16. New Legislation: Bylaw 13.5.1 Transportation General Restrictions, 17.1.5.4 Required Day Off – Playing Season, and 17.1.5.4.7 Exceptions (09/07/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

17. Fall Contact Period Hot Topic (9/6/06 Educational Column) (09/13/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

18. Bylaw 13.4.1.1.1 and National Letter of Intent (9/20/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

19. Bylaw 16.5.2-(g) Nutritional Supplements (9/27/06). Attendees: Brinegar, Green, and Pope.

20. Bylaw 17.5.5.1.1 Qualifying Multi-Team Events (10/04/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

21. Cyber Web Usage (10/11/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

22. Bylaw 12.5.1.1 Promotional Activities and the IU Approval Process (10/18/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

23. Bylaw 17.1.5.4.7, 17.5.3 & 17.5.5.1.1 Review (10/25/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

24. Graduation Success Rate, APR Preliminary Data, Use of Initial Eligibility/Admissions Officer Position (10/26/06).
Attendees: Sampson, McCallum, Meyer, Senderoff, Green, Brinegar, Calhoun, Massey, and Mooney.

25. NLI, Publicity & Dead Periods (11/01/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

26. Official Visit Specifics (11/08/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

27. Travel, Travel Expenses & Restrictions for Between Term Travel (11/15/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

28. Bylaw 13.1.8.8 & November through December Recruiting Calendars (11/21/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

29. Evaluation Period Legislation & Graduate Proposal (11/30/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

30. Legislative Proposals Regarding MBB (12/06/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

31. Initial Eligibility Specifics Figure 14-1 from NCAA Manual (12/13/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

32. Voluntary Activities Bylaw 17.02.13 (12/20/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

33. Telephone Calls to Prospects During Competition-Related Activities Bylaw 13.1.7.2 (01/04/07). Attendees: Green and Pope.

34. Evaluation Period for January and Bylaw 13.02 (01/11/07). Attendees: Green and Pope.

35. Official Visit Reminders (01/17/07). Attendees: Green and Pope.

36. February Recruiting Calendar & Counting Recruiting Days, Bylaws 30.7 and 17.32 (01/24/07). Attendees: Green, Brinegar, Calhoun and Pope.

37. Evaluating Tournaments, Electronic Communications & Contacts at Tournaments (01/31/07). Attendees: Green, Brinegar, Calhoun and Pope.

38. New Rule on Notecards – Effective August 1, 2007 (02/09/07). Attendees: Green, Brinegar and Calhoun.

39. New Proposals on Freshman Academic Requirements – Core Curriculum Time Limitations – Effective August 1, 2007 (02/16/07). Attendees: Green, Brinegar and Calhoun.

40. Admissions and Graduation Data, Banned Drug List, and Initial-Eligibility Standards (02/23/07). Attendees: Green and Brinegar.

41. Rules Regarding Summer School and Permissible Summer Conditioning for Prospects (03/01/07). Attendees: Green and Brinegar.

42. New Legislation and Donations/Fundraising (03/07/07). Attendees: Green and Brinegar.

43. Review of Upcoming Recruiting Calendar and Associated Rules (03/13/07). Attendees: Green, Brinegar and Ian Rickerby (director of compliance).

44. Review of Out of Season Athletically Related Activities (03/23/07). Attendees: Green, Brinegar and Rickerby.

45. Educational Column – Qualifying Regular-Season Multi-Team Event Bylaw 17.5.5.1.1 (03/28/07). Attendees: Green, Brinegar and Rickerby.

46. Review of Summer Activities and Contact Period Reminders; Review of 13.4.1.1 (04/04/07). Attendees: Sampson, McCallum, Meyer, Senderoff, Green, Brinegar and Rickerby.

47. Review of 13.4.1.1 (04/12/07). Attendees: Green, Brinegar and Rickerby.

48. Recruiting Person Days (04/20/07). Attendees: Green, Brinegar, Calhoun and Rickerby

49. Medical Exams (04/26/07). Attendees: Green, Brinegar, Calhoun and Rickerby.

50. All-Star Games (05/03/07). Attendees: Meyer, Brinegar and Rickerby.

51. May Classic Reminders (05/10/07). Attendees: Meyer, Brinegar and Rickerby.

52. Phone Calls and the Lifting of Sampson's Off-Campus and Calling Restrictions as of May 25, 2007 (05/17/07). Attendees: Meyer, Brinegar and Rickerby.

53. Recruiting Rules Review and Summer Activities (5/23/07). Attendees: Sampson, McCallum, Meyer, Senderoff, Brinegar and Rickerby.

B. Other Regularly Occurring Rules Compliance Educational Opportunities.

The men's basketball coaches also attended a Men's Basketball New Coaches Compliance Meeting on April 3, 2006. Those in attendance were: Sampson, Green, Meyer, McCallum, Brinegar and Pope. The three assistant coaches (Myer, McCallum and Senderoff) also were present for the April 11, 2006 men's basketball spring compliance meeting with all of the returning student-athletes.

In addition to the men's basketball-specific meetings, the men's basketball staff attended the monthly compliance meetings (for all coaches and sport-specific staff), received the monthly compliance newsletters that covered current and relevant NCAA and Big Ten rules and reminders, and received the compliance questions of the week that were sent out via email – again with timely and relevant information regarding NCAA rules. **(See Attachment K for sample monthly compliance newsletters and questions of the week.)** In total, Indiana University believes that the men's basketball staff received a significant rules education opportunity specific to coaches approximately twice each week during the period of the sanctions.

Further, the coaches were required to attend all meetings that the compliance staff held with the men's basketball student-athletes. These meetings occurred in August, November, January, and April of the 2006-07 academic year. The first meeting covered all of the information in the 15-page NCAA Summary of Rules for Student-Athletes. The second meeting was specific to the sport of men's basketball and covered recruiting rules and expectations, publicity rules, agents, extra benefits and gambling. The January meeting contained a quiz on the rules education provided to date that academic year, both in team meetings and in the monthly Student-Athlete Newsletter. The April meeting covered more men's basketball specific issues, such as outside competition and other summer activities, employment, and again a review of agents, extra benefits and gambling.

C. NCAA Coaches' Certification Exam.

Finally, Sampson took and passed the NCAA coaches' certification exam on June 5, 2006, despite not being able to recruit off campus until May 24, 2007. All of the other coaches

also took and passed the exam on June 5, 2006. The men's basketball staff averaged 38 points out of a possible 40 on the 2006-07 exam. This year, the men's basketball staff averaged 39 out of a possible 40 on the 2007-08 exam.

IV. Review of Issues Identified Regarding Phone Calls that were Contrary to the Sanctions.

As detailed above, Indiana University (or "the University") and the men's basketball coaching staff have fully complied with the majority of sanctions adopted and transferred by Indiana University and imposed by the Committee on Infractions ("Committee"). However, the athletics department compliance staff recently discovered a number of phone calls that the University has decided, after a careful and thorough review, are contrary to the sanctions regarding phone calls. These phone calls are described below in Sections IV-B and C.[3]

A. Chronology of the University's Investigation.

As described above, the University conducted regular checks of phone records throughout the year. On July 10, 2007, during the course of the compliance staff's additional year-end review of recruiting logs and phone calls for all sports, a compliance intern noticed that one men's basketball prospective student-athlete ([redacted]) had been called numerous times, all permissible under NCAA rules. Upon further inspection of the phone records, the Director of Compliance noticed that on January 29, 2007, there were two calls made by assistant men's basketball coach Rob Senderoff ("Senderoff") from his cell phone to the prospect on the same day[4] and that both involved a three-way calling pattern to a number that was ultimately determined to be the home number for the head men's basketball coach, Kelvin Sampson ("Sampson"). The director of compliance then searched the men's basketball coaching staff's cell and office phone records for other three-way calls.[5]

Upon the discovery of the three-way recruiting calls that included Sampson, which were contrary to one of the sanctions as discussed in more detail below, the compliance staff immediately informed the Director of Athletics and the Senior Woman Administrator, and within 24 hours the Faculty Athletics Representative, the General Counsel and President also became involved. The President, Faculty Athletics Representative and other senior officials at the University received frequent updates throughout the remainder of the investigation. The University continued its review and analysis of phone and recruiting records and retained the services of the Ice Miller Collegiate Sports Practice, as outside counsel, for assistance in investigating and determining the full scope of any failure to comply with the Committee's sanctions and/or NCAA rules. On July 16, the first possible opportunity for an in-person

[3] Some of these calls also resulted in NCAA violations, as set forth below. The University will submit a self-report regarding these violations to the NCAA for processing as secondary violations and in accordance with NCAA Bylaw 19.5.1.

[4] The first call appeared to be "dropped", resulting in the need for a second call, which is permissible under an NCAA rules interpretation received from the Big Ten Conference. However, per the Committee's sanctions, this call-back was not allowed.

[5] Each of the men's basketball coaches reported monthly in writing that home phones would not be used for making recruiting calls. **(See Attachment G.)**

meeting, the Director of Athletics and Senior Woman Administrator met separately with Sampson and the assistant men's basketball coach, Senderoff, who placed the majority of the three-way calls. On July 20, the University's General Counsel, Senior Woman Administrator and outside counsel individually interviewed these two coaches and the only other assistant coach, Ray McCallum ("McCallum"), who had made any three-way calls.[6] The review and analysis of office and cell phone records from May 2006 through June 2007 continued and calls were placed to all ten of the known phone numbers involved in the three-way calls in an attempt to confirm the content and nature of the calls. As of the date of this report, conversations occurred with only three individuals as many of the numbers had changed or been disconnected, despite repeated attempts (five or six times per number) to reach the remaining numbers.

It was determined at that time there were at least some three-way calls that were contrary to one of the sanctions and that this information should be included in this report, which was originally due to the Committee on August 31. Outside counsel contacted Shep Cooper, Director for the Committees on Infractions, on August 22 to apprise him of these issues and to request additional time to thoroughly review and investigate this matter and to complete this report. This request was granted.

Although all of the coaches had reported monthly, in writing, to the University that they did not use their home phones for recruiting **(see Attachment G)**, Indiana University requested that Sampson and Senderoff provide their home phone records for the time period of the sanctions to verify their veracity and to ensure a complete review of all known phones, including that no other three-way calls had occurred. Sampson provided his home phone records shortly thereafter. Outside counsel reviewed the home phone records for Sampson from June 2006[7] through May 2007 and determined there were no three-way or recruiting phone calls during the time period of the sanctions. Outside counsel and the University then conducted follow-up interviews with Sampson and Senderoff[8] on August 23 to address outstanding issues and to obtain additional information regarding their recollections of the three-way calls.

In early September, after consulting with legal counsel, Senderoff provided his home phone records from June 2006 through July 2007.[9] The review of these records revealed that, although there were no three-way calls, Senderoff had placed a significant number of recruiting

[6] Although McCallum placed 11 three-way calls, only four of those calls included Sampson and were thus potentially at issue. Of those four calls, three involved incoming calls from an unknown origin and it could not be determined if the calls involved recruiting (these calls are nonetheless included in the maximum total of impermissible calls set forth below). Neither Sampson nor McCallum recalled these calls. The remaining three-way call involving Sampson, which occurred on May 8, 2007, was not a recruiting call because the involved prospect had enrolled in summer school at Indiana, which began that day, and thus was no longer considered a prospective student-athlete per NCAA Bylaw 13.02.11-(c). The remaining seven three-way calls placed by McCallum included four calls to his own cell phone (perhaps his voicemail) and three other miscellaneous short calls not involving Sampson.

[7] Sampson, who was hired by Indiana University in March 2006, did not begin home phone service until June 2006.

[8] An additional interview with McCallum and the review of his home phone records was deemed unnecessary at that time as his involvement in three-way recruiting calls was limited to at most three phone calls involving undetermined incoming phone calls, only one of which occurred after receipt of a June 13, 2006 email and memorandum clarifying the impermissibility of three-way calls **(see Attachment L, Item No. 8)**. An additional call that occurred on May 8, 2007 and that was initially at issue, was later determined not to be a recruiting call as noted above.

[9] Senderoff started his employment at Indiana University in April 2006 but did not have a home phone until June 2006.

calls from his home phone, even though he had not reported the use of this phone to Indiana University on the required monthly forms **(see Attachment G)** or included these calls with the required reporting that was entered into the compliance office's electronic recruiting monitoring system ("Cybersports"). Outside counsel documented the calls to recruiting phone numbers (or numbers very close to recruiting numbers) and the University's compliance staff then cross-referenced these home calls against other recruiting calls (from office and cell phones) to determine whether any calls were contrary to the sanctions or NCAA rules. In addition, the compliance staff called any unknown numbers that were similar to the phone numbers listed for a prospect to determine the identity of the individual called and whether the call was countable and permissible. Consistent with the University's conservative and strict approach in reviewing the records (i.e., assuming that any questionable call was problematic), if the individual called could not be identified, the call was presumed to be impermissible. This review revealed that a number of calls were contrary to the sanctions and NCAA rules and thus resulted in an expansion of the scope of the investigation.

The University immediately requested and received the home phone records of the two remaining men's basketball coaches, McCallum and Jeff Meyer ("Meyer"), again despite the fact that both coaches had reported monthly that they did not use their home phones for recruiting. A review of the records revealed that Meyer placed ten recruiting calls from his home phone, several of which were contrary to the sanctions and one of which was contrary to NCAA rules. McCallum placed one recruiting call from his home phone, which was not contrary to the sanctions or to NCAA rules.

On September 12, outside counsel and the University conducted another interview with Senderoff to discuss the recruiting calls placed from his home phone. A similar interview with Meyer was held on October 1. After these interviews and the final cross-checking of phone records occurred, the University determined that it had obtained sufficient and complete information to submit this report to the Committee. In addition, it should be noted that, throughout the investigation, the Athletics Director and General Counsel regularly met with senior executives at the University on the expanding nature of the investigation.

B. Review of Impermissible Three-Way Phone Calls that Included the Head Men's Basketball Coach:

Three-way phone calls are permissible under NCAA rules and University policies, including recruiting calls when multiple coaches are on the phone. However, due to Sanction 7 of the revised sanctions, which prohibited Sampson "from making any phone calls that relate in any way to recruiting or being present when members of his staff make such calls" from May 25, 2006 through May 24, 2007, three-way recruiting calls involving Sampson were not permissible. Of the 27 three-way phone calls that occurred during the period of the sanctions, approximately 10 to 18 involved an assistant men's basketball coach connecting Sampson into a phone call with a prospective student-athlete or an individual involved in the recruitment of a prospective student-athlete (e.g., relative, coach). **(See Attachment M for a summary of all three-way calls and Attachment N for those known to involve recruiting.)** Indiana University has determined that these calls are contrary to the intent of Sanction 7 as well as a clarification received from the Committee's staff prior to June 13, 2006 regarding the impermissibility of three-way calling. **(See Attachment L, Item No. 8 for the email and memorandum providing**

this clarification to the men's basketball coaching staff.) It should be noted that Sampson did not place any of the three-way phone calls.

Indiana University takes these transgressions very seriously and has imposed a number of additional sanctions, many of which are already in effect, on the basketball program and on individual coaches, as detailed below, to address any impact caused by the lack of total compliance with the sanctions and to send a clear message that absolute compliance is expected from all of its coaches and staff. The University is disappointed and does not condone the actions of the involved coaches, but it is important to place this issue in context. The men's basketball coaching staff is involved in over a thousand recruiting calls a month and the three-way calls at issue here total at most 18 over approximately eleven months, a fraction of one percent of all calls.

1. Overview of the Three-Way Calls.

Two of the three assistant coaches were involved in three-way calling during the period when Sampson was prohibited from making any recruiting phone calls. Three-way calls occurred when an assistant coach would either receive an incoming call or make an outgoing call and then connect the call to another number. All three-way calls placed by the assistant men's basketball coaches[10] were reviewed to determine those that included Sampson and concerned recruiting. Indiana University contacted the phone companies on several occasions in an attempt to identify the phone numbers for the incoming calls, none of which were listed on the phone bills. The phone companies all reported they were unable to provide the phone numbers for the incoming calls. The University therefore focused the review on outgoing calls and, taking a conservative and strict approach, assumed all of the incoming calls were related to recruiting, as detailed below, even though the identities of the callers remain unknown.

During the course of the review, it became clear that approximately 10 to 18 of the 27 three-way calls placed by the two assistant coaches included Sampson and were thus contrary to the intent and terms of the sanction prohibiting Sampson from making any recruiting phone calls, and specifically the clarification received from the Committee on Infractions regarding three-way phone calls. **(See Attachment M for a summary of all three-way calls; and Attachment L, Item No. 8 for the clarification.)** The lower number (10) represents all of the outgoing calls the assistant coaches placed to known recruiting numbers for prospective student-athletes and counts as one call, on two occasions, two calls (that occurred back-to-back due to a dropped call). **(See Attachment N for a summary of these recruiting three-way calls.)** If these call-backs to the two dropped calls are counted separately, there are 12 known (outgoing) recruiting calls. There are six additional three-way calls that included Sampson: five were incoming calls to an assistant coach where the caller could not be identified and one was an outgoing call to an unknown Detroit number.[11] Erring on the side of caution, these six calls have nonetheless been presumed to be recruiting calls for the purpose of analyzing the extent to which the sanction was

[10] The University also reviewed Sampson's phone records to confirm that he did not place any three-way phone calls.

[11] To determine the identify of the individual who uses that number, the compliance staff called the phone number but it had been disconnected and reassigned. After consultation with Senderoff, the University is fairly confident that the phone number was previously used by the AAU coach of a prospective student-athlete from Detroit. The call was therefore likely, and is assumed to be, a recruiting call.

not complied with and for assessing penalties. One other three-way call, placed by McCallum on May 8, 2007 to the coach of a prospective student-athlete, [redacted], was determined not to be a recruiting call because [redacted] was no longer a prospect, per NCAA Bylaw 13.02.11-(c), as he was enrolled in and attending the summer session at Indiana University, which began that day. The remaining eight three-way calls that occurred prior to the end of the sanction on May 24, 2007, did not involve Sampson, including: four occasions when McCallum patched into his own cell phone number for one minute, perhaps to his voicemail or perhaps by mistake; two calls that were unrelated to phone numbers for any prospect or Indiana coach; and the remaining two calls that involved McCallum, Senderoff and a third number.

The known impermissible 10 (or 12) recruiting three-way calls involved a total of six prospects, one of whom has matriculated at Indiana University and one who has committed as follows:

Prospect	Recruiting Class	Institution Attending	Number of Three-Way Calls
DeJuan Blair	2007	Pittsburgh	4 (or 5)
Wil Buford	2008	Committed to Ohio State	1
Ayodele Coker	2007	St. John's	1
Devin Ebanks	2008	Committed to Indiana	1
Yancy Gates	2008	Committed to Cincinnati	1
[redacted]	2007	Indiana	2 (or 3)

Senderoff initiated all 10 (or 12) of these calls. Of the remaining six potentially impermissible three-way calls, all of which were unidentifiable numbers, three involved Senderoff and three involved McCallum.

These three-way calls were not noticed during the compliance staff's regular and usual monitoring of phone calls during the course of the academic year as both manual and computerized searches focused on the declared recruiting phone numbers being called and the frequency of calls to these numbers, not other columns or information on the phone bills. In addition, because the three-way code was always attached to a local call on the phone bill, it was not detected in analyzing the calls to the declared recruiting numbers. Further, since the coaches had requested and received a clear interpretation from the Committee on Infractions in June 2006 that three-way calling with Sampson would not be permissible **(see Item No. 8, Attachment L)**, three-way calls should not have been an issue.

2. Explanation Regarding Why the Three-Way Recruiting Calls Occurred.

The interviews with Sampson, Senderoff and McCallum were primarily focused on the circumstances and reasons surrounding the outgoing three-way calls that were tied to known recruiting numbers and individuals. Limited questioning occurred regarding specific incoming calls and why the assistant coach would then connect Sampson into the call, other than to ascertain that they did not recall the details, which is understandable as the caller is unknown. According to Senderoff and Sampson, the three-way calls primarily occurred when there had been a dropped call involving Sampson, or when a prospect (or other individual) informed Senderoff that they were frustrated in their inability to contact Sampson or that they urgently

needed to speak with him. McCallum did not recall making any three-way calls and was thus unable to provide any additional information regarding the calls. Sampson generally did not recall the specifics of most of the calls or their origin, other than one call involving DeJuan Blair ("Blair") and to which he stated that, although not 100% certain, he thought Senderoff had initiated the call.[12] Sampson also stated that he did not instruct the assistant coaches to connect him into the calls. Senderoff recalled the circumstances of approximately half of the outgoing calls. **Attachment N** provides some context for those calls the coaches recalled. None of the coaches disputed the fact that the three-way calls had occurred.

It must be noted that there are some unique circumstances that made Sampson's ability to receive phone calls from prospects or other individuals more difficult than it might otherwise have been. All of the calls at issue here occurred in the evening and Sampson understandably does not generally provide his home phone number to prospective student-athletes, who may not receive a scholarship offer or choose to attend Indiana University, or the individuals involved in their recruitment. Instead he provides his cell phone number. Unfortunately, Sampson's home is located several miles outside Bloomington and his cell phone reception is spotty, at best, resulting in many dropped calls. Thus, he reported that there were occasions when he would be on an incoming call with a prospect or an individual involved in the prospect's recruitment and the call would drop and he would have to wait for the individual to call him back, per the sanctions. He stated that if the individual did not call back, he would text message[13] or call one of the assistant coaches to have them remind the individual that he could not call them back, but that they could call him. It appears that some of the three-way calls at issue here may have occurred as a result of a dropped (permissible) call and then Senderoff helped the prospect or other individual reach Sampson by impermissibly patching Sampson into a call, even though the prospect or individual could have called back Sampson directly.

In other instances, Senderoff would receive calls from prospects or other individuals who had trouble reaching Sampson (e.g., his cell phone would go straight to voicemail), at least in part due to the poor cell phone reception at his home. And there were occasions when a prospect or other individual stressed the urgency of the need to speak with Sampson immediately (e.g., to confirm Indiana's continued interest in the prospect or an upcoming visit to campus).

According to Senderoff, who placed all 10 (or 12) of the impermissible recruiting calls involving an initial outgoing call from him to a prospect or other individual, he would dial the first number, sometimes engage in a conversation with the individual, place that call on hold, dial Sampson's number and immediately while Sampson's phone was still ringing connect the other call. Senderoff stated that he then remained on the line and did not say anything. By using this technique, Senderoff reported that he intended to serve only as an "operator" by allowing two people to have a conversation. Senderoff stated that he thought this was a "gray" area in regards to the Committee's sanction and that he never intended to put Sampson or the University in a difficult position. He also noted that he used poor judgment and that he probably should have asked the compliance staff to clarify whether his actions were permissible. Senderoff further

[12] Sampson's recollection of this call, although better than his memory of other calls, was not very detailed. Generally, regarding the October 4, 2006 call with Blair, Sampson recalled that Blair was scheduled to come to Bloomington for a campus visit and then decided not to visit. Sampson remembered Senderoff explaining that Blair needed to speak with him. He noted that Blair never visited and Sampson never met him.

[13] NCAA rules at this time allowed text messaging.

stated that he did not think the spirit of the rule was broken because the individuals were trying to reach Sampson and wanted to speak with him. Neither Senderoff nor Sampson recall Senderoff ever participating in a three-way conversation or introducing the third party to Sampson. However, two of the three individuals that Indiana University successfully contacted from the list of known phone numbers used in the three-way recruiting calls, reported that Senderoff was involved in the respective conversations, as well as Sampson. The University was careful to clarify with both individuals – [redacted]) (currently enrolled at Indiana University) and Yvonne Jackson ("Jackson"), the mother of Devin Ebanks ("Ebanks"), (who has committed to Indiana University) – that both coaches participated in the conversation at the same time as opposed to Senderoff speaking only during the first portion of the call and then remaining silent when Sampson was on the phone. The two individuals were specific in their recollections that Senderoff was involved during the whole call and it should be noted that these calls were relatively recent. Thomas received three-way calls, on January 29 and April 5, 2007; and Jackson received one call on May 1, 2007. The third individual contacted, Keith McClure, a coach for Wil Buford did not recall ever speaking to Sampson.

Indiana University has determined that the connection of Sampson into a recruiting call via a three-way call was contrary to the intent of the sanction each and every time such a three-way call occurred regardless of whether the assistant coach ever spoke while Sampson was on the call. The University has thus counted all 18 possible recruiting calls in assessing the appropriate sanctions, as set forth below, without regard to whether an assistant coach spoke on the call with Sampson and the third party.

Further, as referenced above, in response to a meeting between the compliance staff and the men's basketball coaching staff on May 30, 2006, the University sought clarification from the Committee on Infractions regarding a number of questions about the application of the sanctions imposed on Sampson and the University's basketball program. On June 13, 2006, the compliance staff communicated the Committee's responses to the men's basketball coaching staff via a written memorandum and at meetings with the men's basketball coaching staff, as well as the weekly meetings with the men's basketball director of basketball operations. **(See Attachment L.)** In this memorandum, Item No. 8 specifically addressed three-way calling as follows:

> If an AAU or HS coach calls one of the IU assistant coaches and then adds a prospect in on a 3-way call, can the assistant coach add in Coach Sampson at that time (since the original call was initiated by the AAU or HS coach and not by anyone at IU)? *No.*

Indiana University believes that this information clearly set forth that connecting Sampson into a recruiting call via a three-way call was not permissible for any of the 10 to 18 three-way phone calls described above. Although the scenario presented in the memorandum does not address the exact circumstances that occurred here, it should have been readily apparent that, as this memorandum addressed a more passive circumstance (i.e., a coach receiving a call and having a prospect added in), the more direct action of connecting Sampson on an outgoing recruiting call would also be impermissible, whether or not the assistant coach was an active participant on the call.

C. Review of Other Phone Calls Contrary to the Sanctions

As noted above, during the review of the three-way calls, the University requested and received the home phone records of Sampson and Senderoff, even though all of the coaches had reported monthly that they did not use their home phones for recruiting. **(See Attachment G.)** The University requested these records to determine whether three-way calls had been placed from the home phones, to test the veracity of the coaches and to ensure the most complete review possible. Sampson's home phone records did not contain any recruiting (or three-way) calls during the time period of the sanctions. Senderoff's home phone records revealed a significant number of recruiting calls, none of which had been reported to the compliance office. The home phone records of the two other men's basketball coaches, McCallum and Meyer, were immediately requested and reviewed for recruiting calls. Meyer placed ten recruiting calls from his home phone, three of which were contrary to the sanctions and one of which to the sanctions and to NCAA rules. McCallum had one recruiting call from his home phone, which did not result in any issues with the sanctions or NCAA rules.

The University determined that these calls raised issues under revised Sanctions 3 and 4, which are summarized as follows:

3. Reduced the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school through July 31 of the prospect's junior year in high school from one call per month to one call every other month concluding July 31, 2007.

4. Reduced the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after August 1 of the prospect's senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week concluding July 31, 2007.

1. Overview of Impermissible Calls.

The University incorporated the recruiting calls made from the home phones of the three assistant coaches into spread sheets, organized by prospective student-athlete, that included the other recruiting calls from cell and office phones. Indiana University carefully analyzed these calls to identify any issues with the sanctions or NCAA rules. Taking a conservative and strict approach that counted any potentially impermissible call, the University determined that if an impermissible call occurred, it then rendered the ensuing calls impermissible until the requisite break (one month for juniors or one call per week for seniors) had occurred. Thus, a number of previously permissible calls were determined not to be permissible. For example, if there had previously been permissible phone calls in April and June to a junior prospect but it was then discovered that a coach had placed a call from his home phone to that prospect in May, the May and June calls were counted as impermissible, as well as any other calls that occurred until there was a month without a countable call. It should be noted, that consistent with NCAA rules, only calls to the prospects or their relatives were counted in the impermissible calls as calls to coaches and other individuals do not fall within Sanctions 3 and 4. Further, unsuccessful attempts to reach a prospect or relative prior to a permissible call were not counted; however, once a permissible call with a prospect or relative had occurred, any subsequent attempts to reach that prospect or a relative in the relevant time period were counted as improper even if no contact

The following chart summarized this information for each prospect:

Prospective Student-Athlete	Coach	Total Impermissible Calls	Contrary to Sanctions	NCAA Violations
Yancy Gates	Senderoff	11	9	2
DeJuan Blair	Senderoff	10	10	2
	Sampson	1	1	0
Demetri McCamey	Senderoff	8	8	3
Marcus and Markieff Morris[16]	Senderoff	22	22	1
Evan Turner	Senderoff	1	1	1
Kenny Frease[17]	Senderoff	10	10	0
Phillip Jurick	Senderoff	5	5	0
Jonathon "Bud" Mackey	Senderoff	31	31	25
	Sampson[18]	1	1	0
	Undetermined	2	2	0
Jordan Crawford	Meyer	2	2	0
Scott Martin	Meyer	2	2	1
Ayodele Coker	Senderoff	1	1	0
Brett Thompson	Senderoff	2	2	0
	Undetermined	2	2	0

The University will submit a report to the NCAA Enforcement Services Staff of all of the NCAA violations, including those that were also contrary to the sanctions. It appears that these violations are secondary in nature, particularly as approximately 60% of the phone calls lasted

[16] The number of impermissible calls listed here for Marcus and Markieff Morris, who are twins, is very likely greater than the actual number. As both prospects were recruited by the University, counting the calls and determining the impermissible calls was more complex than with the other prospects. Under NCAA rules, the limits on the number of phone calls apply to each brother individually and allow coaches to call each brother during the same time period. However, several of the calls were to the twins' mother and Senderoff did not record whether the call concerned one or both brothers. The University has, consistent with its conservative and strict approach to err on the side of caution, determined that each call with the mother thus counts as a countable call for both brothers. As a result of this approach, there was a multiplier effect on the number of impermissible calls due to the phone calls to the mother. Specifically, a permissible call to the mother in April was counted for both Marcus and Markieff, thereby rendering all attempted or actual calls in May to be impermissible under the sanctions, even though Senderoff was under the impression that at least some of the calls were permissible because there were two prospects in the family. Calls in June and July also then became impermissible as there was no required month off for either brother.

[17] The calls for Kenny Frease are being counted as impermissible because a June 17, 2006 call lasted four minutes and was thus considered a (permissible) countable recruiting call, even though the recruiting-tracking system (Cybersports) indicated that only a message was left. This determination then caused calls in the subsequent months to become impermissible under Sanction 3. The University determined that it would err on the side of caution by presuming the June 17 call to be a countable recruiting call, even though it is possible for cell phone records to indicate a four-minute call when only a message had been left (because cell phone companies begin timing calls while the phone is dialing and round-up to the next minute, the duration of a cell phone call quickly adds up).

[18] Due to the lack of recording regarding the phone calls Senderoff made from his home phone, Sampson believed he had a recruiting call opportunity.

only one or two minutes, 91% were ten minutes or less and there were no calls exceeding twenty minutes.

Similarly, as demonstrated in the chart below, most of the calls that were contrary to the sanctions were only one or two minutes in duration[19] and over 75% were ten minutes or less:

Length of Call Contrary to Sanctions	Number of Calls	Percentage of Calls
Total Calls	109	100%
1 or 2 minutes	66	60%
3-10 minutes	21	19%
11-20 minutes	12	11%
Over 20 minutes	5	5%
Undetermined	6	6%

There are two additional phone calls that were contrary to the sanctions reducing the number of calls for the men's basketball staff. These calls are related to the three-way calls discussed above and not to the recruiting calls made from home phones. **(See Attachments M and N.)** Specifically, the return call to Thomas on January 29, 2007 was not permissible according to an interpretation received from the Committee that did not allow the men's basketball coaches to return any dropped countable calls. In addition, the May 1, 2007 phone call to Jackson, the mother of Ebanks resulted in three phone calls to Ebanks or his relatives, one each in April, May and June, contrary to Sanction 3.

2. Explanation Regarding Why the Impermissible Calls Occurred.

The September 12, 2007 interview with Senderoff primarily concerned his unreported use of his home phone for recruiting phone calls. Senderoff did not deny that the calls occurred but was able to offer little explanation as to why he neither reported the use of his home phone for recruiting nor the actual recruiting calls that were made. He explained that when he reported information regarding his recruiting calls to be included in the compliance office's call-tracking system "Cybersports", he would scroll down the list of calls he made from his cell phone and list those that were related to recruiting. Senderoff used his cell phone for the vast majority of his recruiting calls. He made approximately 1300 calls from his cell phone each month and, in comparison, rarely used his home phone. Senderoff reported that he forgot to include the calls from his home phone since he submitted this information while in the office. Senderoff further stated that when submitting his monthly forms indicating the phones he used for recruiting he forgot to include his home phone. **(See Attachment G for the forms completed by Senderoff.)** He admitted that this practice was sloppy and/or careless.

[19] These one or two minute phone calls are counted as impermissible calls because they occurred after a permissible call had occurred during the relevant time period. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that, particularly given the fact that cell phone carriers begin timing the call while the phone is ringing and only report calls in whole minutes, it is likely that only a message was left and no conversation occurred during these calls.

During his October 1, 2007 interview Meyer reported that he primarily used his cell phone for recruiting calls and only occasionally made recruiting calls from his office or home phones. He stated that he did not list his home phone on the monthly forms reporting the phones he used for recruiting purposes because he did not yet have a home phone when he initially completed the form the first few months of his employment. When asked why he did not include his home phone on later forms, Meyer stated he thought the forms were only a formality and thus did not change what he previously reported. He noted that he had not realized at the time the importance of the monthly forms. **(See Attachment G for the forms completed by Meyer.)** Meyer reported that he initially tracked all of his recruiting calls in a notebook before submitting the information for inclusion in Cybersports. However, as he started to make more phone calls while traveling, he stopped recording the information in a notebook and relied on the call log in his cell phone to report his recruiting phone calls for monitoring purposes. Meyer also noted that he used Vonage for his home phone and did not receive any details regarding his outgoing calls until the University requested his records during the course of this investigation.

Indiana University is troubled by this disregard for University policies and procedures, particularly as the assistant coaches' failure to notify the compliance office about the use of the home phones for recruiting and the failure to report the calls made from home prevented the compliance office from effectively monitoring these calls and identifying these issues earlier. Accordingly, the University has imposed sanctions, as set forth below, that include reductions in the number of permissible calls by approximately seven to ten times the number of impermissible calls that occurred.

It should also be noted that some of the issues with the sanctions occurred during the transition period prior to the release of the Committee's report in May 2006. Although Indiana University had adopted as its own the sanctions imposed by the University of Oklahoma, it appears that the assistant coaches may not have been aware that there were recruiting phone call sanctions in effect prior to the Committee's report. Senderoff and Meyer recalled that Sampson was limited in his off-campus recruiting but neither recalled being restricted in their phone calls. Thus, they made phone calls in April and May 2006 without regard to Sanctions 3 and 4, which reduced the frequency of recruiting phone calls. In addition, some of the impermissible calls summarized above and detailed in **Attachment O** did not result from the home phone calls. Most of these calls were not discovered previously because they or other calls were not reported in Cybersports. A few calls (approximately four) were documented in Cybersports but the academic year review of the recruiting and phone records did not identify these calls as problematic. Thus, issues regarding these calls were first identified when thousands of phone calls were reviewed and cross-checked several times during this investigation.

D. Additional Sanctions Imposed by Indiana University

Indiana University initially struggled with its assessment of the three-way phone calls and the intentions of the coaches who participated in the three-way calls. To develop as complete a record and understanding as possible, several officials at the University and outside counsel continued reviewing and cross-referencing the coaches' office and cell phone records and conducted repeated interviews of the coaches to clear up loose ends and clarify various issues. In addition, even though the coaches each indicated in monthly signed statements that they did not use their home phones for recruiting, the University requested and received the home phone

records for all four men's basketball coaches. As detailed above, phone calls made by two assistant coaches from home resulted in additional issues with the sanctions and some secondary violations.

After this thorough review and analysis, when the University assessed what had actually occurred, it was apparent that, although the three-way recruiting phone calls were clearly contrary to the terms of the Committee's sanction and clarification and were very troubling in that regard, there were at most 18 calls and as few as 10 over an 11-month period. In trying to determine the intentions of the men's basketball coaching staff, the University considered the fact that with so few impermissible calls involving Sampson out of the thousands of recruiting calls made from May 2006 through May 2007, this could not have been a purposeful plan to circumvent the sanction. Further, approximately one-third of the calls – three of the outgoing known recruiting calls and three of the unknown incoming calls – occurred prior to the receipt of the clarification from the Committee regarding three-way calling.

The University was also troubled by the fact that its assistant men's basketball coaches made recruiting calls from home, despite reporting monthly in writing that home phones were not used for recruiting. The fact that these calls were then not reported and were not able to be monitored or reviewed by the compliance office caused concern as well. The University remains deeply disturbed that additional issues with the sanctions and a number of NCAA secondary violations resulted from the these calls. It must be noted, however, that of the 109 phone calls contrary to the sanctions, sixty percent (65 calls) were one or two minutes in duration.[20] Further, almost 80% (86 calls) were less than ten minutes and only five calls (less than one-half of one percent) lasted more than 20 minutes.[21] Similarly, with the calls that resulted in NCAA violations, approximately 60% lasted one or two minutes, 91% were ten minutes or less and there were no calls longer than 20 minutes. In addition, as noted above, the University took a very conservative and strict approach to identify all potentially impermissible phone calls and include them in the determination of the appropriate sanctions. This methodology resulted in a multiplier effect as, for example, one phone call placed in an "off month" would then cause many previously permissible phone calls in the next month (including attempts to contact a prospect as well as the actual phone conversation) to become impermissible. The University recognized that this approach would increase the number of calls that were deemed contrary to the sanctions, but determined that it was important to identify and present the maximum scope of the issues.

In light of the actions of the men's basketball coaches and the calls that were contrary to the sanctions and to NCAA rules, the University determined that significant additional sanctions were necessary. These penalties were designed to directly impact the coaches involved as well as the men's basketball program as a whole. Indiana University takes this matter very seriously and understands that the ban on Sampson making recruiting calls was intended to limit his and the basketball program's ability to recruit prospects, as were the other sanctions reducing the number of permissible calls. Accordingly, Indiana University has designed the following sanctions, many of which are already in effect, to address any impact from the impermissible

[20] As noted above, these one or two minute calls, although impermissible, did not likely result in any substantive conversation, particularly given the fact that cell phone companies begin counting minutes while the phone is still ringing and round-up calls to the next minute (e.g., a one minute, ten second call counts as two minutes).
[21] Five calls were for an unknown duration.

calls and to send a strong message that complete commitment to NCAA compliance is expected and required of all coaches and staff. It should be noted that in evaluating the extent of the additional sanctions, the University used the maximum number of potentially impermissible calls.

1. Corrective Actions

a. Sampson voluntarily agreed over the next twelve-month period to forego his scheduled $500,000 raise for this current contract year.

b. Senderoff and Meyer will not be entitled to any bonuses for the 2007-08 academic year or salary increases for the 2008-09 academic year.

c. Letters of reprimand will be issued to Sampson, Senderoff and Meyer.

d. A letter will be included in the personnel file for McCallum.

e. The University will require Senderoff to sign a form each month reminding him of these corrective actions and sanctions and will require him to submit his monthly home phone records for review, in addition to his cell and office phone records.

f. The compliance office will conduct mandatory compliance meetings every other week for the full men's basketball coaching staff (i.e., Head Coach, Assistant Coaches, and Director of Basketball Operations) for one year beginning September 17, 2007.

g. Sampson and Senderoff will be required to attend at their own expense the same 2008 NCAA Regional Rules Seminar as a member of the University's compliance staff. Meyer and McCallum will also be required to attend the seminar.

h. The University has ceased the recruitment of prospective student-athlete Jonathon "Bud" Mackey, the subject of the vast majority (25) of the NCAA violations.

2. Self-Imposed Sanctions

a. The University has, effective September 17, 2007, reduced the number of coaches allowed to be involved in recruiting by one through July 31, 2008. Specifically, Senderoff will be prohibited from: (i) making ANY phone calls that relate in any way to recruiting (whether or not they are countable under NCAA rules); and (ii) engaging in any off-campus recruiting activities. When Senderoff leaves the employment of the University's men's basketball program, if prior to July 31, 2008, another assistant coach will serve the remainder of this sanction.

b. The University will reduce by one the number of men's basketball financial aid awards for the 2008-09 academic year.

c. The University will reduce the number of permissible calls to prospects on or after August 1 of their senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week from September 17, 2007, through the end of the regular National Letter of Intent signing period (May 21, 2008). Further, Sampson is only eligible to make every other one of these phone calls.

[Note: With approximately 20 senior recruits and a 35-week period, this sanction reduces calling opportunities by approximately 700 phone calls, including an additional reduction of 350 calls for Sampson].

d. The University will reduce the number of phone calls Sampson will be permitted to make to junior prospective student-athletes to every other one of the monthly calls to junior prospects beginning September 17, 2007, and ending July 31, 2008.

[Note: With approximately 177 junior recruits and a 10-month period, this sanction reduces Sampson's calling opportunities by approximately 885 phone calls.]

e. The University has limited Sampson to four (4) off-campus recruiting contact days during the fall 2007 contact period.

f. The University will limit Sampson to no more than ten (10) additional off-campus recruiting days to be used from the conclusion of the fall contact period (October 5, 2007) through July 31, 2008.

[Note: Sampson's typical practice has been to divide the off-campus recruiting person-days by the four coaches. Therefore, since there are 130 recruiting person-days during the academic year and 20 person-days by three coaches during the July recruiting period, his off-campus recruiting days have been reduced from approximately 48 (130 + (20 x 3) = 190 ÷ 4 coaches = 48) to 14, a 71% reduction.)

g. The University will reduce the number of permissible official paid visits from 12 to six (6) during the 2007-08 academic year.

h. Indiana University will submit a report to the Committee on Infractions by September 30, 2008, documenting the University's compliance with these additional sanctions.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

October 25, 2007

Mr. Chris Strobel
NCAA Director of Enforcement – Secondary Violations
NCAA
P.O. Box 6222
Indianapolis, IN 46206-6222

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Chris:

Attached is a self-report by Indiana University of secondary violations of Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 that occurred in the sport of men's basketball. It is being reported directly to your office since it is a Level I violation and we are not requesting reinstatement of any of the prospective student-athletes involved in the violations.

You can contact me at 812-855-0451 or by e-mail at jhooker@indiana.edu if you need any additional information in this regard.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Brinegar

Jennifer Brinegar

c: Rick Greenspan
[redacted]
Chad Hawley

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2794
Fax: 812-856-5155
iuhoosiers.com

BIG TEN CONFERENCE
www.bigten.org

SELF-REPORT FOR SECONDARY VIOLATIONS

CONFERENCE RULE VIOLATIONS/ NCAA BYLAW VIOLATIONS

1. **Institution:** Indiana University
2. **Sport(s) Involved:** Men's Basketball
3. **Date Institution Determined Violation Occurred:** July – September 2007
4. **Date Reported to: NCAA:** October 25, 2007 **Conference:** N/A
5. **Location of Violation:** Bloomington, Indiana
6. **Date of Violation:** May 7, 2006 – July 17, 2007
7. **How was the violation discovered?** Year-end review of recruiting logs and phone records done annually to supplement monthly recruiting log and phone-records monitoring (see Section I of Attachment A).
8. **Legislation Involved:** **NCAA:** 13.1.3.1.2
   Conference:
9. **For NCAA violations, indicate whether this is a Level I or Level II violation. Report Level I violations directly to the NCAA.**

   X **Level I:** In general: violations of bylaws outside of Bylaws 10-17, all intentional violations, any violations not isolated or limited to a single occurrence, and any similar violations that previously have occurred in the same sport during that same year. **Refer to the NCAA website for a complete list of Level I violations (http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/enforcement/secondary_violations/index).**

   Level II: All inadvertent violations of the operating bylaws (Bylaws 10-17) not identified as Level I violations. Level II violations do not require reinstatement by the NCAA. If this self-report involves restitution, please attach documentation of repayment.

10. **Individuals Involved (include Name/Position or Title):**

    Rob Senderoff and Jeff Meyer, assistant coaches, and Kelvin Sampson, head coach

11. **Prospective Student-Athletes Involved:**

    Yancey Gates, DeJuan Blair, Demetri McCamey, Markeiff Morris, Evan Turner, Jonathon "Bud" Mackey, and Scott Martin.

12. **Eligibility reinstatement required?** We are no longer recruiting any of these prospects. **Yes** ____ **No** _X_
    If yes, requested to: **NCAA** _____ If YES, request eligibility reinstatement directly from NCAA.

    Or **Conference** _____ If YES, request eligibility reinstatement directly from Conference.

    A) **Date institution declared the prospect/student-athlete ineligible:** **Date:** _____

    B) **Name(s) of Prospect(s) or Student-Athlete(s) declared ineligible:** _____

    C) **Are there other eligibility issues with this prospect or student-athlete (e.g., petition pending; additional reinstatement pending, etc.)? If YES, please clarify:**

13. Facts of the Case:

See Section II of Attachment A.

14. Corrective Actions Taken by Institution:

See Attachment B.

15. Punitive & Disciplinary Actions—Level II Violations: N/A

Under the provisions of Rule 32.2.1.C, this report is to be countersigned by the Faculty Representative and Director of Athletics.

Submitted By:
Signature _____ **Date:** 10/25/07
Faculty Representative

Signature: _____ **Date:** 10-24-07
Director of Athletics

Copies to:

Jennifer Brinegar
Grace Calhoun
Tim Fitzpatrick
Dottie Frapwell
Rick Greenspan
Chad Hawley
Bruce Jaffee
Michael McRobbie
Jeff Meyer
Kelvin Sampson
Rob Senderoff
Chris Strobel

Attachment A
Background and Facts of the Case
(Response to Question Nos. 7 and 13)

I. How the Violations Were Discovered. [Response to Question No. 7]

The university conducted regular checks of men's basketball's phone logs and office and cell phone records throughout the year. On July 10, 2007, during the course of the compliance staff's additional year-end review of recruiting logs and phone records for all sports, a compliance intern noticed that one men's basketball prospective student-athlete (DeAndre Thomas) had been called twice in one day. This was immediately brought to the attention of the director of compliance. Upon further inspection of the phone records, the director of compliance confirmed that on January 29, 2007, there were two calls made by assistant men's basketball coach Rob Senderoff ("Senderoff") from his cell phone to the prospect on the same day[1] and that both involved a three-way calling pattern to a number that was ultimately determined to be the home number for the head men's basketball coach, Kelvin Sampson ("Sampson"). The assistant athletics director for compliance then asked the director of compliance to search the men's basketball coaching staff's phone records for other three-way calls.

Upon the discovery of the three-way recruiting calls that included Sampson, which were contrary to one of the sanctions imposed by the Committee on Infractions, the compliance staff immediately informed the director of athletics and the senior woman administrator, and within 24 hours the faculty athletics representative, university counsel and the university's president also became involved. The president, faculty athletics representative and other senior officials at the university received frequent updates throughout the remainder of the investigation. The university continued its review and analysis of phone and recruiting records and retained the services of the Ice Miller Collegiate Sports Practice, as outside counsel, for assistance in investigating and determining the full scope of any failure to comply with the Committee's sanctions and/or NCAA rules.

Although all of the assistant coaches had reported monthly, in writing, to the university that they only used their cell and office phones for recruiting and Sampson had reported monthly that he had not engaged in any recruiting calls, the university requested that Sampson and Senderoff provide their home phone records for the time period of the sanctions to verify their veracity and to ensure a complete review of all known phones, including that no other three-way calls had occurred. Sampson provided his home phone records shortly thereafter. Outside counsel reviewed the home phone records for Sampson from June 2006[2] through May 2007 and determined

[1] The first call appeared to be "dropped", resulting in the need for a second call, which is permissible under an NCAA rules interpretation received from the Big Ten Conference. However, per the Committee on Infractions' sanctions and subsequent interpretations of these sanctions, this call-back was not allowed.

[2] Sampson, who was hired by Indiana University in March 2006, did not begin home phone service until June 2006.

there were no three-way or recruiting phone calls initiated by Sampson during the time period of the sanctions.

In early September, after consulting with legal counsel, Senderoff provided his home phone records from June 2006 through July 2007.[3] The review of these records revealed that, although there were no three-way calls, Senderoff had placed a significant number of recruiting calls from his home phone, even though he had not reported the use of this phone to Indiana University on the required monthly forms or included these calls with the required reporting that was entered into the athletics department's electronic recruiting monitoring system ("Cybersports"). Outside counsel documented the calls to recruiting phone numbers (or numbers very close to recruiting numbers) and the university's compliance staff then cross-referenced these home calls against other recruiting calls (from office and cell phones) to determine whether any calls were contrary to the sanctions or NCAA rules. In addition, the compliance staff called any unknown numbers that were similar to the phone numbers listed for a prospect to determine the identity of the individual called and whether the call was countable and permissible. Consistent with the university's conservative and strict approach in reviewing the records (i.e., assuming that any questionable call was problematic), if the individual called could not be identified, the call was presumed to be impermissible. This review revealed that a number of calls were contrary to the sanctions and NCAA rules and thus resulted in an expansion of the scope of the investigation.

The university immediately requested and received the home phone records of the two remaining men's basketball coaches, Ray McCallum ("McCallum") and Jeff Meyer ("Meyer"), again despite the fact that both coaches had reported monthly that they did not use their home phones for recruiting. A review of the records revealed that Meyer placed ten recruiting calls from his home phone, one of which was contrary to NCAA rules. McCallum placed one recruiting call from his home phone, which was not a countable call and was not contrary to NCAA rules.

Interviews were conducted with the coaches throughout the process to ascertain their best independent recollections of the calls in question. In total, Sampson was interviewed three (3) times, Senderoff was interviewed four (4) times, and McCallum and Meyer were interviewed one (1) time each. Once all interviews and the final cross-checking of phone records was completed, the university determined that it had obtained sufficient and complete information to submit a report to the Committee on Infractions on October 3, 2007, detailing the phone calls that were contrary to the sanctions. In addition, Ice Miller and the university were in agreement that a total of 35 phone calls placed by Senderoff and Meyer were in violation of NCAA bylaw 13.1.3.1.2, as detailed below.

[3] Senderoff started his employment at Indiana University in April 2006, but did not have a home phone until June 2006.

II. Facts of the Violations. [Response to Question No. 13]

A. Overview of Impermissible Calls.

The university incorporated the recruiting calls made from the home phones of the three assistant coaches into spread sheets, organized by prospective student-athlete, which included the other recruiting calls from cell and office phones. The university in conjunction with Ice Miller carefully analyzed these calls to identify any issues with NCAA rules violations.

It should be noted, that consistent with NCAA rules, only calls to the prospects or their relatives were counted in the impermissible calls, as calls to coaches and other individuals are not considered countable calls. Further, unsuccessful attempts to reach a prospect or relative prior to a permissible call were not counted; however, once a permissible call with a prospect or relative had occurred, any subsequent attempts to reach that prospect or a relative in the relevant time period were counted as improper even if no contact was made. Following its conservative and strict approach, the university also counted any questionable call as impermissible (e.g., a call to an unknown number in the area code of a prospect, which was made around the time of another call to that prospect's listed numbers). Thus, the total number of impermissible phone calls reported below is the maximum number of potentially impermissible calls and the actual number of impermissible calls may in fact be lower.

The vast majority of the calls made from the assistant coaches' home phones were permissible under NCAA rules. However, there were 32 phone calls[4] that were considered by Indiana University to be contrary to NCAA bylaw 13.1.3.1.2. Of these calls, it is apparent that at most 13 resulted in a conversation. The following chart summarizes this information for each prospect:

Prospective Student-Athlete	Coach	NCAA Violations
Yancy Gates	Senderoff	2
DeJuan Blair	Senderoff	2
Demetri McCamey	Senderoff	3
Marcus and Markieff Morris	Senderoff	1
Evan Turner	Senderoff	1
Jonathon "Bud" Mackey	Senderoff	22[5]
Scott Martin	Meyer	1

[4] The university reported in the October 3 report to the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions that there were 35 calls in violation of NCAA rules. Upon further review of the phone records following this submission, it was determined that three phone calls to one prospect, Jonathon "Bud" Mackey ("Mackey") should not have been counted as violations of NCAA rules as there were no prior countable calls that had occurred during the respective months. These three calls were thus permissible under NCAA rules. **(See Attachment C for more details regarding these three calls.)**

[5] Due to the determination described in footnote 4, the number of calls to Mackey that violate NCAA rules is 22, rather than the 25 initially reported.

Attachment C contains charts summarizing the impermissible calls by prospect.

B. Explanation Regarding Why Violations Are Secondary in Nature.

The university and Ice Miller have concluded that these violations are secondary in nature because they were isolated; provided at most a minimum, if any, recruiting, competitive or other advantage; and did not include any recruiting inducement or extra benefit.

It is understood that multiple secondary violations can be considered a major violation. However, classification of these calls as a major violation would not be appropriate in this case for the reasons discussed below and based on case precedent where multiple violations were classified as secondary in nature. Specific to recruiting, Case Nos. 32041, 30418 and 30669 concerned repeated violations involving several prospects and were determined to be secondary in nature. **(See Attachment D.)** Two of these cases involved repeated impermissible phone calls, 24 in Case No. 32041 and 28 in No. 30418, and the other case (No. 30669) involved 57 prospects.[6]

The calls in this case are isolated as they involved only one sport and one bylaw. Moreover, the vast majority of the calls (22) were between one coach and one prospect (Mackey) during a four-month period (from March through June 2007) and were not designed to solicit a commitment from the prospective student-athlete to attend Indiana University.[7] Of the remaining ten calls, only four presumably resulted in a recruiting conversation **(as set forth in Attachment C)**.

The majority of phone calls at issue here were of limited duration, resulting in little, if any substantive conversation. Almost 60% (19) of the phone calls lasted only one or two minutes, 91% (29) were ten minutes or less and there were no calls exceeding twenty minutes. Even though 32 calls were placed, it is probable that at most only 13 resulted in an actual conversation. The one or two minute phone calls are counted as impermissible calls because they were placed after a permissible call had occurred during the relevant time period. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that, particularly given the fact that cell phone carriers begin timing the call while the phone is ringing and only report calls in whole minutes, it is likely that at most a message was left and no conversation occurred during these calls.

The following chart provides a breakdown by length of call:

[6] See also Case Nos. 32391 and 27263 for two additional cases that were classified as secondary despite numerous violations that occurred over several years.

[7] The prospect had orally committed to the university in the Fall of 2006. Senderoff reported that the calls occurred because the prospect was not doing well in school and the prospective student-athlete's mother asked him to encourage the prospect with his academics.

Length of Call Contrary to NCAA Rules	Number of Calls	Percentage of Calls
Total Calls	32	100%
1 or 2 minutes	19	59%
3-10 minutes	10	31%
11-20 minutes	3	9%
Over 20 minutes	0	0%

As noted above, almost 70% (22) of the phone calls were to one prospective student-athlete, who the university has ceased recruiting. Further, of the 22 calls to this prospect, 13 were less than three minutes in duration and likely resulted in no discussion. In addition, none of the five members of the recruiting class of 2007 committed to or are attending Indiana University and the remaining prospect has committed to another institution (Cincinnati). There was thus no recruiting advantage gained from these violations.

It should also be noted that only one phone call (to Demetri McCamey or "McCamey") out of the 32 impermissible phone calls was recorded in the university's recruiting database "Cybersports". Without the compliance office being aware of other unrecorded phone calls for McCamey, this one recorded call appeared to be permissible.

Finally, the 32 phone calls reported as violations constitute the maximum possible number of violations. For example, every apparently impermissible one or two minute call (19 calls) is counted as impermissible, even though it was likely no substantive conversation had occurred. In addition, two calls to the father of a prospect (Yancy Gates) are presumed to be impermissible because Senderoff reported that recruiting was discussed during calls with the father, even though the calls could have been considered permissible because the father is also a high school and AAU coach.[8] Although it appears that no substantive conversation occurred during these two calls, which were 31 seconds and at most two minutes in duration, the university has included these calls in this report consistent with its approach of counting as impermissible any questionable call. The university has also included in this report two phone calls to another prospect (to DeJuan Blair in July) because a three-minute call earlier that month was considered a countable call, even though a notation in Cybersports indicated that only a message had been left. Although the two calls could be considered permissible since they are only two minutes in duration and would be permissible attempts if the initial three-minute call is considered a noncountable message, the university included the two subsequent calls in this report consistent with its conservative approach of counting any questionable calls as impermissible.

[8] It should be noted that Senderoff subsequently explained that when he reported in his interview that recruiting was discussed, it was because when conversations occurred with the father he had discussed more than one prospect on the father's team, not just the father's son. He further explained that these conversations were consistent with the general nature of other conversations with fathers who were also coaches, and were in contrast to conversations with fathers who were not coaches.

Further, the impermissible call reported regarding Marcus and Markieff Morris is a violation only because the university adopted a very conservative approach in counting any call to the mother as a call to both brothers, even though only one prospect might have been discussed in any individual call. **(See the footnotes in Attachment C for more detailed explanations regarding these calls.)** Thus, the university could have reasonably reported significantly fewer violations.

C. Explanation Regarding Why the Impermissible Calls Occurred.

A September 12, 2007, interview with Senderoff primarily focused on his unreported use of his home phone for recruiting phone calls. Senderoff did not deny that the calls occurred but was able to offer a little explanation as to why he neither reported the use of his home phone for recruiting nor the actual recruiting calls that were made. He explained that when he reported information regarding his recruiting calls to be included in the athletics department recruiting database "Cybersports," he would scroll down the list of calls he made from his cell phone and list those that were related to recruiting. Senderoff used his cell phone for the vast majority of his recruiting calls. He made approximately 1300 calls from his cell phone each month and, in comparison, rarely used his home phone. Senderoff reported that he forgot to include the calls from his home phone since he submitted this information while in the office. Senderoff further stated that when submitting his monthly forms indicating the phones he used for recruiting he forgot to include his home phone. He admitted that this practice was sloppy and/or careless.

Senderoff explained that, as to the majority of the calls that violated NCAA rules, because the prospect (Jonathon "Bud" Mackey) had orally committed in the Fall of 2006, he had not been careful about tracking these calls. Further, regarding Yancy Gates, he believed the calls to the father were permissible as the father was the prospect's coach. Senderoff believed additional calls to the Morris twins were allowed as there were two prospects being recruited.[9] Despite these explanations, the university has determined violations occurred.

During an October 1, 2007, interview Meyer reported that he primarily used his cell phone for recruiting calls and only occasionally made recruiting calls from his office or home phones. He stated that he did not list his home phone on the monthly forms reporting the phones he used for recruiting purposes because he did not yet have a home phone when he initially completed the form the first few months of his employment. When asked why he did not include his home phone on later forms, Meyer stated he thought the forms were only a formality and thus did not change what he previously reported. He noted that he had not realized at the time the importance of the monthly forms. Meyer reported that he initially tracked all of his

[9] In fact, under NCAA rules, the limits on the number of phone calls do apply to each brother individually and allow coaches to call each brother during the same time period. However, several of the calls were to the twins' mother and Senderoff did not record whether the call concerned one or both brothers. The university has, consistent with its conservative and strict approach to err on the side of caution, determined that each call with the mother thus counts as a countable call for both brothers.

recruiting calls in a notebook before submitting the information for inclusion in Cybersports. However, as he started to make more phone calls while traveling, he stopped recording the information in a notebook and relied on the call log in his cell phone to report his recruiting phone calls for monitoring purposes. Meyer also noted that he used Vonage for his home phone and did not receive any details regarding his outgoing calls until the university requested his records during the course of this investigation.

Further, the lone violation involving Meyer has extenuating circumstances. Meyer called a prospect's (Scott Martin's) home for nine minutes; however, he was on hold the majority of this time waiting for other family members to ask the prospect to come to the phone. While waiting, he chatted briefly with the young man's mother before she told the coach that the prospect was not home. Meyer ended the call and then called the prospect the next day, believing that the first call should not count.

Indiana University is troubled by this disregard for university policies and procedures, particularly as the assistant coaches' failure to notify the compliance office about the use of the home phones for recruiting and the failure to report the calls made from home prevented the compliance office from effectively monitoring these calls and identifying these issues earlier. **Accordingly, the university has imposed corrective actions and sanctions, as set forth in Attachment B.**

Attachment B

14. Corrective Actions and Self-Imposed Sanctions Taken by the Institution:

In light of the actions of the men's basketball coaches and the calls that were contrary to the sanctions and to NCAA rules, the university determined that significant additional corrective actions and sanctions were necessary. These penalties were designed to directly impact the coaches involved as well as the men's basketball program as a whole, and are intended to address both violations of Committee on Infractions sanctions reported previously as well as violations of NCAA bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 as contained herein. The university believes that these corrective actions and sanctions send a strong message that complete commitment to NCAA compliance is expected and required of all coaches and staff. (It should be noted that in evaluating the extent of the additional sanctions, the university used the maximum number of potentially impermissible calls.)

Corrective Actions

a. Sampson voluntarily agreed over the next twelve-month period to forego his scheduled $500,000 raise for this current contract year.

b. Senderoff and Meyer will not be entitled to any bonuses for the 2007-08 academic year or salary increases for the 2008-09 academic year.

c. Letters of reprimand will be issued to Sampson, Senderoff and Meyer.

d. A letter will be included in the personnel file for McCallum.

e. The university will require Senderoff to sign a form each month reminding him of these corrective actions and sanctions and will require him to submit his monthly home phone records for review, in addition to his cell and office phone records.

f. The compliance office will conduct mandatory compliance meetings every other week for the full men's basketball coaching staff (i.e., head coach, assistant coaches, and director of basketball operations) for one year.

g. Sampson and Senderoff will be required to attend at their own expense the same 2008 NCAA Regional Rules Seminar as a member of the university's compliance staff. Meyer and McCallum will also be required to attend the seminar.

h. The university has ceased the recruitment of prospective student-athlete Jonathon "Bud" Mackey, the subject of the vast majority (25) of the NCAA violations.

Self-Imposed Sanctions

a. The university has, effective September 17, 2007, reduced the number of coaches allowed to be involved in recruiting by one through July 31, 2008. Specifically,

Senderoff will be prohibited from: (i) making ANY phone calls that relate in any way to recruiting (whether or not they are countable under NCAA rules); and (ii) engaging in any off-campus recruiting activities. When Senderoff leaves the employment of the University's men's basketball program, if prior to July 31, 2008, another assistant coach will serve the remainder of this sanction.

b. The university will reduce by one the number of men's basketball financial aid awards for the 2008-09 academic year.

c. The university will reduce the number of permissible calls to prospects on or after August 1 of their senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week from September 17, 2007, through the end of the regular National Letter of Intent signing period (May 21, 2008). Further, Sampson is only eligible to make every other one of these phone calls. [Note: With approximately 20 senior recruits and a 35-week period, this sanction reduces calling opportunities by approximately 700 phone calls, including an additional reduction of 350 calls for Sampson].

d. The university will reduce the number of phone calls Sampson will be permitted to make to junior prospective student-athletes to every other one of the monthly calls to junior prospects beginning September 17, 2007, and ending July 31, 2008.

[Note: With approximately 177 junior recruits and a 10-month period, this sanction reduces Sampson's calling opportunities by approximately 885 phone calls.]

e. The university limited Sampson to four (4) off-campus recruiting contact days during the fall 2007 contact period.

f. The university will limit Sampson to no more than ten (10) additional off-campus recruiting days to be used from the conclusion of the fall contact period (October 5, 2007) through July 31, 2008.

[Note: Sampson's typical practice has been to divide the off-campus recruiting person-days by the four coaches. Therefore, since there are 130 recruiting person-days during the academic year and 20 person-days by three coaches during the July recruiting period, his off-campus recruiting days have been reduced from approximately 48 (130 + (20 x 3) = 190 ÷ 4 coaches = 48) to 14, a 71% reduction.)]

g. The university will reduce the number of permissible official paid visits from 12 to six (6) during the 2007-08 academic year.

h. The university will submit a report to the Committee by September 30, 2008, documenting compliance with these additional sanctions.

Attachment C

Summary of Impermissible Recruiting Calls Under NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2[1]

YANCY GATES – CLASS OF 2008

Date	Involved Prospect	Cell/Home	Time of Call	Minutes	NCAA Violation	Recorded in Cybersports [Investigative notes in brackets.]
5/31/2006	Yancy Gates	RS Office	10:32 a.m.	0:31	Yes -A[2]	No [Note: Prospect's father (Tony Dees) is his AAU coach and assistant coach. The number called is listed as the father's cell phone.]
6/7/2006	Yancy Gates	RS Cell	5:05 p.m.	2	Yes-A[3]	No [Note: Senderoff reported the call was to the prospect's father who is an AAU coach and assistant coach.]

DEJUAN BLAIR – CLASS OF 2007

Date	Involved Prospect	Cell/Home	Time of Call	Minutes	NCAA Violation	Recorded in Cybersports [Investigative notes in brackets.]
7/19/2006	DeJuan Blair	RS Cell	8:15 p.m.	2	Yes-B[4]	No
7/22/2006	DeJuan Blair	RS Cell	4:51 p.m.	2	Yes-B[5]	No

EVAN TURNER – CLASS OF 2007

Date	Involved Prospect	Cell/Home	Time of Call	Minutes	NCAA Violation	Recorded in Cybersports [Investigative notes in brackets.]
5/11/2006	Evan Turner	RS Cell	11:01 p.m.	14	Yes-B	No

[1] To delineate the type of violation of 13.1.3.1.2, we have used the following notations: "Yes-A" indicates a call that was made prior to June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school; and "Yes-B" indicates more than one call per month on or after June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school through July 31 of the prospect's junior year in high school.

[2] The institution and Ice Miller counted the May 31 and June 7 calls as impermissible under NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 (in this case, a call before June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school) because Senderoff stated in an interview that he did discuss recruiting when he spoke with the prospect's father, who also happens to be a high school and AAU coach. Upon further review, it appears likely that, on these two occasions, no substantive recruiting conversation took place because the length of the calls were 31 seconds (for the call from the office phone) and between 61 seconds and 2 minutes (for the call from the cell phone). However, consistent with its approach of counting as impermissible any questionable call, these two calls are included in this report.

[3] See footnote 2.

[4] The institution and Ice Miller counted the July 19 and 22 calls as impermissible under NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 because there was a 3-minute call on July 18, 2006 that was considered a countable call. However, upon further review of the handwritten logs and Cybersports recruiting database, there is a notation indicating that Senderoff left a message during the July 18, 3-minute call. The July 19 and 22 calls might thus be considered noncountable as they each were only two minutes long and would be permissible attempts if the call on July 18 is considered a noncountable message. The two calls are, however, included in this report consistent with the university's conservative approach of reporting any questionable calls.

[5] See footnote 4.

DEMETRI McCAMEY – CLASS OF 2007

Date	Involved Prospect	Cell/Home	Time of Call	Minutes	NCAA Violation	Recorded in Cybersports [Investigative notes in brackets.]
5/7/2006	Demetri McCamey	RS Cell	7:56 p.m.	2	Yes-B	No
5/9/2006	Demetri McCamey	RS Cell	10:56 p.m.	20	Yes-B	Yes
5/30/2006	Demetri McCamey	RS Cell	11:24 p.m.	1	Yes-B	No

MARCUS AND MARKIEFF MORRIS – CLASS OF 2007[6]

Date	Involved Prospect	Cell/Home	Time of Call	Minutes	NCAA Violation	Recorded in Cybersports [Investigative notes in brackets.]
6/29/2006	Markieff	RS Cell	12:12 p.m.	9	Yes-B	No [Note: The call was to the twins' mother. The university is counting all calls to the mother as a call regarding both Marcus and Markieff.]

SCOTT MARTIN – CLASS OF 2007

Date	Involved Prospect	Cell/Home	Time of Call	Minutes	NCAA Violation	Recorded in Cybersports [Investigative notes in brackets.]
7/18/2006	Scott Martin	JM Home	?[7]	8	Yes-B	No

JONATHAN "BUD" MACKEY – CLASS OF 2008

Date	Involved Prospect	Cell/Home	Time of Call	Minutes	NCAA Violation	Recorded in Cybersports [Investigative notes in brackets.]
3/1/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	9:16 p.m.	5	Yes-B	No
4/8/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Cell	8:96 p.m.	2	No[8]	No

[6] Marcus and Markieff Morris are twins. As both prospects were recruited by the university, counting the calls for each brother and determining the impermissible calls was more complex than with the other prospects. Under NCAA rules, the limits on the number of phone calls apply to each brother individually and allow coaches to call each brother during the same time period. However, several of the calls were to the twins' mother and Senderoff did not record whether the call concerned one or both brothers. The university has, consistent with its conservative and strict approach to err on the side of caution, determined that each call with the mother thus counts as a countable call for both brothers. As a result of this approach this call was determined to be a violation even though it would have been permissible if the conversation solely concerned Marcus.

[7] Meyer's home telephone provider is Vonage, which doesn't provide detailed billing.

[8] In the October 3 report to the Committee on Infractions, the April 8 and 16 calls were mistakenly included as violations. Per NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2, the coaching staff could call Mackey once a month. As the April 8 call was the first call to Mackey for the month and as it was only two minutes long, it should be noncountable and permissible. The April 16 call is thus the permissible call for the month of April.

Date	Involved Prospect	Cell/Home	Time of Call	Minutes	NCAA Violation	Recorded in Cybersports [Investigative notes in brackets.]
4/16/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Cell	5:09 p.m.	4	No[9]	No [Note: This is the number for Earl Mackey, Bud's granddad.]
4/23/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	9:24 p.m.	1	Yes-B	No
4/23/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	9:26 p.m.	2	Yes-B	No
4/23/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	9:28 p.m.	5	Yes-B	No
5/7/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	9:16 p.m.	1	Yes-B	No
5/7/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	9:16 p.m.	1	Yes-B	No
5/7/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	9:17 p.m.	1	Yes-B	No
5/7/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	9:53 p.m.	1	Yes-B	No
5/20/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	10:40 p.m.	1	Yes-B	No
5/20/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	10:43 p.m.	2	Yes-B	No
5/23/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	9:12 p.m.	6	Yes-B	No
5/27/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	8:36 p.m.	1	Yes-B	No
5/27/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	8:37 p.m.	1	Yes-B?	No [Note: Because it cannot be determined who Senderoff was calling (during the investigation the university called the number, which would not accept incoming calls at the subscriber's request), it is unclear if this call is contrary to the sanction and NCAA rules and whether it is a countable call. Nonetheless, it is being counted as impermissible.]
5/27/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	9:29 p.m.	1	Yes-B	No
5/27/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	9:30 p.m.	7	Yes-B	No
5/27/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	10:03 p.m.	7	Yes-B	No
5/28/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	6:46 p.m.	3	Yes-B	No
5/29/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	9:43 p.m.	14	Yes-B	No
6/8/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Cell	10:00 p.m.	4	Yes-B	No
6/13/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	8:50 p.m.	1	Yes-B	No
6/13/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	10:12 p.m.	8	Yes-B	No
6/27/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Cell	6:27 p.m.	2	Yes-B	No
7/17/2007	Bud Mackey	RS Home	8:52 p.m.	4	No[10]	No

[9] See Footnote 8.

[10] In the October 3 report to the Committee on Infractions, the July 17 call was mistakenly included as a violation. Per NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2, the coaching staff could call Mackey once a month and this was the first call made during the month of July and was thus permissible.

Attachment D

Secondary Infractions Case Precedent

Secondary Case Number: 32041 **Eligibility Case Number:** 29721
Eligibility Decision Date: Feb 21, 2007
Secondary Decision Date: Apr 20, 2007
Division: I

Involved Sports:

Men's Track, Outdoor

Facts:

During the 2006-07 academic year, the head men's track coach had 16 impermissible telephone contacts with a men's track prospective student-athlete (PSA #1) and eight impermissible telephone contacts with a second PSA PSA #2). Specifically, between October 31, 2006, and January 5, 2007, the coach made 16 impermissible calls to the PSA #1, and between December 27, 2006, and January 5, 2007, the coach made eight impermissible calls to PSA #2. Poor record keeping led to the track and field recruiting coordinators and the compliance office being unable to accurately monitor the coach's telephone calls. Most of the calls were made because neither of the PSAs spoke English and the coach spoke their language and could explain the process of enrolling and other translational issues.

Additional Facts:

Institution Action:

The coach will not make recruiting phone calls for a period of 48 weeks beginning January 22, 2007. Other men's track staff members, no calls for 24 weeks. The coach will not have any off-campus contact with PSAs of any kind for 48 weeks beginning January 22, 2007. A full time recruiting coordinator will be designated/hired to oversee all areas of recruiting in the track program and ensure timely submission of all required reports. The coach will review rules with compliance office. Letter of reprimand will be placed in the coach's file. Sport supervision for track will be reassigned within the department and supervisor will supply monthly reports on all recruiting activity to the director of athletics, as well as ensure that all reports are timely submitted. The coach will be placed on a probationary status and any further NCAA infractions in his track reassignment or termination of employment at the athletic director's discretion. The coach, in consultation with athletic director, shall review and consolidate all non-track obligations that the coach currently has outside of the athletic department, in order to focus on his primary responsibilities within the track program. The coaches in track and in cross country will attend 2007 rules seminars. Two student-athletes are being held out and will not participate in the 2006-07 indoor season.

Enforcement Action:

No further action.

Eligibility Action:

STAFF: Eligibility reinstated.

Rationale:

STAFF: Based on case precedent. Please note the staff considered imposing a reinstatement condition to negate the recruiting advantage gained by the institution specifically the high number of phone calls made to PSA no. 1. However, the staff felt that the responsibility for this violation fell on the institution and cannot be appropriately addressed in Student-Athlete Reinstatement.

1	0

Associated Bylaws

Sel	Bylaw	Title
18851	13.1.3.1.6	Application of Telephone Call Limitations.

Secondary Case Number: 30418 **Eligibility Case Number:** 0
Eligibility Decision Date:
Secondary Decision Date: Oct 12, 2006
Division: I

Involved Sports:

Women's Basketball

Facts:

During the 2005-06 academic year, an assistant women's basketball coach exceeded one permissible telephone call per week to six women's basketball prospective student-athletes (PSAs). Specifically, the assistant coach initiated impermissible telephone calls, after it otherwise was permissible to have such contact, to the PSAs on 28 different occasions. The assistant coach initiated 12 impermissible telephone calls to one PSA (four of which were messages), six impermissible telephone calls to a second PSA (five of which were messages), six impermissible telephone calls to a third PSA (four of which were messages), one impermissible telephone call to a fourth PSA, one impermissible telephone call to a fifth PSA and one impermissible telephone call and one impermissible message to a sixth PSA. The violations occurred because the assistant coach failed to accurately document his recruiting activities. Each of the six PSAs signed with and will be attending other institutions.

Additional Facts:

Institution Action:

As a result of this violation, the interim head women's basketball coach has provided the assistant coach with a logging system that can be used to maintain an accurate log of his recruiting activities. In addition, the compliance office has reviewed the applicable recruiting legislation with the assistant coach with the expectation that this type of recruiting violation does not reoccur, and the assistant coach will receive a letter of reprimand. The assistant coach will be notified in his letter of reprimand that the office of human resources will be contacted to determine if additional punitive action can be taken. Since the institution is no longer recruiting the above mentioned PSAs, the assistant coach will be prohibited from contacting any PSA for four weeks beginning September 1, 2006. In addition, the assistant coach will be prohibited from recruiting off-campus for half of the permissible recruiting period during the 2006-07 year.

Enforcement Action:

The enforcement staff is extremely concerned regarding the number of impermissible calls made and the assistant coach's apparent lack of knowledge of basic NCAA recruiting legislation and failure to monitor recruiting calls. Further, the staff gave serious consideration to processing these violations as a major infractions case. The institution should be required to prohibit the entire women's basketball coaching staff from telephoning any PSAs who have not previously

signed a National Letter of Intent with the institution from May 1, 2007, until September 1, 2007. In addition, please note that four of the PSAs are ineligible for intercollegiate competition at the institution until their eligibility is restored by the NCAA student-athlete reinstatement staff. If the institution seeks reinstatement for any of these PSAs in the future, the enforcement staff will re-evaluate this matter to determine if additional actions or penalties should be imposed.

Eligibility Action:

STAFF:

Rationale:

STAFF:

1	0

Associated Bylaws

Sel	Bylaw	Title
17974	13.1.3.1.3	Exception -- Women's Basketball.

Secondary Case Number: 30669 **Eligibility Case Number:** 28446
Eligibility Decision Date: Jun 21, 2006
Secondary Decision Date: Jun 21, 2006
Division: I

Involved Sports:

Administrative

Football

Facts:

Institution engaged in impermissible recruiting activity with 57 prospective student-athletes (PSAs) during their official visits. In addition, the associate athletics director for football operations sent impermissible letters to PSAs prior to their official visits during the 2004-05 and 2005-06 academic years. Specifically, institution discovered associate athletics director for football operations sent impermissible letters (in that it was not prepared by a head coach or one of the full-time assistant coaches) to PSAs prior to their official visits in fall 2005 and similar letters from him had been placed in the hotel rooms of the PSAs on their arrival to campus for official visits. The main purpose of the letters was to provide a copy of the institution's campus visit conduct guidelines. Institution discovered that similar letters had been sent during the 2004-05 academic year as well. During institution's review, it discovered a large cookie snack was placed in the hotel room for each PSA on an official visit and the cookie was personalized with the PSA's first name, which is a violation of NCAA legislation as it is a personalized recruiting aid. The violations were discovered in January 2006 during a review of the official visit reports.

Additional Facts:

Institution Action:

Compliance staff reviewed applicable recruiting legislation with the associate athletics director for football operations and his support staff. They were informed that no personalized recruiting aids could be used at any location when a prospect visits the institution. They were informed that only the head football coach and nine full-time assistant coaches are permitted to prepare and send general recruiting correspondence to PSAs, their parents or their legal guardians. They were also informed that no personalized recruiting aids could be used at any location when a PSA visits. Athletics director sent a letter of reprimand to the associate athletics director for football operations and a letter of admonishment to the assistant director of football operations and required them to attend a 2006 NCAA Regional Rules Compliance Seminar. An additional full-time compliance assistant has been hired to assist with monitoring of recruiting in all sports. Finally, applicable recruiting legislation will be points of emphasis at the institution's next NCAA Rules and Compliance Education meeting with all coaches.

Enforcement Action:

No further action.

Eligibility Action:

STAFF: Eligibility reinstated for all 57 PSAs.

Rationale:

STAFF: Based on case precedent.

1	0

Associated Bylaws

Sel	Bylaw	Title
19298	13.4.1.1	Printed Recruiting Materials.
17823	13.4.4.1	Recruiting Advertisements.
17311	13.6.7.9	Activities.

Secondary Case Number: 32391 **Eligibility Case Number:** 29859
Eligibility Decision Date: Mar 09, 2007
Secondary Decision Date: Mar 09, 2007
Division: I

Involved Sports:

Administrative

Facts:

For several years, numerous prospective student-athletes (PSAs) across all sports incorrectly received institutional waivers of the admissions and housing deposits. Specifically a waiver was provided from the admissions office of the $250 acceptance deposit to PSAs that sign a National Letter of Intent (NLI), as well as a waiver of the housing deposit for all PSAs on scholarship living in the athletics department allotment of on-campus housing. Institution reported this had been a standard practice that the previous compliance personnel did not question. Specifically, the waiver of deposit fees was used because the NLI itself was a binding promise to attend the institution if admitted and, therefore, a deposit was not needed to hold that PSA's seat in the incoming class. The housing deposit was waived as it was a portion of PSA's future housing charges, which would be paid by the athletics scholarship. PSAs not signing a NLI or not on a full scholarship did not receive these waivers. These waivers covered deposits, which were permissible to refund to the athletes and thus the SAs did not receive any net financial benefit but standard practice was impermissible in procedure. The violation was discovered when the director of compliance was reviewing the draft of a self-study report.

Additional Facts:

Institution Action:

Institution has modified its procedures with an immediate effective date to require PSAs pay all acceptance and housing deposits and fees. The expenses will be refunded only to PSAs who have been awarded financial aid covering institutional fees. A memorandum has been issued to all athletics department staff concerning this change of policy. The compliance office has also notified the admissions and housing offices of the legislation and will schedule a yearly educational meeting with each office.

Enforcement Action:

No further action.

Eligibility Action:

STAFF: Eligibility reinstated.

Rationale:

STAFF: Based on case precedent.

1	0

Associated Bylaws

Sel	Bylaw	Title
984	15.2.1.4	Fees and Related Expenses for Prospective Student-Athletes.

Secondary Case Number: 27263 **Eligibility Case Number:** 26643
Eligibility Decision Date: Apr 29, 2005
Secondary Decision Date: Dec 20, 2005
Division: I

Involved Sports:

Men's Soccer

Men's Tennis

Women's Lacrosse

Softball

Facts:

For approximately the last 10 summers, including the summer of 2004, the institution provided numerous student-athletes (SAs) on various sports teams with impermissible athletically related aid during the summer in that the amounts received exceeded amounts permitted by NCAA legislation for summer school. (The institution is seeking reinstatement for 25 SAs who have eligibility remaining and who received impermissible aid during the 2003 and 2004 summers. The amounts of impermissible aid received by SAs ranged between $400.50 and $2,142.50.) Specifically, the institution incorrectly calculated the equivalency amounts for athletically related summer financial aid over this 10-year period. When determining the percentage of summer aid awarded for each SA who received less than a full grant-in-aid during the academic year, the institution used the value associated with full-time enrollment for summer term as defined by the financial aid office as the cost of tuition, room and board and books for an SA taking three eight-week courses. However, per NCAA regulations, the percentage of summer aid should have been awarded based on the SA's actual cost of attendance, as opposed to the cost of full-time enrollment for the summer term. Prior to the start of the summer term, SAs received notification of the amount of summer aid they were to receive and that it was equal to the percentage of aid they received during the academic year. The SAs relied on this information when making their decision whether to attend summer school. With the exception of one SA, none of the 25 SAs involved required summer courses to be eligible the following year. In addition, the institution could have used the Student-Athlete Opportunity Fund to permissibly pay for the SA's courses in the summer of 2004. The institution discovered the violations through an established, periodic audit documented by an outside agency per institutional policies and procedures.

Additional Facts:

Institution Action:

Institution will reduce the amount of summer aid awarded to its SAs in the summers of 2006 and 2007 by the amounts of $20,952.63 and $6,127.10, which

represent the total amount of summer aid that was over-awarded to currently enrolled SAs during the summers of 2004 and 2003. In addition, staff members from the compliance, academic services and financial aid offices will be required to attend a financial aid educational session conducted by the conference office and will also attend the conference spring workshop scheduled for April 2006 and the 2006 NCAA Regional Rules Compliance Seminar. The internal auditing procedures have been amended to include an annual review of the summer financial aid awarding procedures for at least the next five years after which the institution will evaluate whether to return to the one-in-four years audit. Letters of reprimand would have been placed in the files of those responsible for the oversight of the financial aid process between 1995 and 2004; however, those individuals no longer are employed by the institution. As a result of a comprehensive investigation to determine how the violations could have occurred, the institution has made several changes relative to the process for awarding athletically related summer financial aid. The compliance office will also increase educational efforts for its SAs relative to financial aid with emphasis placed on the calculation of summer athletically related aid.

Enforcement Action:

Although the enforcement staff is concerned regarding the length of time over which the violations occurred and the number of SAs involved, it was determined that the case should be classified as secondary. The decision to process the case as secondary primarily was based on the following factors: (1) The violations were the result of a misinterpretation of only one area of the financial aid legislation; (2) only one of the student-athletes with eligibility remaining needed summer school courses to be eligible; and (3) during the summer of 2004 (which involved the vast majority of the impermissible funds) the institution could have paid for the summer courses through the Student-Athlete Opportunity Fund. In addition, it was determined that no further action should be taken in the matter.

Eligibility Action:

STAFF: Eligibility reinstated for 24 SAs who did not need summer school hours. Eligibility reinstated based on repayment of impermissible aid for the one SA who required the courses.

Rationale:

STAFF: Based on the totality of the circumstances. The staff provided relief in this case based on the institutional error. SAs made decision to take summer school classes based on information provided by institution regarding the amount of aid they would receive. Further, the staff noted the classes were not needed for eligibility purposes. In this case, the staff felt the high institutional involvement in arranging, encouraging and incorrectly informing SAs of amount of aid for which they were eligible was more appropriately addressed through actions against institution than through requiring repayment of SA's who did not need the class. Repayment was required for the SA who needeed the classes to be eligible.

1	0

Associated Bylaws

Sel	Bylaw	Title
17119	15.2.8.1	General Stipulations.

I/2028906.1

P.O. Box 6222
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206
Telephone: 317/917-6222

Shipping/Overnight Address:
1802 Alonzo Watford Sr. Drive
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

www.ncaa.org

June 12, 2006

VIA FASCIMILE/OVERNIGHT

Ms. Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Director of Athletics for Compliance
Indiana University, Bloomington
1001 E. 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47408-1590

Dear Ms. Brinegar:

Thank you for your letter of May 31, 2006, directed to me as acting chair of the NCAA Division I Committee on Infractions. I will attempt to answer the questions you raised in the order they were presented to the committee.

Regarding questions 1-4, the committee considers this to be an issue of "strict liability" for Indiana, that is, if Coach Sampson chooses to attend an event (or if the institution allows him to attend an event) and prospects happen to be present, he runs the risk of being in violation of the committee's sanction. If he or the institution chooses to assume that certain functions will not be attended by prospects, it is done with the same understanding.

Regarding question 5, the limitation on the number of coaches permitted on the road is not reduced by Coach Sampson's removal from the road. Of course, all other coaches must be certified to recruit off-campus per NCAA rules.

Regarding question 6, Indiana is accurate and not too restrictive in its interpretation. As is stated in the committee's report, Coach Sampson cannot make ANY calls that relate in any way to recruiting, including calls to the individuals mentioned in your letter. Also, yes, the committee's order is violated if Coach Sampson has one of his assistants tell a prospect to call Coach Sampson at a specific time arranged by the coaches.

Regarding questions 7, 8, 9 and 11, the answer is no. Regarding question 10, no, Coach Sampson cannot call him back.

Finally, in response to question 12, once the time for perfecting an appeal has run none can be filed. Therefore, if the NCAA does not receive the notice of appeal in a timely fashion, the NCAA will be aware that no appeal has been taken.

Sincerely,

Thomas E. Yeager, acting chair
NCAA Division I
Committee on Infractions

TEY:cad

cc: Mr. Michael Glazier
Mr. Rick Greenspan
President Adam Herbert

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L

Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2006 3:47 PM

To: Barbara JMcelroy; Fitzpatrick, Timothy Martin (tmfitzpa@indiana.edu); Green, Jerry; Greenspan, Richard I (rgreensp@indiana.edu); Kelvin Sampson; McCallum Jr, Ray Ray (rmccallu@indiana.edu); Meyer, Jeffrey Dennis (jedmeyer@indiana.edu); Senderoff, Robert A.; Tim CGarl

Cc: Calhoun, M. Grace; Jaffee, Bruce L.; Pope, Christian Dean

Subject: Clarification of COI Penalties

Attachments: Clarification COI Sanctions.doc

Please see the attached memo which provides the committee on infractions ("COI") responses (in italicized red font) to the questions we had regarding the application of the penalties set forth by the COI.

A brief summary:

1. The COI holds IU strictly liable if any prospects are in attendance at any off campus speaking engagement.
2. Coach Sampson's local radio show should either be broadcast from an on-campus site (e.g., Yogi's, Lennie's) or at a site off-campus that is secure and closed to the public (to ensure that no prospects are present).
3. Coach Sampson (nor any of his assistant coaches) can text message (or call, in the case of an assistant) a prospect and tell him to call Coach Sampson. Given the wording of the COI reply to this specific question, it appears to be okay for the text message to provide his number (which a text message does automatically anyway) and say words to the effect, "You can call me anytime at your convenience."
4. The assistant coaches may not bring Coach Sampson in on a 3-way call with a prospect, parent or coach, even if the call originated from the prospect, parent or coach.
5. If a prospect, parent or coach calls Coach Sampson and the call is dropped (e.g., bad cell connection), the prospect, parent or coach must call back. Coach Sampson is not allowed to return dropped calls.
6. Indiana is still allowed to have our maximum limit of coaches on the road at any one time.

I will send out a copy of the letter from the COI to everyone listed in this email. In the meantime, please let me know if you have any further questions.

Thanks.

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451

COMPLIANCE MEMORANDUM

To: MBB Coaching Staff

From: Jennifer Brinegar

Date: June 13, 2006

Re: Clarification of COI Sanctions

Below, please find answers from the committee on infractions to our questions regarding the application of the sanctions assessed Coach Sampson and the Indiana basketball program.

1. We would like clarification regarding the prohibition on outside speaking engagements. Specifically, what is the institution's obligation to monitor attendance at the few speaking engagements Coach Sampson may make during the next year on behalf of our institution?

   Regarding questions 1-4, the COI considers this to be an issue of "strict liability" for Indiana, that is, if Coach Sampson chooses to attend an event (or if the institution allows him to attend an event) and prospects happen to be present, he runs the risk of being in violation of the committee's sanction. If he or the institution chooses to assume that certain functions will not be attended by prospects, it is done with the same understanding (we will be held strictly liable for violating the sanction if a prospect-aged individual happens to show up.

2. For example, Coach Sampson was previously scheduled to speak at a local black tie fundraiser for the American Heart Association this weekend. What happens if an attendee brings his or her son or daughter in place of a business associate who cancels at the last minute?

   We would be held strictly liable for violating the restriction against being off-campus in the presence of prospects.

   Is the intent of this restriction aimed at recruiting only? *No.* If so, is it possible to look at the target audience and then not hold Coach Sampson or the institution responsible if there happen to be a few prospect-aged individuals in the audience (using perhaps a reasonable person standard for determining in advance who the target audience is)? *No (really not applicable since the answer to the first question was "no").*

What about at our IU booster/donor events? We typically schedule the majority of these in the summer – around golf outings – they are aimed at the boosters/donors, but what happens if they bring along their children or grandchildren?

Again, we would be strictly liable for violating the sanctions imposed by the COI if a prospect was present at any off-campus speaking engagement, regardless of the "target" audience.

3. Coach Sampson has a long-standing speaking engagement at the 20 year reunion of the movie "Hoosiers" which is taking place in Knightstown, Indiana, where much of the movie was filmed. Is it okay for him to fulfill his obligation even though this event is open to the public and there may be prospect-aged individuals in the audience?

   He should not attend any speaking engagement or function if there is any chance a prospect-aged individual could be present.

4. What about his local radio show during the season – it is broadcast from a local restaurant and he does take questions from the audience (actually, the host, Don Fisher, acts as the moderator and he is the one who takes the calls/questions)?

   Again, see above. ***IU needs to have Coach Sampson's local radio show on campus if it's open to the general public.***

   What happens if prospect-aged individuals are eating at the restaurant during the show?

   See above.

   What happens if there are prospect-aged females in attendance at a speaking engagement?

   See above. The committee did not limit the restrictions to male prospects. The restrictions apply to all prospects.

5. It doesn't appear that the COI limited the number of IU coaches who could be on the road at any one time except for the fact that Coach Sampson can not be out at all. Is this an accurate statement?

   The limitation on the number of coaches permitted on the road is not reduced by Coach Sampson's removal from the road. Of course, all other coaches must be certified to recruit off-campus per NCAA rules.

6. Exactly who <u>can</u> Coach Sampson call? He is restricted from "making any phone calls that relate in any way to recruiting or being present when members of his staff make such calls." The restriction certainly applies to prospects, their coaches, and their parents. We can't think of anyone whom he should be permitted to call that has a relationship to high school, JC, or AAU basketball. Is our interpretation too restrictive? Does it violate the

spirit of the penalties if the assistants make a recruiting call and tell the person to call Sampson at some specific time that Sampson has arranged?

We are accurate and not too restrictive in our interpretation. As is stated in the committee's report, Coach Sampson cannot make ANY calls that relate in any way to recruiting, including calls to the individuals mentioned above. Also, yes, the committee's order is violated if Coach Sampson has one of his assistants tell a prospect to call Coach Sampson at a specific time arranged by the coaches.

7. Can Coach Sampson text message a recruit and type: "Call me at 1-800-IUBBALL" (or whatever his phone number is)? *No.*

8. If an AAU or HS coach calls one of the IU assistant coaches and then adds a prospect in on a 3-way call, can the assistant coach add in Coach Sampson at that time (since the original call was initiated by the AAU or HS coach and not by anyone at IU)? *No.*

9. Once a prospect signs an NLI, is it possible for Coach Sampson to call him and to have off-campus contact with him (can he make a home visit to a current NLI signee)? *No.*

10. What happens if Coach Sampson receives a call from a prospect (or coach or parent), but loses the connection (common problem with cell phones)? *The prospect, parent or coach must call Coach Sampson back.* Can he call back or must he wait for the prospect (or coach or parent) to call him back? *No, he cannot call them back. He must wait for the prospect, coach or parent to call him back.*

11. Can Coach Sampson call high school and/or AAU coaches about basketball related issues, such as talking about our offense, defense, etc.? *No.*

12. If the institution determines we will not be appealing or contesting any findings made by the committee, do we need to notify you of that decision or is notification only necessary if we did decide to appeal or contest any findings? *Once the time for perfecting an appeal has run, none can be filed. Therefore, if the NCAA does not receive the notice of appeal in a timely fashion, the NCAA will be aware that no appeal has been taken.*

cc: Rick Greenspan
Tim Fitzpatrick
Grace Calhoun
Bruce Jaffee
Jerry Green
Christian Pope

Detail for 812-219-0155 (Continued)

Call Detail

	Date	Time	Phone Number	Call Destination	Rate/ Type	Minutes Used	Airtime Charges	LD/ Additional Charges	Total Charges	
174	5/31	10:59 A M	Incoming			1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
175	5/31	10:59 A M	Incoming		⚲⚲	1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
176	5/31	11:05 A M	407-469-2561	Montverde, FL		20.0	included	0.00	0.00	
177	5/31	11:32 A M	Incoming			1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
178	5/31	12:04 P M	Incoming			16.0	included	0.00	0.00	
179	5/31	12:20 P M	914-273-5499	Armonk Vlg, NY		1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
180	5/31	12:59 P M	740-624-2425	Zanesville, OH		1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
181	5/31	12:59 P M	740-624-2425	Zanesville, OH		1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
182	5/31	1:27 P M	812-219-0155	Bloomingtn, IN		1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
183	5/31	1:38 P M	219-902-6290	Gary, IN	⚲⚲	1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
184	5/31	1:40 P M	Incoming			12.0	included	0.00	0.00	
185	5/31	2:11 P M	Incoming			3.0	included	0.00	0.00	
186	5/31	2:51 P M	812-219-0155	Bloomingtn, IN		2.0	included	0.00	0.00	
187	5/31	2:55 P M	216-973-1962	Cleveland, OH		2.0	included	0.00	0.00	
188	5/31	2:57 P M	971-234-5091	Portland, OR		2.0	included	0.00	0.00	
189	5/31	3:01 P M	Incoming			17.0	included	0.00	0.00	
190	5/31	3:11 P M	812-219-5620	Bloomingtn, IN	⚲⚲ 3W	7.0	included	0.00	0.00	(3)
191	5/31	3:19 P M	Incoming			5.0	included	0.00	0.00	
192	5/31	4:14 P M	248-890-0813	Royal Oak, MI		1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
193	5/31	4:33 P M	Incoming			4.0	included	0.00	0.00	
194	5/31	4:37 P M	330-258-2222	Akron, OH		2.0	included	0.00	0.00	
195	5/31	4:41 P M	412-512-9565	Pittsburgh, PA	⚲⚲	17.0	included	0.00	0.00	
196	5/31	4:58 P M	812-219-0155	Bloomingtn, IN		2.0	included	0.00	0.00	
197	5/31	5:35 P M	Incoming		⚲⚲	9.0	included	0.00	0.00	
198	5/31	5:47 P M	812-679-9086	Bloomingtn, IN	⚲⚲	2.0	included	0.00	0.00	
199	5/31	5:50 P M	Incoming		⚲⚲	1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
200	5/31	5:56 P M	812-855-2002	Bloomingtn, IN		1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
201	5/31	5:56 P M	812-320-8574	Bloomingtn, IN		2.0	included	0.00	0.00	
202	5/31	6:10 P M	Incoming		⚲⚲	1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
203	5/31	6:10 P M	Incoming		⚲⚲ CW	5.0	included	0.00	0.00	
204	5/31	6:15 P M	412-512-9565	Pittsburgh, PA	⚲⚲	2.0	included	0.00	0.00	
205	5/31	6:16 P M	812-219-5620	Bloomingtn, IN	⚲⚲ 3W	1.0	included	0.00	0.00	(4)
206	5/31	6:17 P M	812-219-5620	Bloomingtn, IN	⚲⚲	1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
207	5/31	6:18 P M	412-512-9565	Pittsburgh, PA	⚲⚲	9.0	included	0.00	0.00	
208	5/31	6:19 P M	812-219-5620	Bloomingtn, IN	⚲⚲ 3W	8.0	included	0.00	0.00	(5)
209	5/31	6:27 P M	812-219-0155	Bloomingtn, IN		1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
210	5/31	6:28 P M	812-219-5620	Bloomingtn, IN	⚲⚲	4.0	included	0.00	0.00	
211	5/31	6:39 P M	740-624-2425	Zanesville, OH		7.0	included	0.00	0.00	
212	5/31	7:19 P M	330-995-4221	Aurora, OH		1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
213	5/31	7:20 P M	914-273-5499	Armonk Vlg, NY		1.0	included	0.00	0.00	
214	5/31	7:40 P M	812-219-5620	Bloomingtn, IN	⚲⚲	2.0	included	0.00	0.00	
215	5/31	7:59 P M	914-629-9313	Westchestr, NY		6.0	included	0.00	0.00	
216	5/31	8:06 P M	812-333-3030	Bloomingtn, IN		1.0	included	0.00	0.00	

⚲⚲ = Sprint Mobile to Mobile

Indiana athletic director Rick Greenspan and head basketball coach Kelvin Sampson took teleconference questions for over a half hour today from reporters following a news release outline self imposed sanctions on impermissible phone calls. Read the first half of what was said.

Q&A session with Greenspan, Sampson, Grace Calhoun Associate Athletic Director-Compliance and Student Development, Robin Green Harris- Ice Miller

Two things that jumped out here....that Kelvin will forego a $500,000 raise in '07-08 and that Rob Senderoff is not allowed to recruit for a year. If you could just expand on both of those points, obviously on the severity of both of those. The figure is certainly very high and with Rob not being able to recruit for a full year, that is pretty serious as well.

Greenspan: **Let me start with coach. Coach was scheduled to receive a significant increase this year and I as well as members of the administration reviewed these matters and it became very clear that while the majority of the issues involved are all sanctions, he should take responsibility for those that were in the basket. TI think it shows a rather strong statement and willingness to cooperate with that voluntary reduction of compensation. It is a significant amount for everyone.**

The second is with an assistant coach we disciplined. Again I share (inaudible). I think it is significant for any of you that follow college basketball to take an assistant coach off the road and off the phones for a period of a year. Again it was the institution's recommendation that we put this on the coaching staff to show our expectations on compliance or how seriously we take these matters.

Can you tell us how much money the university paid for the Ice Miller investigation?

Greenspan: **I can't because I don't know yet** (more comments were made but no details given on costs).

Rick, when Kelvin was hired you said that if there were future problems that you would potentially be able to terminate his contract. Is this a fireable offense? Something you considered?

Greenspan: **We have had is what we think we have done is a very, very thorough investigation. Very broad participation with those on campus who we think are important. To and including the President. We determined that these sanctions were significant, they were severe and they were appropriate. We also had discussions with legal counsel on contractual issues and that is probably the only thing I can say at this point.**

When you participated in the three-way calls that Rob set up, at that moment did you stop and think whether those were allowed under your sanctions?

Sampson: **All the three way calls were made to me. My assistant coaches did a great job of saying Coach can't call you because of the sanctions, will you call him? And that is what they did. After we looked at the records and found out there were some three way calls made we found out that Rob, after the kid could not reach me on my cell phone because of cell service or whatever, they would call Coach Senderoff and say Coach Sampson is unavailable. So what Rob was doing was patching the calls into me after Rob had made the connection. So Rob was basically an operator. This was 10 calls out of thousands and it is disappointing. We are trying to get 100% compliance here. If we had 10 out of thousands then that is 10 too many.**

Grace Calhoun: **Most of the problems we are dealing with in our report to the NCAA are problems of the sanctions, not NCAA violations.**

Coach, what do you say to fans that feel betrayed by this news and feel hurt by more types of these violations coming down?

Sampson: **Disappointed. We have been dealing with these sanctions from May 25th to May 25th. When it was over we were under the impression that the thing was over. We were confident that we had followed all the rules. I want to go back to what Andy asked about the three-ways. Other than one call, I was not aware that it was a three way call. There was one call and I don't want to get into the specifics of that. But we are disappointed. Needless to say we apologize. We are dedicated to 100% compliance. We had an issue with the phone calls and we have some things worked out and think that this is something that we can be 100%, not 99% or 99.5%, but that we can be 100% compliant on this as we move forward.**

Can we get a clarification of when these 10 (three way) calls were made?

Grace Calhoun: **The phone calls were made over a several months period. Throughout the period of the sanctions. As Mr. Greenspan described a routine audit conducted in July identified some irregularities and upon further investigation we did find what we believe to be about 10 of these phone calls. A very small portion of all the permissible calls that were made.**

Robin Harris: **Just to reiterate what Grace said these were 10 calls that were spread out and averaged out to one per month. From May to May but they really were spread out.**

How will you handle Rob's position on the staff now that he is not able to make phone calls or recruit off campus?

Sampson: **That is not something that I am prepared to answer right now. He is at practice everyday, he is doing a lot of the administrative things. Rob has a lot of talent in other areas. The area where Rob made his mistakes....you have mistakes of omission and mistakes of commission. I don't think there was an intention here to circumvent the rules. There are different ways you can identify certain things but Rob is on the floor everyday, doing individual workouts, participating on our staff the way that he normally does except that he is not making phone calls or traveling for recruiting. We'll just have to figure this out as we go.**

If you are a man down are you allowed to substitute?

Calhoun: **We are a man down.**

Greenspan: **We will not take those sanctions off on Senderoff till July even if Rob were to leave that position. That position would continue to incur those sanctions.**

Now you can read the transcript highlights of the second half of today's IU teleconference on the men's basketball sanctions.

Participants:

Rick Greenspan - IU athletic director
Kelvin Sampson - IU men's basketball head coach
Grace Calhoun - IU Associate Athletic Director-Compliance and Student Development
Robin Green Harris- Legal counsel, Ice Miller

Transcript Highlights Part Two

Are you sure you have the legal right to terminate with just cause?

Greenspan: **That would be a question that needs to be posed to our legal counsel. I don't know that that is a question that Robin Green Harris, who is a lawyer, but I think that is a question better posed to our legal counsel. I can tell you that we looked at a variety of actions and sanctions and this was the recommendation made and accepted by the university.**

We received legal advice throughout the process. We received legal advice from Dottie Frapwell who is our in-house counsel, we received consultative and legal advice from Robin Green Harris and the firm of Ice Miller. It is my understanding that Dottie Frapwell, our legal counsel, also counseled with other attorneys. I think I received advice on these from senior administrators, Dottie being one of them. Certainly our President, Vice President of Administration as well as others. Obviously these decisions and recommendations are not independent

Grace Calhoun: **I can add that we certainly were advised by Ice Miller and others that our sanctions are quite severe for the problems that were identified. So we feel very comfortable that we have imposed severe sanctions and as you heard Mr. Greenspan say we have a very long and very proud tradition of rules compliance at Indiana and do intend to send a strong message that is what we fully expect going forward.**

Is the loss of a scholarship for the Class of 2008 or the Class of 2009?

Grace Calhoun: **It is for the next incoming class. The Class of '08-09.**

At this point Kelvin, how does this (scholarship loss) affect you---does that affect anything that is already going on?

Sampson: **We'll just have to wait and see. We are in our '07-'08 and still need to sign a class for this season. That is just something we will have to plan for as we go forward.**

Kelvin, with the spotlight that was on you after that sanctioned period, how can something like this happen? Do you think the perception will be that you are above the law when something like this happens?

Sampson: **I certainly don't think so. There was certainly no intent to think that we were above the law. The rules that we broke were mistakes but not mistakes where we are hitting our chest and thinking we don't need to worry about this. It is a mistake and we take full responsibility for what happened.** A lot of these were sloppiness or maybe a clerical error, not something that we were out front trying to do purposely.

Grace Calhoun: **The coaches I would add have been incredibly cooperative throughout the course of the review. We do want to point out again we found these problems ourselves as Coach Sampson alluded to and a lot of which can be attributed to some poor record keeping. But we did find the problems ourselves, the coaches were very cooperative with the review including the step of disclosing their home records to us so we could also review those.**

What is the next step?

Robin Green Harris: **We have submitted a report to the Committee on Infractions, which is the group that has to look at (inaudible). And we are awaiting to hear back from that committee. There are also other phone calls that violated NCAA rules and there will be a second report to the enforcement staff indicating the university believes these to be secondary and those will need to be processed by the enforcement staff. So there are two reports, two processes, but it is important to emphasize the penalties cover all the issues we have reviewed.**

Do these penalties mean Coach Sampson is prevented from going off campus to recruit?

Grace or Robin: **He is not prohibited from off campus recruiting.**

Rick, how worried are you about the public's perception of you going forward? You took a chance on hiring Kelvin to begin with and now something like this happens, are you at all worried about that?

Greenspan: **First and foremost I think my responsibility as the athletic director is to try to run this organization in the best way that I can. That incorporates a lot of things. It incorporates personnel in making hopefully wise and valued personnel decisions. It involves fiscal matters. It involves academic matters. It involves a lot of things. So I accept my responsibility for the position that I am put in, but the actions that I contribute to and decisions that I make. I am certainly not going to judge myself. It is for others to judge.**

I would like to think that despite our significant and profound disappointment, a couple things come through here. One is that the work that Coach Sampson has done in so many areas to be very significant and very meaningful to our fan base. And the work that he has done in terms of good and effective recruiting, coaching and teaching of our young people. I think in terms of his outreach to our fans. His charitable work and other things that will go on for a long time.

As for me I understand the responsibilities of my position. I am very, very disappointed to be in the position that I am in but I don't in any way absolve myself from the responsibility of being athletic director at Indiana.

With the echo earlier, it was really hard to follow with the three way calling explanation. I am hoping Coach Sampson could once again tell us what happened with the three way calling and why is that a violation of the sanctions?

Sampson: **Under NCAA rules you are allowed to make three way calls. That is not against the NCAA rules. The sanctions that were put on us stated that I was not allowed to receive three way calls. Because of the way the calls were placed to me, outside of one of the 10 calls, I wasn't aware that they were three way calls. Without getting into too many specifics when someone calls your phone, especially when you are under phone call restrictions, you answer the phone and a kid is talking, you start talking to him. The going through the investigation and seeing**

Summary of Impermissible Recruiting Calls as Requested in Subquestions 1a and 2a

The calls listed in this chart resulted in a total of 128 phone calls that were contrary to the sanctions or NCAA rules. Of these calls, 126 were contrary to the sanctions and 42 violated NCAA rules (highlighted in gray) regarding phone calls (two involved only NCAA violations and were not contrary to the sanctions[1]). One hundred and eleven (111) of the phone calls were made to junior prospects contrary to Sanction E and 15 of the calls were made to senior prospects contrary to Sanction F. The following chart summarizes the impermissible calls that occurred:

DEJUAN BLAIR – CLASS OF 2007

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Sampson Cell	DeJuan Blair	5/2/2006	10:00 p.m.	2	A 15 minute call to Blair was made on 4/24/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Blair in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	DeJuan Blair Spoke to Grandmother	5/16/2006	7:49 p.m.	6	A 15 minute call to Blair was made on 4/24/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Blair in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	DeJuan Blair	6/9/2006	5:08 p.m.	18	A 6 minute call to Blair was made on 5/16/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Blair in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	DeJuan Blair	7/18/2006	8:47 p.m.	1	An 18 minute call to Blair was made on 6/9/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Blair in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	DeJuan Blair	7/18/2006	8:48 p.m.	2	An 18 minute call to Blair was made on 6/9/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Blair in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	DeJuan Blair	7/18/2006	8:49 p.m.	1	An 18 minute call to Blair was made on 6/9/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Blair in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	DeJuan Blair	7/18/2006	8:50 p.m.	3[2]	An 18 minute call to Blair was made on 6/9/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Blair in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	DeJuan Blair	7/19/2006	8:15 p.m.	2	An 18 minute call to Blair was made on 6/9/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Blair in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. 3 minute call on 7/18/2006 creates the violation.
Senderoff Cell	DeJuan Blair	7/22/2006	4:51 p.m.	2	An 18 minute call to Blair was made on 6/9/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Blair in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. 3 minute call on 7/18/2006 creates the violation.
Senderoff Cell	DeJuan Blair	9/15/2006	7:17 p.m.	6	A 7 minute call to Blair was made on 9/13/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Blair in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.

[1] These two calls related to Yancy Gates, whose father is his AAU coach and assistant high school coach. The calls occurred prior to the first permissible phone call date (June 15 of his sophomore year). According to Senderoff, the calls in question were with the father, but recruiting was discussed. Thus, consistent with its conservative approach, the University determined these calls to be contrary to NCAA rules.

[2] Even though this 3-minute call was recorded in Cybersports as "left message", the University considered this a countable call per its methodology of counting all calls three minutes or longer. As a result, the 7/19/2006 and 7/22/2006 2-minute calls became contrary to the sanctions and NCAA rules even though they might have been permissible.

AYODELE COKER – CLASS OF 2007[3]

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Senderoff Cell	Ayodele Coker's uncle	7/17/2006	5:05 p.m.	1	A 6 minute call to Coker was made on 7/2/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Coker or his uncle in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. 6 minute call on 7/2/2006 creates the violation.
Senderoff Cell	Ayodele Coker's uncle	7/17/2006	6:24 p.m.	14	A 6 minute call to Coker was made on 7/2/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Coker or his uncle in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. 6 minute call on 7/2/2006 creates the violation.
Senderoff Cell	Ayodele Coker	8/7/2006	5:03 p.m.	12	A 13 minute call to Coker's uncle was made on 8/6/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Coker in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Ayodele Coker's uncle	8/28/2006	9:24 p.m.	1	A 16 minute call to Coker's uncle was made on 8/28/2006 at 9:05 p.m., therefore another call could not be placed to Coker or his uncle in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Ayodele Coker's uncle	9/5/2006	6:41 p.m.	2	A 9 minute call to Coker was made on 9/4/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Coker or his uncle in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Ayodele Coker's uncle	9/6/2006	2:44 p.m.	2	A 9 minute call to Coker was made on 9/4/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Coker or his uncle in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Ayodele Coker's uncle	9/29/2006	9:33 p.m.	2	A 3 minute call to Coker was made on 9/26/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Coker or his uncle in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Ayodele Coker's uncle	9/29/2006	9:35 p.m.	19	A 3 minute call to Coker was made on 9/26/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Coker or his uncle in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.

JORDAN CRAWFORD – CLASS OF 2007

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Meyer Home[4]	Jordan Crawford's mother	9/30/2006	?	14	A 13 minute call to Crawford's mother was made on 9/26/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Crawford or his mother in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Meyer Cell	Jordan Crawford's mother	10/2/2006	1:52 p.m.	4	A 9 minute call to Crawford was made on 10/1/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Crawford or his mother in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.

[3] These calls were identified after a December 7, 2007 interview with Coker where he reported his uncle received recruiting calls from Senderoff. When the University realized in the preparation of this response, the number Coker provided for his uncle had not been listed by the coaches as a recruiting number and thus had not been searched during the investigation, the University reviewed Senderoff's phone records and recently identified eight additional calls contrary to the sanctions, two of which were also in violation of Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2. The University reported these calls to the NCAA Enforcement Staff and accepts responsibility for them but notes, due to the timing of their discovery, Senderoff has not had an opportunity to review or respond to the information.

[4] Note: Meyer's cell phone company (Vonage) for his home phone does not report detailed call information, including the time of the calls.

KENNY FREASE – CLASS OF 2008[5]

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Senderoff Cell	Kenny Frease	7/2/2006	6:47 p.m.	2	A 4 minute call to Frease was made on 6/17/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Frease in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Kenny Frease	7/18/2006	9:16 p.m.	1	A 4 minute call to Frease was made on 6/17/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Frease in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Kenny Frease	7/18/2006	9:16 p.m.	1	A 4 minute call to Frease was made on 6/17/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Frease in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Kenny Frease	7/18/2006	9:17 p.m.	1	A 4 minute call to Frease was made on 6/17/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Frease in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Kenny Frease	8/13/2006	8:40 p.m.	2	Calls were placed to Frease in July, therefore another call could not be placed to Frease in August per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Kenny Frease	8/14/2006	9:33 p.m.	38	Calls were placed to Frease in July, therefore another call could not be placed to Frease in August per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Kenny Frease	9/4/2006	9:43 p.m.	1	A 38 minute call to Frease was made on 8/14/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Frease in September per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Kenny Frease	9/4/2006	9:45 p.m.	1	A 38 minute call to Frease was made on 8/14/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Frease in September per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Kenny Frease	9/5/2006	9:45 p.m.	31	A 38 minute call to Frease was made on 8/14/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Frease in September per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Kenny Frease	10/11//2006	8:54 p.m.	41	A 31 minute call to Frease was made on 9/5/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Frease in October per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.

[5] Note: These calls are being counted as impermissible because a June 17, 2006 call lasted four minutes and was thus considered a (permissible) countable recruiting call, even though Cybersports indicated that only a message was left. This determination then caused calls in the subsequent months to become impermissible under Penalty E. The University determined that it would err on the side of caution by presuming the June 17 call to be a countable recruiting call, even though it is possible for cell phone records to indicate a four-minute call when only a message had been left (because cell phone companies begin timing calls while the phone is dialing and round-up to the next minute, the duration of a cell phone call quickly adds up).

YANCY GATES – CLASS OF 2008

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Senderoff Office	Yancy Gates' father	5/31/2006	?	0:31	NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. This call occurred prior to June 15 after Gates' Sophomore year.[6] **[Note: Not a sanction violation.]**
Senderoff Cell	Yancy Gates' father	6/7/2006	5:05 p.m.	2	NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. This call occurred prior to June 15 after Gates' Sophomore year.[6] **[Note: Not a sanction violation.]**
Senderoff Cell	Yancy Gates	7/11/2006	2:28 p.m.	2	A 16 minute call to Gates was made on 6/28/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Gates in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Yancy Gates	7/17/2006	5:16 p.m.	2	A 16 minute call to Gates was made on 6/28/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Gates in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Yancy Gates	7/18/2006	7:28 p.m.	1	A 16 minute call to Gates was made on 6/28/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Gates in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Yancy Gates	10/9/2006	9:25 p.m.	1	A 13 minute call to Gates was made on 9/5/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Gates in October per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Yancy Gates	10/22/2006	6:01 p.m.	1	A 13 minute call to Gates was made on 9/5/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Gates in October per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Yancy Gates	10/23/2006	9:12 p.m.	1	A 13 minute call to Gates was made on 9/5/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Gates in October per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Yancy Gates	10/24/2006	8:40 p.m.	2	A 13 minute call to Gates was made on 9/5/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Gates in October per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Yancy Gates	10/25/2006	7:20 p.m.	1	A 13 minute call to Gates was made on 9/5/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Gates in October per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Yancy Gates	10/26/2006	9:34 p.m.	1	A 13 minute call to Gates was made on 9/5/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Gates in October per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.

ROBBIE HUMMEL – CLASS OF 2007[7]

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Meyer Cell	Robbie Hummel	6/29/2006	5:46 p.m.	1	A 4 minute call to Hummel was made on 6/29/2006 at 2:11 p.m., therefore another call could not be placed to Hummel in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 4 minute call on 6/29/2006 creates the violation.
Meyer Cell	Robbie Hummel	6/29/2006	5:54 p.m.	3	A 4 minute call to Hummel was made on 6/29/2006 at 2:11 p.m., therefore another call could not be placed to Hummel in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 4 minute call on 6/29/2006 creates the violation.

[6] These two calls were to Gates' father who is his AAU coach and assistant high school coach. The calls occurred prior to the first permissible phone call date (June 15 of his sophomore year). According to Senderoff, the calls in question were with the father, but recruiting was discussed. Thus, consistent with its conservative approach, the University determined these calls to be contrary to NCAA rules.

[7] All of these calls and the 6/29/2006 2:11 p.m. "triggering" call were marked as "left message". These calls are impermissible because of the University's methodology of counting all calls three minutes or longer as countable calls.

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Meyer Cell	Robbie Hummel	7/10/2006	5:38 p.m.[8]	8	A 4 minute call to Hummel was made on 6/29/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Hummel in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Meyer Cell	Robbie Hummel	7/10/2006	5:46 p.m.	1	An 8 minute call to Hummel was made on 7/10/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Hummel in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 8 minute call on 7/10/2006 at 5:38 p.m. creates the violation.
Meyer Cell	Robbie Hummel	7/10/2006	5:58 p.m.	3	An 8 minute call to Hummel was made on 7/10/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Hummel in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 8 minute call on 7/10/2006 at 5:38 p.m. creates the violation.
?[9]	Robbie Hummel	7/17/2006	?	?	An 8 minute call to Hummel was made on 7/10/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Hummel in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 8 minute call on 7/10/2006 at 5:38 p.m. creates the violation.

PHILLIP JURICK – CLASS OF 2008

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Senderoff Home	Phillip Jurick	9/4/2006	9:51 p.m.	18	A 15 minute call to Jurick was made on 8/21/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Jurick in September per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Phillip Jurick	10/9/2006	7:17 p.m.	2	An 18 minute call to Jurick was made on 9/4/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Jurick in October per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Phillip Jurick	10/9/2006	9:03 p.m.	1	An 18 minute call to Jurick was made on 9/4/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Jurick in October per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Phillip Jurick	10/18/2006	10:06 p.m.	13	An 18 minute call to Jurick was made on 9/4/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Jurick in October per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Phillip Jurick's mother	3/26/2007	9:55 p.m.	1	A 29 minute call to Jurick's mother was made on 3/4/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Jurick in March per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 29 minute call on 3/4/2007 creates the violation.
Senderoff Home	Phillip Jurick	3/26/2007	10:00 p.m.	18	A 29 minute call to Jurick's mother was made on 3/4/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Jurick in March per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 29 minute call on 3/4/2007 creates the violation.

[8] If, in fact, Meyer did not believe he had made a countable call in June (because he only left messages), then this 8 minute call would have been perceived to be permissible.

[9] There is no record of any calls on Meyer's home, cell or office phone records, but the university has included the call as it is recorded as "left message" in Cybersports. Again, if Meyer had only left messages, he would have thought this call was permissible.

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Senderoff Cell	Phillip Jurick	4/10/2007	9:57 p.m.	10	A 29 minute call to Jurick's mother was made on 3/4/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Jurick in April per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Phillip Jurick's mother	4/15/2007	9:28 p.m.	1	A 29 minute call to Jurick's mother was made on 3/4/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Jurick or his mother in April per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 10 minute call on 4/10/2007 creates the violation

JONATHAN "BUD" MACKEY – CLASS OF 2008

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	1/17/2007	10:01 p.m.	8	A 3 minute call to Mackey was made on 12/24/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in January per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	2/12/2007	9:30 p.m.	11	An 8 minute call to Mackey was made on 1/17/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in February per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	3/1/2007	8:41 p.m.	1	An 11 minute call to Mackey was made on 2/12/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in March per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	3/1/2007	8:49 p.m.	1	An 11 minute call to Mackey was made on 2/12/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in March per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	3/1/2007	8:58 p.m.	17	An 11 minute call to Mackey was made on 2/12/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in March per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	3/1/2007	9:16 p.m.	5	An 11 minute call to Mackey was made on 2/12/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in March per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 17 minute call on 3/1/2007 creates the violation
Senderoff Cell	Bud Mackey	4/8/2007	8:05 p.m.	2	A 17 minute call to Mackey was made on 3/12/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in April per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. [10]
Senderoff Cell	Bud Mackey's granddad	4/16/2007	5:09 p.m.	4	A 17 minute call to Mackey was made on 3/12/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in April per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. [10]
?	Bud Mackey	4/16/2007	?	?	A 17 minute call to Mackey was made on 3/12/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in April per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. [Note: Cybersports documentation was not clear, but same number as the next call and thus assumed impermissible.]

[10] In the October 3 report to the Committee on Infractions, the April 8 and 16 calls were mistakenly included as violations. Per NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2, the coaching staff could call Mackey once a month. As the April 8 call was the first call to Mackey for the month and as it was only two minutes long, it should be noncountable and permissible. The April 16 call is thus the permissible call for the month of April.

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
?	Bud Mackey	4/16/2007	?	?	A 17 minute call to Mackey was made on 3/12/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in April per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. [Note: Listed in Cybersports as "talk to prospect"]
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	4/23/2007	9:24 p.m.	1	A 17 minute call to Mackey was made on 3/12/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in April per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 4 minute call on 4/16/2007 creates the violation
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	4/23/2007	9:26 p.m.	2	A 17 minute call to Mackey was made on 3/12/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in April per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 4 minute call on 4/16/2007 creates the violation
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	4/23/2007	9:28 p.m.	5	A 17 minute call to Mackey was made on 3/12/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in April per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 4 minute call on 4/16/2007 creates the violation
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/2/2007	9:49 p.m.	16	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/7/2007	9:16 p.m.	1	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007 creates the violation
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/7/2007	9:16 p.m.	1	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007 creates the violation
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/7/2007	9:17 p.m.	1	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007 creates the violation
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/7/2007	9:53 p.m.	1	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/20/2007	10:40 p.m.	1	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007 creates the violation
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/20/2007	10:43 p.m.	2	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007 creates the violation

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/23/2007	9:12 p.m.	6	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007 creates the violation
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/27/2007	8:36 p.m.	1	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007 and the 6 minute call on 5/23/2007 create the violation.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/27/2007	8:37 p.m.	1	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007 and the 6 minute call on 5/23/2007 create the violation. [Note: Because it cannot be determined who Senderoff was calling (during the investigation the University called the number, which would not accept incoming calls at the subscriber's request), it is unclear if this call is contrary to the sanction and NCAA rules and whether it is a countable call. Nonetheless, it is being counted as impermissible.]
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/27/2007	9:29 p.m.	1	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007 and the 6 minute call on 5/23/2007 create the violation.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/27/2007	9:30 p.m.	7	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007 and the 6 minute call on 5/23/2007 create the violation.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/27/2007	10:03 p.m.	7	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007, the 6 minute call on 5/23/2007 and the 7 minute call on 5/27/2007 create the violation.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/28/2007	6:46 p.m.	3	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007, the 6 minute call on 5/23/2007 and the two 7 minute calls on 5/27/2007 create the violation.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	5/29/2007	9:43 p.m.	14	A 5 minute call to Mackey was made on 4/23/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2007 and the four other calls 3 minutes or longer in May create the violation.

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Sampson Cell	Bud Mackey	6/5/2007	?	?	A16 minute call to Mackey was made on 5/2/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. [Note: There was no record of this call on Sampson's cell phone bill; it was nonetheless counted as impermissible because it was recorded in Cybersports.]
Senderoff Cell	Bud Mackey	6/8/2007	10:00 p.m.	4	A16 minute call to Mackey was made on 5/2/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The call on 6/5/2007 creates the violation.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	6/13/2007	8:50 p.m.	1	A16 minute call to Mackey was made on 5/2/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The calls on 6/5/2007 and 6/8/2007 create the violation.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey	6/13/2007	10:12 p.m.	8	A16 minute call to Mackey was made on 5/2/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The calls on 6/5/2007 and 6/8/2007 create the violation.
Senderoff Cell	Bud Mackey's granddad	6/27/2007	6:27 p.m.	2	A16 minute call to Mackey was made on 5/2/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The calls on 6/5/2007, 6/8/2007 and 6/13/2007create the violation.
Senderoff Home	Bud Mackey's granddad	7/17/2007	8:52 p.m.	4	A 4 minute call to Mackey was made on 6/8/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Mackey in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.[11]

SCOTT MARTIN – CLASS OF 2007

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Meyer Home	Scott Martin	7/17/2006	?	9	A 15 minute call to Martin was made on 6/26/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Martin in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Meyer Home	Scott Martin	7/18/2006	?	8	A 15 minute call to Martin was made on 6/26/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Martin in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 9 minute call on 7/17/2006 creates the violation.

[11] In the October 3 report to the Committee on Infractions, the July 17 call was mistakenly included as a violation. Per NCAA Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2, the coaching staff could call Mackey once a month and this was the first call made during the month of July and was thus permissible.

DEMETRI McCAMEY – CLASS OF 2007

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Senderoff Cell	Demetri McCamey	5/7/2006	7:56 p.m.	2	A 16 minute call to McCamey was made on 5/2/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to McCamey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2006 creates the violation
Senderoff Cell	Demetri McCamey	5/9/2006	10:56 p.m.	20	A 16 minute call to McCamey was made on 5/2/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to McCamey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2006 creates the violation
Senderoff Cell	Demetri McCamey	5/30/2006	11:24 p.m.	1	A 16 minute call to McCamey was made on 5/2/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to McCamey in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 16 minute call on 5/2/2006 creates the violation
Senderoff Home	Demetri McCamey	6/22/2006	10:38 p.m.	1	A 16 minute call to McCamey was made on 5/2/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to McCamey in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Demetri McCamey	6/22/2006	11:02 p.m.	1	A 16 minute call to McCamey was made on 5/2/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to McCamey in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Demetri McCamey	6/22/2006	11:06 p.m.	1	An 16 minute call to McCamey was made on 5/2/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to McCamey in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Demetri McCamey	6/22/2006	11:12 p.m.	1	A16 minute call to McCamey was made on 5/2/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to McCamey in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Demetri McCamey	6/22/2006	11:13 p.m.	37	A 16 minute call to McCamey was made on 5/2/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to McCamey in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.

MARCUS AND MARKIEFF MORRIS – CLASS OF 2007[12]

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	5/7/2006	7:59 p.m.	2	An 8 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 4/24/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	5/22/2006	6:37 p.m.	2	An 8 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 4/24/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	5/22/2006	8:06 p.m.	1	An 8 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 4/24/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	5/23/2007	6:07 p.m.	2	An 8 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 4/24/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus Morris	5/23/2006	7:01 p.m.	1	An 8 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 4/24/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Markieff Morris	5/23/2006	7:02 p.m.	1	An 8 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 4/24/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus Morris	5/23/2006	8:32 p.m.	1	An 8 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 4/24/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Markieff Morris	5/23/2006	8:33 p.m.	10	An 8 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 4/24/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	6/1/2006	7:38 p.m.	2	A 10 minute call to Markieff Morris was made 5/23/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Markieff or the Morris' mother in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Markieff Morris	6/25/2006	8:17 p.m.	6	A 10 minute call to Markieff Morris was made 5/23/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Markieff or the Morris' mother in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	6/29/2006	12:12 p.m.	9	A 10 minute call to Markieff Morris was made 5/23/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Markieff or the Morris' mother in June per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 6 minute call on 6/25/2006 creates the violation.

[12] The number of impermissible calls listed here for Marcus and Markieff Morris, who are twins, may be greater than the actual number. As both prospects were recruited by the University, counting the calls and determining the impermissible calls was more complex than with the other prospects. Under NCAA rules, the limits on the number of phone calls apply to each brother individually and allow coaches to call each brother during the same time period. However, several of the calls were to the twins' mother and Senderoff did not record whether the call concerned one or both brothers. The University, consistent with its conservative and strict approach to err on the side of caution, determined that each call with the mother thus counts as a countable call for both brothers. As a result of this approach, there was a multiplier effect on the number of impermissible calls due to the phone calls to the mother. Specifically, a permissible call to the mother in April was counted for both Marcus and Markieff, thereby rendering all attempted or actual calls in May to be impermissible under the sanctions, even though Senderoff was under the impression that at least some of the calls were permissible because there were two prospects in the family. Calls in June and July also then became impermissible as there was no required month off for either brother. It should be noted that the NCAA Enforcement Staff contacted the NCAA Membership Services Staff for an interpretation on how to count these calls and the response received confirmed the University's general approach. **(See Attachment 8 for March 13, 2008 email forwarding NCAA interpretation.)**

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Senderoff Home	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	7/17/2006	9:13 p.m.	1	A 9 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 6/29/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	7/18/2007	?	?	A 9 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 6/29/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. [Note: There is no record of the call, but Cybersports indicated a message was left with the mother.]
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	7/18/2006	4:13 p.m.	1	A 9 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 6/29/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	7/18/2006	7:26 p.m.	1	A 9 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 6/29/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	7/18/2006	9:05 p.m.	1	A 9 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 6/29/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	7/19/2006	6:15 p.m.	2	A 9 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 6/29/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	7/19/2006	8:30 p.m.	20	A 9 minute call to the Morris' mother was made 6/29/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in July per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Markieff Morris	8/22/2006	9:34 p.m.	2	A 9 minute call to the Morris' mother was made on 8/22/2006 at 8:52 p.m., therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus Morris	8/22/2006	9:36 p.m.	2	A 9 minute call to the Morris' mother was made on 8/22/2006 at 8:52 p.m., therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus Morris	9/6/2006	9:04 p.m.	2	An 8 minute call to the Morris' mother was made on 9/6/2006 at 8:32 p.m., therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Markieff Morris	9/6/2006	9:06 p.m.	1	An 8 minute call to the Morris' mother was made on 9/6/2006 at 8:32 p.m., therefore another call could not be placed to either Morris brother in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	10/9/2006	9:12 p.m.	2	A 3 minute call to Marcus was made on 10/9/2006 at 9:08 p.m, therefore another call could not be placed to Morris' mother in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Cell	Marcus & Markieff Morris' mother	10/13/2006	5:07 p.m.	2	A 3 minute call to Marcus was made on 10/9/2006 at 9:08 p.m, therefore another call could not be placed to Morris' mother in that same week per Penalty F of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250

BRET THOMPSON – CLASS OF 2008

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
?	Bret Thompson	4/1/2007	?	?	An 18 minute call to Thompson was made on 3/6/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Thompson in April per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. [Note: Senderoff listed call in Cybersports, there is no record of this call in phone records.]
?	Bret Thompson	4/12/2007	?	?	An 18 minute call to Thompson was made on 3/6/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Thompson in April per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. [Note: Senderoff listed call in Cybersports, there is no record of this call in phone records.].
Senderoff Cell	Bret Thompson	4/15/2007	9:52 p.m.	2	An 18 minute call to Thompson was made on 3/6/2007, therefore another call could not be placed to Thompson in April per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.
Senderoff Home	Bret Thompson	5/8/2007	10:35 p.m.	21	A 2 minute call to Thompson was made on 4/15/2007, therefore there was no requisite one month without a call and another call could not be placed to Thompson in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.

EVAN TURNER – CLASS OF 2007

Involved Coach	Individual Called	Date	Time of Call	Duration (Minutes)	Reason Call was Impermissible
Senderoff Cell	Evan Turner	5/11/2006	11:01 p.m.	14	An 11 minute call to Turner was made on 5/8/2006, therefore another call could not be placed to Turner in May per Penalty E of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250. NCAA Violation: Only allowed one call a month to junior prospects. The 11 minute call on 5/8/2006 creates the violation.

I/2130182.6

McCaw, Carrie

From: Harris, Robin Green
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2008 10:22 AM
To: McCaw, Carrie
Subject: FW: D-I Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 question

From: Neyland, Mark [mailto:mneyland@ncaa.org]
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2008 9:25 AM
To: Tompsett, Scott; Harris, Robin Green; Jones, Mark
Cc: Najjar, Ameen; Comley, Susan
Subject: FW: D-I Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 question

Good morning all. Below you will find analysis from NCAA Membership Services regarding the application of Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 as it relates to the recruitment of twins.

Mark A. Neyland
Assistant Director of Enforcement
National Collegiate Athletic Association
P.O. Box 6222, Indianapolis, IN 46206-6222
Office: 317/917-6274 / Mobile: 317/966-9354 / Fax: 317/917-6055

From: Hostetter, Brad
Sent: Wednesday, March 12, 2008 4:57 PM
To: Neyland, Mark
Subject: RE: D-I Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 question

Mark

The interpretation below confirms that the recruiting regs apply separately. However, if one phone call incorporated discussion on both prospects, that counts as the school's one call per month for EACH prospect. In other words, they get one call for each kid and they used it at once since they discussed both kids.

Member institution recruits twin prospective student-athletes

Date Issued: Oct 11, 1991
Type: Staff Interpretation
Item Ref: a

Interpretation: Generate Archive Request

a. Member Institution Recruits **Twin** Prospective Student-Athletes: Reviewed NCAA Bylaws 13.1.4 (permissible number of contacts) and 13.1.6 (limitations on number of evaluations -- all sports) and confirmed that the recruiting regulations (e.g., permissible number of contacts and evaluations) would apply separately to each **twin** prospective student- athlete who is

being earnestly recruited by a member institution.

From: Neyland, Mark
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2008 10:20 AM
To: Hostetter, Brad
Subject: D-I Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2 question

Brad,

I have a question regarding the application of the "one call per month" rule in Bylaw 13.1.3.1.2, as it relates to multiple psa's living in one home. Specifically, I have an instance where a set of twins were being recruited by an institution as a "package deal". My understanding is that in this circumstance, an institution may make one call per month to each of the twins individually. My question is whether that also applies to calls made to the relative(s), even if it is clear that the call to the relative was for the purpose of recruiting both twins. I have a situation where an institution was calling the mother of twins and when interviewed, the mother said that all calls were for the purpose of recruiting both twins. My instinct tells me that the institution would be able to place two calls per month to the mom (one per son) regardless of whether they discussed both sons in each call, but I wanted to confirm this with you.

Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Thanks,

Mark A. Neyland
Assistant Director of Enforcement
National Collegiate Athletic Association
P.O. Box 6222, Indianapolis, IN 46206-6222
Office: 317/917-6274 / Mobile: 317/966-9354 / Fax: 317/917-6055

Verification that Rob was aware of call restrictions by 5/1/06!

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Sent: Monday, May 01, 2006 10:29 AM
To: Senderoff, Robert A.
Cc: Pope, Christian Dean
Subject: MBB Questions

Hi Rob,

Maybe we can meet face-to-face today!

Anyway, just a few quick clarifications:

You can begin sending out written correspondence to sophomores (2008 graduates) beginning June 15 at the conclusion of their sophomore year (not at the conclusion of each prospect's sophomore year). Until June 15, you can send out a generic cover letter for questionnaires. I am checking with the Big Ten to see about generic cover letters for camp brochures (didn't find anything on point in the database or our camp/clinic guide regarding this issue).

Also, for the 2007 graduates, currently in their junior year, you may:

1. Call them once **every other** month (per IU's and UO's self-imposed penalties regarding 13.1.3.1.2. MBB may NOT call juniors once a month until after June 30, 2007!
2. Send recruiting correspondence per 13.4.1. Please be sure to carefully review this bylaw as it was changed last year! But, you can definitely include a personalized cover letter for camp brochures and questionnaires.

As for 2006 graduates, we can only call them once a week (again per the self-imposed penalties), unless they have signed an NLI with IU.

I'll forward on the Big Ten's response regarding generic cover letters as soon as I get it. Also, in the future, please contact Christian Pope (856-6074 or cdpope@indiana.edu) as he is our point person on recruiting and interpretations.

Finally, we need to schedule an orientation (regarding IU's compliance policies and procedures) with you and Jerry Green as soon as possible.

Thanks and looking forward to meeting you!

Jennifer

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451

Compliance Staff Notes From Men's Basketball Recruiting Meetings (April 2006 through May 2007)

No.	Date	Time	Context
1	04.25.06	10-10:00 am	Mt w/Jerry Green @ recruiting methodolgy & Oklahoma miscellaneous issues. Specifically, I began by asking what software they had utilized in the past and what method they would proceed to utilize at IU. Coach Green indicated that Oklahoma had a specific piece of software that they had thought was sound and that we should begin to attempt to acquire from the OU staff. I indicated that I would ask our Assistant Director of Athletics for compliance if she could request that for Indiana to review and see if it were suitable for our purposes. I then asked how they were set up to immediately begin collection of data on recruits. I was shown and did review a small stack of sheets that had been printed from the Cybersports program detailing variopus current IU recruits as well as simple recruiting sheets that the new coaches were using to indicate recruiitng activities for new recruits that the new staff were primarily focusing on. The meeting concluded at 10:30 and Coach Green did indicate that we will continue our weekly meetings on Tuesdays at 10 am.
2	05.04.06	9:30-10 am	Mt w/Jerry Green @ recr methodolgy & Listing from Cybersports. Specifically, I sat with Coach Green in his office to review the files recently created from the Cybersports recruiting software. This was a particularly informal meeting and the review was done as a spot check on the progress being made. The meeting conclude at 10 am.
3	05.09.06	1-3:30 pm	This meeting with the DOBO was a joint meeting with myself and the assistant coaches and focused on Cybersports training. The program and its functions were imparted to us by a conference call. Those that attended were as follows: BJ McElroy, Rall McCallum, Jeff Meyer, Jerry Green, Rob Senderoff, myself and Beth McLaughlin. At this meeting it was unannimous that Cybersports was more than sufficient for their needs and that this particular piece of software would be what the staff would utilize at Indiana University. This meeting concluded at 3:30 pm.
4	05.25.06	10-10:15 am	Mt w/J. Green @ phone logs request for March through the present, a individual statement from each coach about home phone usage and whether or not it is used for recruiting purposes, cell phone logs and all coacntact numbers for every prospect we have recruited since their hire. Coach Green contacted John Tweedie to have IU phone records delivered to the compliance office and those were received on May 25, 2006 at 10:30 am. The statements will be forthcoming. Coach Green asked me to look into whether or not cell phone records would be necessary with IU administration. I contacted the assistant director of athletics at 4:00 of the same date about Mr. Greens comments and was informed that all records to include office, home and cell records would be required if those phones are utilized for recruiting purposes. I conveyed that information to Coach Green on friday May 30, 2006 at 11 am.
5	05.30.06	2-3:00 pm	This meeting was conducted jointly by the director of athletics and the assistnt director of athletics for compliance to discuss the sanctions that the committee on infractions imposed upon coach sampson as well as Indiana university and our self-imposed penalties. The entire basketball coaching staff was present and did discuss concerns regarding how different scenarios could or would play out regarding phone calls, speaking engagements, text messaging , etc. Jerry Green and Christian Pope were identified as the primary liaisons in each office to begin collection and sharing of any and all information regarding the implementation of the sanctions. See 05.31.06 DOBO meeting for specifics of the data collection. Additionally, Pete Rhoda, director of media relations, was mentioned with assisting in creating a "party line" to syncronize IU athletics with one voice in respoding to outside requests for speaking engagements for coach Sampson relevant to his situation, since many requests will be made of his attendance throughout the year.

No.	Date	Time	Context
			The last concern broached was that of incoming students and monitoring of housing and automobile data. Specifically, where the incoming PSA will live, who is paying for the housing, the automobile infomation that the psa will use(if any) as well as who paid or is paying for that, insurance payments being made by whom, etc. Jerry Green was assigned the duty of collecting and passing on that information to the compliance office.
6	05.31.06	9-9:30 am	Jerry then proceeded to disclose a cell phone issue with the sprint bill for Coach Senderoff. It was a bill with no included breakdown of all calls, text messages made. I requested that he have Rob contact his cell provider and request a detailed account with call by call/text by text breakdowns. All cell bills from March 29th forward were requested. I also requested that Beth or BJ copy the logs that coach Green was keeping in a hand written format to the cybersports recruiting software for ease of reporting in the future but to make a copy of the current phone logs (paper) and master log (paper) for the compliance office file. Those logs were to include all phone numbers available for a prospect to include (the prospects' cell(s) numbers, home number, parents' work numbers, parents cell(s), high school coach number(s), coachs cell(s), AAU coach numbers, etc.) BJ McElroy joined the meeting to request notification from the NCAA what speaking engagements were permissible to assist in solidifying coach Sampson's schedule. The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 am.
7	06.02.06	2:3-2:45 pm	This meeting was a brief review of the April off-campus contact log for all coaches. Coach Sampson used one dat on April 18th and met both Mr. Lance Stemler and Mr. Xavier Keeling. Jerry and I also met with Beth McLaughlin @ Cybersports database and what phone numbers for contacts were being input into the system. Additionally, I left a copy of the NCAA Infractions report for OU with the coaching staff for their review. Coach McCallum also asked about logging phone calls with regard to dropped calls and lapses between a dropped call and the resumption of the call depending on circumstances.(ie., Plane flight, system availability, etc.) I did inform him that per membership services staff member Jay Jones interpretation at the regional seminars in May, I had posed that very question and was informed that immediate returned "dropped" calls were permissible. Lapses in the return of a dropped call would constitute another phone call and be considered a violation.
8	06.07.06	4:30-5:15 pm	This meeting was a compliance review of speaking engagements and request for hard copy of all recruiting data for the past week. This meeting included myself, Jeff Meyer and Jerry Green. The issue of rules interpretations and communications with the compliance office was reinforced in that interpretive questions were posed to the eligibility coordinator and not the director of compliance. Proper communications were emphasized in this meeting as a means to avoid complications or lack of response to time sensitive issues. Additional questions were posed by both basketball staff inquiring about the interpretation of speaking enegagements and whether or not coach Sampson may attend an event, not targeted to prospective aged individuals if there is any chance a prospective age student may show up. I discouraged attendance at all such events until such time as the COI weighs in with their findings on the questions originally posed by the Assistant director of athletics for compliance to clarify the issue for IU and the basketball staff.
9	06.07.06	9-10am	Rules education regarding official visits process and internal procedure of IU conducted by Charles Armbruster. Those present include: Charles Armbruster, Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer, Ray McCallum, myself & Rob Senderoff.
10	06.13.06	10-11:30am	This meeting was focused on the committee on infractions response to IU questions requesting clarification for sanctions and to review sanctions specifics as well as to review collection of all pertinent data regarding the sanctions to include: A) IU is held in strict liability regarding coach Sampson and any activity in which he inserts himself off-campus. B) Coach Sampsons radio show must be on-campus. C) The sanctions are not specific to

No.	Date	Time	Context
			male prospects and carry over to females of prospective student-athlete age. D) The number of coaches who may be on the road at any one given time for the purpose of recruitiment. E) Coach Sampsons phone call restriction and its implication for when his assistants are making recruiting calls. F) The availability of text messaging and the fact that Coach Sampson cannot text a prospect and request a call within the body of the message. G) Coach Sampsons preclusion from having a phone call to or off-campus contact with a prospect who has signed a National letter of intent. H) The inability of Coach Sampson to return a dropped call placed to him by a prospect. I) The inability of Coach Sampson to speak with HS,prep-school, Juco or AAU coaches about any basketball related issues (i.e., offense, defense, etc.). J) The timeline remaining for an appeal to the COI findings. Those present were Jerry Green, Jennifer Brinegar & myself.
11	3:30-4pm	3:30-4pm	This meeting was with BJ McElroy, Jerry Green and Beth McLaughlin to request the following items: a) Data on Coach Sampson's recruiting trips on April 22-23 and 29-30. b) A s tatement to indicate all off campus recruiting activity for Coach Sampson between March 29 and May 25 to include prospect's names, schools, cities, type of recruiting activity, etc. c) A statement to indicate that Coach Sampson has not recruited off campus since May 25 including no off-campus contact with any HS, JC or AAU coach. d) A statement to indicate that the assistant coaches have been briefed on, and fully understand all of the sanctions imposed on Coach Sampson and the IU MBB program by the COI, including those carried over from Oklahoma. e) MBB must have all recruiting activities (contacts/phone calls and evaluations made to date) logged in on CyberSports by June 30, 2006. The paper documents utilized to enter the data must also be retained. BJ did indicate that itme a was nearing completion and she did need to communicate with Coach Sampson for confirmation. Beth also indicated that Cybersports should be ready by June 30 with all data entered.
12	06.16.06	8-8:30am	This meeting was to clarify what items need to be collected for recruiting tracking. Two items were discussed. They are as follows: A) A statement to indicate whether or not home phones are utilized for recruiting purposes on a monthly basis. B) A statement from the coaches to indicate that home phones were or were not being utilized in recruiting by the coaching staff.
13	06.19.06	8-8:30 am	This was a meeting entirely focused on two things. I first met with Beth regarding the collection and input of data to the Cybersports DBF to request completeion asap for all phone numbers that the coaches utilize for each student-athlete. Also I asked Beth to step up the entry of all contact and evaluation data. Next I met with Jerry Green and Rob Senderoff regarding the camp violation regarding Bylaw 13.12.1.6 and the educational component requirement for all basketball camps to include drugs, gambling, alcohol, and the NCAA Initial eligibility clearinghouse and the importance for that piece to be in all camps not just those where prospective aged students may attend.
14	06.20.06	10-11 am	This meeting was entirely between me and Jerry Green. No others were present. I presented the information contained on the agenda document for June 20, 2006 and we reviewed all outstanding requests from the email from Jennifer Brinegar(outlined in meeting 06.15.06) Earlier in the day I was able to collect statements from the assistant coaches that the are in full understanding of the sanction imposed by the COI as well as adopted by IU. I also collected the document from Coach Sampson confirming that he has engaged in no recruiting activities since May 25, 2006. I also collected a calendar for coach Sampson to include any speaking engagements he has accepted to attend as well as a listing of all off campus recruiting he was involved in during April. He used 4 dates: April 18, 23, 25 & 30th during which only 1 contact was made with PSA [redacted] and the rest were evaluations.(20 in all) I did later this date speak with Coach Sampson regarding his schedule and the necessity to creat a buffer in the

No.	Date	Time	Context
			events he attends and any propsect who may be in the area to avoid any contact whatsoever. Mt meeting with Jerry Green concluded at 11:00 am.
15	06.27.06	9-9:45 am	Beth McLaughlin will speak today with the Cybersports software group to design a more detailed and specific report to suit our needs. Lastly, I conducted a rules education component with Jerry to inform the assistants regarding NCAA Bylaw 13.12.2.3.2 and coaches working at a noninstitutional camp/clinic. As of August 1, 2005, it is no longer permissible for a division I coach to work at any camp/clinic not conducted by his/her own institution. This met with some surprise and I was informed that Coach McCallum had been asked to speak at just such a camp. I met with him directly following the meeting with the DOBO to communicate directly that he may not work such an event. Our meeting conclude at 9:45 am.
16	06.30.06	10-11 am	This meeting was inpromptu and was initiated by Coach Green to "touch base" but precipitated a series of meetings for the assistant coaches as well as the support staff. I met with Coach Greeen in my office to convey my contact information as I will be out of the office the week of July 4th. I then met with BJ McElroy in the basketball office to request a change in the monthly phone declaration forms. I asked her to include the language that specifies for each coach which phone(s) are utilized for recruiting purposes to include: office, home, cell or any other phone. I next met with Beth McLaughlin regarding the logging of data in the Cybersports software. She indicated that the data is in process and she has had some difficulty meeting our June 30 deadline to have all recruiting phone calls, evaluation and contacts to date as well as any and all data regarding any official and unofficial visits made since the coaches were employed in late March. She assured me that the data would be in the system as of later today. She also showed me the new phone log report in the Cybersports software protocol that the coaches will sign weekly beginning this week that includes more detail regarding all recruiting calls to include who was actually spoken with when a cal is made. I then met with Coaches Jeff Meyer and Rob Senderoff to cover the data from the June 14, 2006 email regarding recruiting periods during the month of July as well as to cover each and every one of the COI sanctions. I immediately after met with Coach Ray McCallum regarding the same topics. Also, each coach was warned to communicate thoroughly regarding who is the recruiting coach for each prospect to avoid any violations regarding impermissible phone calls. The meeting concluded at 11 am.
17	07.11.06	11-12 pm	This was a regularly scheduled meeting but was to cover last week's information as the meeting was cancelled due to the fourth. As is our custom, we began with a review of the sanctions which as always was read verbatim to Coach Green. I then covered the reductions of phone calls permissible by the assistant coaching staff as well as the preclusion of Coach Sampson from recruiting off-campus at any time. Then we discussed coach Sampson upcoming schedule and I inquired about any engagements that had been added to review and verify if those events were approvable by the compliance office. I was concerned with the Batesville eveny and was informed that only 21 and older would be allowed to attend. The 2 dates in July that cause me to pause are the July 19 Indiana Celbrity Golf outing and the July 25 Chamber of commerce event. The sole engagement in August that I cannot approve at the point is the Wayne Street speaking engagement. Per BJ McElroy, Jeff Meyer set up the invitation and the basketball office does not have any information about it at this point. The other dates in August are the Varsity Club functions that we will control institutionally to prohibit entrance to anyone who is of prospect age. Next, we reviewed the phone declaration sheets from the month of June where each coach indicated which phone(s) they utilized for recruiting purposes for the month. Coach Green then provided me with a list of unofficial visits for the staff from April 5 on. Coach Green then presented me with a sample copy of the Cybersports prospect contact (countable) phone call

No.	Date	Time	Context
			listing. I received the offical (alphabetized listing) on July 13,2006. Last, Coach Green gave me the hand written phone logs for each assistant coach for the week of June 25 through July 1, 2006. Rules education was the next item of business discussed where we covered the dead period coming up as well as what is permissible during the july evaluation periods. Additionally, we discussed the changes in bylaw 13.1.7.2.2 and it was requested that all coaches sign all phone logs documentation when they return and process it to my office as soon as possible. The last item of business reviewed was to have coach Sampson inform me when he could meet upon returning from his vacation to discuss newspaper actices regarding [redacted] and Scott Martin(PSA). The meeting was concluded at 12:02pm
18	07.18.06	10-10:45 am	This meeting took the customary format in that the first three bullet ppoints were covered from the agenda document from the commencement of the meeting. While Jerry was printing the months of July and August to review coach Sampsons calendar, he provided me with the following documentation: 1. July 2-8 & July 9-16 hand written phone logs for each coach 2. The Cybersports phone logs from April to present signed by each coach 3. The statement requested in last weeks meeting from Coach Sampson outlining that he has not spoke with Scott Martin since calling him prior to May 25, 2006. 4. A statement from Jeff Meyer regarding his cell bills priror to May 26, 2006 indicating that Missouri has those records. 5. Jerry Green handwritten recruiting log 6. Coach Sampson calendar for the rest of July and August. We then discussed any new dates and reviewed the sanction issues and identified three dates for Jerry to follow up on. (August 14, 2006 Dell Harris Golf outing; August 23, 2006 IU school of Business orientation; August 25, 2006 Varsity Club open reception) We must maintain that any engagement restricts attendees to anyone not of prospect age. I the provided Jerry Green with the April Cybersports contact/evaluation logs for each assistant coach to sign and return. I also asked that he convey to Beth that once the July evalauations are returned to her to work hard at inputting those dates to the cybersports system so that we can have the coaches sign off on all July recruiting done ASAP. The last item of business discussed with Jerry was the review of the rules education portion of the meeting and the new legislation which will become effective on August 1, 2006 regarding Bylaws 13.1.7.2.2 and 11.7.1.2. We discussed what the coaches will be permitted to do regarding contacts under 13.1.7.2.2 as well as wheat they will be required to do under 11.7.1.2 becuase recruiting functions will no longer be permitted for other office staffers. At this point in the meeting we were joined in the office by Jeff Meyer and I asked if I may contact Mary Austin at Missouir to request his cell phone bills up to May 25, 2006. He consented. The meeting concluded immediately afterward at 1):45 am.
19	07.25.06	2-3 pm	This meeting was held with Jerry Green and myself in attendance solely. We discussed the conclusion of the July evaluation period and the issue of getting recruiting information to Beth for Cybersports input as quickly as possible. Then we began our coverage of the agenda items. Jerry then presented me with Coach Sampsons calendar for July and August to discuss any further additions. I reemphasized the necessity for the compliance office to review and approve the additions to coaches calendar before they are actually added to his agenda. Jerry indicated that the monthly coaches statemnents would be coming as soon as all the coaches return. I then met with Jerry and Beth McLaughlin about Cybersports logs and the production of prospective student-athlete records for compliance review and phone call checks on a weekly basis as well as monthly. Last I sat with Jerry alone to discuss the supplementary documentation regarding Bylaw 13.1.7.2.2 & Prop 2004-124 regardinbg communications with prospects during the July periods. This information as well as all supplements is forwarded through Jerry Green to all assiatnt coaches. The meeting concluded at 3 pm.

No.	Date	Time	Context
20	08.01.06	10-11 am	The meeting began at 10 am and was attended by Jerry Green and myself. We began the meeting with the review of the COI sanctions and IU's adoption of OU's penalties. I also discussed the conclusion of the COI report and what materials were to be included as well as the timetable for the staff's information. The next agenda item covered was Coach Sampson's calendar of events for August and September. I again emphasized the necessity of the staff to obtain approval from the compliance staff prior to ammending coach Sampson schedule to include the event. Four events were singled out as potential issues. The first being September 21 (Indy Boys & Girls Club event), September 25 (Columbus Rotary), September 28 (Indiana Education Conference) & September 30 (IU Law School). Jerry Green confirmed with BJ that all events had been garaunteed attendance by all but prospective aged students on August 01.06. I the collected from Jerry coach Sampson's contact & eval logs from the Cybersports database. Jerry assured me that the assistant coaches records would be forthcoming asap. Jerry then informed me that the countable calls report from Cybersports has grown to over 100 pages and requested that that form be reviewed online and not printed for inclusion witrh each weekly meeting. That point was agreed upon. The I requested the coaches countable call logs and cell bills as soon as possible as well as cell bills from Sprint. The last item covered was the discusion of the rules supplement for the week. Bylaw 13.1.8.8 was discussed and a color copy of the regulation was provided for each coaches review. Even though the regulation pertains to the entire academic year the focus was the fall contact period. The meeting concluded at 11 am.
21	08.08.06	10-11 am	The meeting began at 10 am and was attended by Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer and myself. As is customary, we began the meeting with a verbal reading of the sanctions and self-imposed sanctions adopted from OU. I the informed them that the report to the Coi had been submitted and was in excess of 100 pages and a copy should be requested if not already received from Jennifer's office. Next on the agenda was a review of coach sampson calendar and no new items had been added since the meeting on August 01.06. Jerry then presented me with coach Senderoff's recr logs both cybersports as well as self generated for the month of july. Jerry also provided me with all of the assistant coaches Sprint cell phone bills. Coach Sampsons' was requested and he indicated he would forward it asap. Jeff requested feedback on the format desired for evaluations records. Both written and Cybersports generated are requested by compliance. Jerry then provided me with each assistant coaches evaluation records from cybersports as well as all phone logs for each assistant coach as is in the database files to date. Beth is working diligently to include the July period but currently the evaluations are only through April for each. The Jerry provided the coaches individual handwritten records for the weeks in July. At that point I asked that Jerry schedule a meeting with the staff Jennifer and myself to discuss the Fall periods coming up n september and october to review contact regulations and we reviewed the supplementary document provided for each coaches review (color copy). Jerry then asked that I get with BJ and indicated that he would also to request that any changes to Sampson's calendar also include contact information to indicate who at each event has garaunteed no attendees will be of prospect age. I did meet with BJ and request that addition be made from this point forward. The last item discussed was the permissibility of coach Sampson speaking to a camera on campus while the assistants are in a home visit and having the video be a live feed to the computer that the assistant has setup at the remote location. I indicated that the question was unique and further investigation was necessary to give a complete and thoughtful answer. I then asked that Jerry secure Jff Meyers and Ray McCallums evaluation logs (handwritten) asap as well as Sampons cell bills. The meeting concluded at 11 am.
--	08.15.06	10-11 am	No meeting Jerry Green out of office

No.	Date	Time	Context
22	08.22.06	10-11 am	The meeting began at 10 am and was attended by myself, Jeff Meyer and Jerry Green. We began with a review of the sanctions and adopted penalties from OU and those were read point by point by me to to Jerry and Jeff. I then asked to review coach Sampson's calendar for the remainder of the month as well as Septemeber. Three dates in Septemeber were identified as potential issues. August 8, Barnhouse Int was aksed about and neither had knowledge of what that event involved. I asked Jerry to follow up on that event and report any findings to my office. September 21, Indy Boys & Girls club dinner was also pinpointed. Jerry reviewed and indicated that the attendees would be elementary and middle school students only. Heather Donogan is the director (317.920.4700) I am to follow up with her on 08.23.06. The last date discussed was August 28, Indian Education conference at IUPUI. Jerry researched and informed that no high school aged students would be in attendance. Johnny Fyln is the director (317.274.1465) and again I will followup on August 23 with a request for specifics from the director. At this point in the meeeting Jerry provided me with documentation of the past unofficial visits that took place in August (4 total). The Jerry provided the handwritten recruiting phone records from the past week as well as contact/evaluation logs from Meyer and McCallum. At this point we discussed the new legislation pertaining to skill instruction and the timeframe (September 15-April 15) that is permissible to allow the whole team to participate in skill related activities. Jeff Meyer indicated he would follow up with Ohio State regarding the Rising Stars exposure camp and how coach Matta participated in the camp when it appears contrary to bylaw 13.12.2.3.2. I then covered the rules edcuation materials provided to Jerry regarding competition against prospective student-athletes (Bylaw 1311.1.2) Last, we discussed the schedule of DOBO meetings for the immediate future based upon SA compliance meetings and beginning of the year miscelaneous. The meeting concluded at 11:04.
23	08.28.06	8:30-9:30 am	Attendees: Jerry Green and myself. This meeting was abreviated but contained the same information and rules education components as all the others. We began with a recap of the COI sanctions and adopted penalties as well as a review of Indiana issues regarding the adoption of Oklahoma carry over restrictions. We then reviewed together Coach Sampsons' calendar for September and October to review any and all speaking engagements that are coming up. Two dates were identified that needed follow up. October 11 at the Carmel Chamber Luncheon and October 30 P. Podsakoff's class. Jerry agreed to follow up with those dates and speak with the directors to discuss the importance of ensuring that no prospective aged students are admitted to the function. Jerry then provided me with documentation regarding phone logs and evaluation records for each assistant coach for the week preceeding. The we began with the rules education portion of the meeting. The Indiana University recruiting policy was discussed and I emphasized the importance of adherance to institutional policies regarding official visits and the process necessary to approve and reconcile the visit. The bylaw regarding meals on official visits was discussed as was the bylaw regarding entertainment on official visits of spouse, parent, and legal guardians. The meeting concluded at 9:30 am.
24	09.07.06	8-9 am	Attendees: Jerry Green and myself. This meeting was much the same in terms of structure as those that have preceded it. I began the meeting with a review of the COI sanctions and IU's adopted penalties regarding the infractions at Oklahoma. We discussed the allowance that the COI has now made in that now Coach Sampson can be with a prospect off campus and within a 30 mile radius but only when the prospect is on an official visit. This was precipitated by the request of IU administration through the Big Ten to Shep Cooper to request if Coach Sampson's house may be used for official visits and occasional meal even if Coach Sampson is not present. It was determined that his house could be used and he may attend the occasional meal, moreover he may have contact within the 30 mile radius with a prospect on an official visit to Indiana University. We then reviewed coach Sampson's upcoming

No.	Date	Time	Context
			schedule for the remainder of the month and for October. Two dates were identified for clarification by Jerry Green. September 20 (Investment Prof/Indy and September 25 Columbus Rotary). Jerry determined later in the day that this was a speaking engagement to a group of investment bankers in Indianapolis and he confirmed no prospective aged students, either male or female, will be in attendance. I followed up with the cloumbus rotary for assurance that no prospective aged students would be in attendance. The director of the event, Dick Johnson did confirm via email that no prospects would attend. Finally, we conducted the rules education portion of the meeting. We reviewed the the general restrictions on official visit transportation, the required day off legislation and the new legislation for the exception which allows for basketball to grant two days off either prior to or following a week where 3 basketball events take place. Bylaws 13.5.1; 17.1.5.4 & 17.1.5.4.7 respectively. The rules education portion was covered with Jeff Meyer, Rob Senderoff and Ray McCallum in attendance. The meeting concluded at 9 am.
25	09.13.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer & myself. I began the meeting with the reading of the sanctions and the preclusions covering the staff regarding phone calls and Coach Sampons specific issues regarding attendance at engagements where prospects may be in attendance. I then again emphasized that the allowance for Coach Sampson to have contact on a visit only applies to official visits and NOT unofficial visits. Jerry then provided a September and October calendar with Coach Sampsons schedule for review. No new dates were identified this week and Jerry did confirm that per BJ, once basketball practice commences in mid-October, caoch Samspon will all but stop excepting invitations to attend speaking engagements. We then turned our attention to covering phone logs and recruiting miscellaneous. Beth McLaughlin has now begun to initial the handwritten logs from the coaches so that I know that each call has been input to the Cybersports syatem. Now with the review of the Cybersports record I can cross reference them solely with the cell logs. As of early this week, I can now access each Coaches cell records on line and sort and search to locate numbers much more rapidly. This process was discussed with Jerry to be shared with the coaching staff. Finally, we began the rules education portion of the meeting. I spoke with each coach (except Coach Sampson) individually to cover the material. The session focused on bylaw 13.1.8.8 and the hot topic the NCAA had issued on September 8, 2006 regarding evaluations during the fall contact period of Septemebr 9 - October 5 with examples and application provided from the Big Ten. The meeting(s) concluded at 10 am.
26	09.20.06	8-9 am	Attendees: Jerry Green and myself. I began the meeting with a review of the review of sanctions on the basketball program as well as Coach Sampson. Each bullet point from the agenda was read aloud to cover the restrictions on phone calls and off campus activity preclusion. Next I covered Indiana's adoption of the penalties self-imposed by Oklahoma University. Each point on the agenda was also read aloud for emphasis. We then discussed item seven on the agenda and spoke briefly regarding the National letter of intent and the exception permitted under Bylaw 13.4.1.1.1. I then requested the september and October calendar to review any additions/ alterations to Coach Sampson schedule of events. The only additional identified event is on September 29 (Clevenger Award Dinner). This is an on campus recognition event for former athletes at Indiana University. Lastly we discussed the coaches recruiting logs (phone as well as contact/evaluation) input to Cybersports accuracy. I emphasized and requested that Jerry do likewise with each coach when he meets with them this week to make certain that there entries to their handwritten logs are accurate. The reason being, when Beth inputs the handwritten logs to Cybersports they are only accurate if the handwritten logs are accurate. When checking the cell logs, the compliance office must be certain that the logs in cybersports are accurate. The meeting adjourned at 8:50 am. I then met solely with Beth to

No.	Date	Time	Context
			emphasize that the handwritten logs are only due to compliance once she has input them to Cybersports and has initialled them to verify that they have been input to the system.
27	09.27.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Grace Calhoun, Jennifer Brinegar and Myself. We began the meeting with a review of the sanctions, which I read to the group. At the conclusion of agenda item 1, Grace inquired as to follow up with the basketball coaching staff during the week regarding information conveyed during the weekly meetings. Jerry informed Grace about inter-office communications, the usage of Cybersports by the staff as well the changes made regarding cell phone billing made by Grant communications. I then informed Grace that I do meet with the assistant coaches on a weekly basis as available. I then began the review of agenda item #2 and the adoption of the COI penalties. Jennifer asked about transcript receipts for all unofficial/official visits as soon as possible to determine admissability as well as clearinghouse issues and academic deficiencies for student development purposes. Grace concurre dwith the request and added that student development would like to begin tracking potential recruits at the earliest possible opportunity to assist in program planning with changes in IU and CLR requirements. Jerry discussed the probability of getting the information from the coaching staff and the difficulties in acquiring some data for those purposes but assured the group that every effort would be made to obtain information at the earliest possible opportunity. Jerry did refer Grace to Rob for a depth chart regarding hot prospects for the future. Jennifer then asked Jerry to clarify what he meant in his statement that some coaches would have more overall calls on their logs but that not all calls would be countable regarding recruitment. We then moved on to review agenda item #3 and Jerry provided Sampsons calendar for the group to review. October 11, 2006 was the only date Jerry was asked to research and report regarding the Carmel Chamber Luncheon. Grace excused herself from the meeting at this point and we then turned our attention to recruiting paperwork as provided by Beth for contact and evaluation fro the assistant coaches from April through July. This covered both items 4 & 5 on the agenda. We then beganm with the rules education portion of the meeting. We reviewed NCAA Bylaw 16.5.2(g) regarding nutritional supplements and I emphasized that the coaches need to be proiactive in discussing this bylaw with the student-athletes so that the only voice heard regarding supplementation is not that of compliance once during the year. Jerry was concerned that Jeff Watkinson (S&C) as well as Tim Garl have more access at this point as well as more influence regarding this area and that they should be informed and requested to cover this information with the team as well. Jerry did state that he saw benefit in collecting a listing from Tim/Jeff regarding what we currently provide to the team in this regard. Finally, we covered agenda item #7 and we focused the discussion on the possibility of having the cell bill downloaded directly to Cybersports electronically. Jerry provided contact information to me regarding Cybersports as well as Grant communications. The meeting concluded at 10:37 am.
28	10.04.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green & myself. I began the meeting with the reading of the sanctions and the preclusions covering the staff regarding phone calls and Coach Sampons specific issues regarding attendance at engagements where prospects may be in attendance. I then again emphasized that the allowance for Coach Sampson to have contact on a visit only applies to official visits and not unofficial visits. Then we discussed IU's adoption of restrictions to include weekly meetings and a written report to the COI. I then asked Jerry to let me know what information he had regarding the Merrillville issue. He was unaware of the occurrence and I filled him in the specifics as I knew them to this point. He requested to be kept informed with any further infoirmation as it becomes available. Jerry then produced Coach Sampson calendar for the months of October and November. No new dates for speaking engagements were identified and Jerry specified that Iu ought to shut down any new invitations in light of the

No.	Date	Time	Context
			occurance at Merrillville. Jerry then provided me with recruiting phone logs of Rob Senderoff and Jeff Meyer and specified that we had multiple phone calls the day(s) prior to two official visits that did not end up taking place due to the PSA cancelling the visit. [redacted] and [redacted] both cancelled their respecive visits. The we began a discussion regarding phone logs and the usage of Cybersprts software on the current cell phones of the coaches. Cybersports has quoted us a fee of $500.00 for the package which simply needs to be installed on the phones of our coaches. Jerry indicated that we should pursue this ASAP. Last we began our rules education portion of the meeting. We discussed the multi-team qualifying event hot topic and the NCAA's stance on how contracts should be drawn up for the event. Jerry was alksed to share both the agenda and the rules education materials with the coaching staff. The meeting concluded at 9:55 a.m.
29	10.11.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green & myself. I began the meeting with the reading of the sanctions and the preclusions covering the staff regarding phone calls and Coach Sampons specific issues regarding attendance at engagements where prospects may be in attendance. I indicated that today's meeting would need to be brief due to the fact that I woulkd be in attendance at Coach Sampson's appearance at Carmel this afternoon for compliance oversight. I also indicated that Coach is restricted to contact with a prospect on an unofficial visit to campus only. The 30 mile radius applies only to prospects during an official visit to IU. I urged that care must be taken when we schedule an official visit and other prospects come on unofficial during the same time frame. We then reviewed Coach Sampson's calendar from October through December. No new appearances or speaking engagements were noted. Jerry then supplied me with copies of the coaches Septemebr recruiting contacyts and evaluations logs to track dates used from the 130 permissible allottment. The assistant coaches utilized 44 person days during the September/October time frame. Jerry also processed the monthly statements from each person on the coaching staff as well as himself regarding phone usage for recruiting purposes for the month of September. Last, I spoke with Jerry regarding the Cyber web availability that basketball has for inputting all recruiting calls, evaluations anc contacts. This would eliminate the necessity for hand written logs and would sychronize the cell bills to the recruiter 2000 Cybersports reports that are monitored and signed by the staff. I met with Jeff, Rob & Ray as well as Beth about this Cyber web syatem and was met with trepidation as the staff believes that bouncing from the web to regular phone use during a travel trip and the complications that that would present. I indiacted that I would get in touch with Candice at Cybersports to request further information but was certain that this concern would prove unfounded. The meeting concluded at 9:50 am
30	10.18.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer and myself. I began the meeting with the reading of items one and two as well as the emphasis on restrictions and clarifications on Coach Sampson and the assistant coaches in particular regarding all recruiting activities as they pertain. I then asked Jerry to produce a calendar for Coach Samspon through Decemebr which we reviewed together. No new speaking enegagements were noted. We did however begin a converstaion about the Shalom soup kitchen dated on Friday November 3rd. I then jumped to agenda item number 6 and we began the rules education component concerning promotional activities. We reviewed the procedures necessary to ensure all paperwork was on file and that the activity has been approved prior to the event. We reviewed the paperwork and the points of emphasis as well as what portions of the documents were needed by which agency officials. I emphasized the importance of pre-approval of the event prior to participation by the team and Jerry assured me that both the Shalom soup kitchen as well as two school corporation officials had been forwarded the promotional activities form for processing. We then turned our attention to the recruiting records of the

No.	Date	Time	Context
			assistant coaches and the move to Cyber web to assist in eliminating the use of handwritten logs. I urged that care must be taken to make certain any time a countable clall is placed to a prospect, their family or a coach, that the coach placing the call must make certain that they are logged onto Cyber web or the service will not record the call. I also asked if the staff had undergone training with Candice to educate themselves in the usage of the program. Jeff indicated that they had attempted to schedule last Wednesday and were not able. I informed them that Candice would be condiucting a Cybersports/Cyberweb training for women's basketball on Monday in the first aid conference room and that they may be able to attend also. Jeff indicated that they would attemtpt to do so. We adjourned the meeting after that discussion at 10:02 a.m.
31	10.25.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green and myself. I began the meeting with a point by point review of sanction and self-imposed restrictions. These were read aloud as usual to cover throughly all pertinent information concerning the restrictions on phone calls and off campus recruiting. Jerry and I then began our review of Coach Sampson's calendar to identify any new events/speaking engagements scheduled for the remainder of the month throughout the month of December. No new events were noted, however, the promotional activites (Shalom soup kitchen as well as the reading program events were discussed and the necessary paperwork was requested to have on file prior to the events for compliance oversight of any activities of the coaches and student-athletes.) At this point in the meeting, Jerry shared the coaches recruiting records (hand written) with me and we discussed Beth and input strategies for the coaches. I again urged Jerry to emphasize the Cyber web trainig with each assistant coach to synchronize the records and avoid any inaccuracies. Jerry concurred that the assistant coaches need to utilize the service and begin the training and said he would speak with each to that affect. We then turned our attention to the rules education materials regarding playing and practice seasons materials. Specifically, we discussed the application of the new legislation regarding the day off exception for basketball as well as scheduling issues for a qualifying multi-team event as well as the first permissible game allowed in the season legislation. Jerry and I then reviewed the schedule proposal for the 2007-2008 season for compliance with the regualtions concerning maximum contests for the year. We adjourned our meeting at 9:51 a.m. I then met with Beth McLaughlin at that time and we discussed scheduling each assistant coach with Candice at Cybersports Inc. to begin training on Cyber web applications for cell phone access and usage. I asked that Beth inform me when each assistant was available so I can be present for the conference call for each. The assistants were out and she will contact me as sson as eachbecome available.
32	11.01.06	8:30-9:30 am	Attendees: Jerry Green and Myself. I began the meeting by reading the sanctions and the preclusions covering the staff regarding phone calls and Coach Sampons specific issues regarding attendance at engagements where prospects may be in attendance. I then again emphasized that the allowance for Coach Sampson to have contact on a visit only applies to official visits and not unofficial visits. Then we discussed IU's adoption of restrictions to include weekly meetings and a written report to the COI. I then asked Jerry to inform me with any information he had regarding the IU Radio sponsor lunch set up by Frank Cuervo. Jerry had no further information than what was alrready known. We then reviewed Coach Sampson's schedule for November and December. No new dates or speaking engagements were identified. Jerry provided me with the written records from the assistant coaches regarding recruiting logs and asked about the conversion to Cyber mobile. The assistant coaches will probably contiune with written records until or if they become comfortable with recording their recruiting information using their cell phones through the cyber mobile software package. I then asked Jerry to update me on the promotional activities status regarding the student athletes affirmation (signature) on the promotion form concerning the reading

No.	Date	Time	Context
			program. He indicated that compliance would get the form tomorrow and the student athletes would sign that evening at practice. He also indicated that the team may work with special olympics if a mutual date can be worked out in the future. Jerry then provided a concern Coach Meyer had regarding the new legislation under bylaw 17.1.5.4.7 and if during the Thanksgiving week requires a day off. I assured him under Bylaw 17.1.53.6 that a day off would ned to be granted due to the fact that the entire week is not considered a vacation period by the institution. The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 am and IU then met with Coach Sampson and Rob Senderoff and Ray McCallum regarding the rules education materials covered with Jerry Green earlier in the meeting. Finally, I met with Beth McLaughlin regarding the collection of recruiting logs and the potential move to cyber mobile usage by the coaches.
33	11.08.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer & myself. I began the meeting with the reading of the sanctions and the preclusions covering the staff regarding phone calls and Coach Sampons specific issues regarding attendance at engagements where prospects may be in attendance. I reierated that Coach Sampson cannot be present during any phone calls that the assistant coaches make nor can he have off campus contact with a pSA on an unofficial visit. Moreover, he may only have contact within a 30 mile radius with prospects on an official visit. Then we discussed IU's adoption of restrictions to include weekly meetings and a written report to the COI. I then asked Jerry to provide me with the November and December Calendar for Coach Sampson to review any and all additions to his schedule regarding speaking engagements. Coach has no new enagagements to date for Novemebr and December. While we were reviewing the schedule, we discussed the athletically related activities regaulations and the day off requirement and what days were to be used during the month of November.
34	11.15.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer and Myself. I began the meeting by reading the sanctions and the preclusions covering the staff regarding phone calls and Coach Sampons specific issues regarding attendance at engagements where prospects may be in attendance. I then again emphasized that the allowance for Coach Sampson to have contact on a visit only applies to official visits and not unofficial visits. Then we discussed IU's adoption of restrictions to include weekly meetings and a written report to the COI. I then asked Jerry to inform me with any information he had regarding any new engagements for Coach Sampson. No further dates were identified. While we were reviewing the schedule, we discussed the athletically related activities regulations and the day off requirement and what days were to be used during the month of November. Jerry then provided me with the recruiting logs for Jeff Meyer and Rob Senderoff to include contact, evaluations and phone calls. Ray McCallums were not available at that time and will be provided as soon as they are collected. We then began our discussion of the rules education supplements. The topics covered included practice sites on road trips, departure and return expense restrictions, travel during vacation periods, transportation for competition occurring between terms, meal allowance limits and travel exceptions. Jerry asked that this information also be provide to Tim Garl. It will be emailed to Mr. Garl this afternoon. The meeting concluded at 9:40 am. I returned to the basketball office about ten minutes later to discuss Cybersports and recruiting records for Ray McCallum as well as to provide materials given to me by Jerry Green that had yet been input to the Cybersports system. At that time I also discussed the new autographed item process with Beth as well as BJ. Both expressed concern with the Varsity Club as well as the Alumni Association's heavy requests and their adherance to the new procedure. I then met with Ricki Chastain regarding basketballs concerns and a meeting was scheduled for lkater in the day to get all parties together and review what is expected and should occur from this point forward.

No.	Date	Time	Context
35	11.21.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer, Rob Senderoff and Myself. The meeting began as usual by my reading the sanctions and the preclusions covering the staff regarding phone calls and Coach Sampons specific issues regarding attendance at engagements where prospects may be in attendance. I then again emphasized that the allowance for Coach Sampson to have contact was only on official visits and did not extend to unofficial visits. Then we discussed IU's adoption of restrictions to include weekly meetings and a written report to the COI. I then asked Jerry to update me on any information he had regarding any new engagements for Coach Sampson. He noted that there were no future dates identified through january at this point. Jerry then provided me with the assistant coaches recruiting documentation for phone calls during the week of November 11 through 18th. We then immediately began discussing the rules education portion of the meeting. Both Jeff Meyer and Rob Senderoff expressed concern that [redacted] eligbility has come into question regarding years of particiation and asked that I look into that. Jerry indicated that he would follow up with Anitra on Monday after Thaksgiving break. The meeting concluded at 9:40 am.
36	11.30.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer, and Myself. The meeting began as usual by my reading the sanctions and the preclusions covering the staff regarding phone calls and Coach Sampons specific issues regarding attendance at engagements where prospects may be in attendance. I then again emphasized that the allowance for Coach Sampson to have contact was only on official visits and did not extend to unofficial visits. Then we discussed IU's adoption of restrictions to include weekly meetings and a written report to the COI. I then asked Jerry to update me on any information he had regarding any new engagements for Coach Sampson. He noted that there were no future dates identified through january at this point. I then asked Jerry for the information that the coaches have had Beth input to the Cyber sports database regarding recruiting. Only four recruiting calls were identified from the week of Thanksgiving by the coaching staff. Jerry then asked about the affect of the vacation break on countable athletically related activities and what the limits on weekly and daily hours applied. Jerry also asked if 17.1.5.2 applied to Men's basketball during the week prior to the exam week. I informed him that since basketball is in season, the legislation did not affect them but would in the spring term the week prior to final exams. We then began our discussion of the rules education portion of the materials provided. I discussed the main legislation regarding evaluation periods and what could and could not occur. We also coveredthe official interpretation enclosed to insure compliance during the coming month(s) for evaluations during the academic year. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:30 am.
37	12.06.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green , Jeff Meyer and myself. The meeting began as usual with the reading of the first item on the agenda to include phone callrestrictions on Coach Sampson until May May 25th 2007 as well as assistant coaches reductions in the number of calls that they may make to prospects in their sophomorer and junior years. The xceptions for NLI and official visits were discussed. I also covered the information regarding Coach Sampson being able to meet with prospects on an official visit to IU within a 30 mile radius of campus. We next discussed the committee on infractions requirment of weekly meetings between compliance and the DOBO as well as the written report coming in May 2007. I asked to review Coach Sampson's calendar and was provided with the remanider of Decembers calendar. No new speaking engagements were identified and none were expected to be added. I then reviewed with Jerry the recruiting paperwork that the coaches had provided for phone calls for the previous week. Jerry then asked that we review the calendar with regard to days off per week during the vaction period concerning the first week back in school in the spring term and Bylaw 17.1.5.4.7. We then began our discussion of the rules education portion of the materials provided. I discussed the new legislation being proposed for Spring 2007. Specifically we covered items 2006-23 (Tryouts after enrollement); 2006-25 (Professional Draft); 2006-52 (March

No.	Date	Time	Context
			Contact Period) and 2006-53 (Championship Dead Period) We also discussed one piece of general legislation item 2006-64 (Harship waiver) regarding the increases to 3 events or 30% even though the chances for this particular legislative piece are not good at present. The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 am.
38	12.13.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer and Myself. The meeting began as usual with the reading of the first item on the agenda to include phone callrestrictions on Coach Sampson until May May 25th 2007 as well as assistant coaches reductions in the number of calls that they may make to prospects in their sophomorer and junior years. The exceptions for NLI and official visits were discussed. I also covered the information regarding Coach Sampson being able to meet with prospects on an official visit to IU within a 30 mile radius of campus. We next discussed the committee on infractions requirment of weekly meetings between compliance and the DOBO as well as the written report coming in May 2007. Next we began our rules education component and I discussed the significance of communication with high school coaches and guidance offices regarding the upcoming core course changes for initial eligibility. The current 14 core course credits will be changing to 16 in two years and most high schools are still unaware and current sophomores will be adversely affected if commnicationss are not made to ensure the high schools are aware and notify the student athletes appropriately. We then began to address the recruiting logs of the coaches and reviewed the monthly calendar for Coach Sampson. Soem small change was needed for Coach Senderoffs recruiting log and was addressed. Also, we discussed the schedule for future meetings in the latter part of December and early January due to the season schedule. The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 am.
39	12.20.06	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer and Myself. The meeting began as usual with the reading of the first item on the agenda to include phone callrestrictions on Coach Sampson until May May 25th 2007 as well as assistant coaches reductions in the number of calls that they may make to prospects in their sophomorer and junior years. The exceptions for NLI and official visits were discussed. I also covered the information regarding Coach Sampson being able to meet with prospects on an official visit to IU within a 30 mile radius of campus. We next discussed the committee on infractions requirment of weekly meetings between compliance and the DOBO as well as the written report coming in May 2007. I then asked for and we reviewed coach Sampson's calendar for the remainder of December and January. No new dates for speaking engagements were identified. We then turned or focus to the coaches recruiting logs and Jerry provided the weekly phone logs for Meyer and Senderoff. Ray McCallum then joined our meeting and informed me that he would tuern his weekly phone logs into to me later today. He then excused himself from the meeting. Next we discussed the rules education componment of the meeting. We discussed the HT article concerning [redacted] and using the "Gun" for shooting practice versus coaches or persons with sports specific duties being present. We discussed and reviewed Bylaw 17.02.13 in detail and also reviewed an official interpretation from October 12, 2005 regarding non coaching athletics department staff members with sports specific duties participating in voluntary activities. In particular, we discussed the preclusion that coaches or staff members may not report back the activity which they witness if they are present. We then concluded our meeting at 9:29 AM. Ray McCallum then approached me on my way out of the office to reiterate that he would get his weekly phone log to me asap.
40	01.04.07	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer and Myself. The meeting began as usual with the reading of the first item on the agenda to include phone callrestrictions on Coach Sampson until May May 25th 2007 as well as assistant coaches reductions in the number of calls that they may make to prospects in their sophomorer and junior years. The exceptions for NLI and official visits were discussed. I also covered the information regarding Coach Sampson being

No.	Date	Time	Context
			able to meet with prospects on an official visit to IU within a 30 mile radius of campus. We next discussed the committee on infractions requirment of weekly meetings between compliance and the DOBO as well as the written report coming in May 2007. I then asked for and we reviewed coach Sampson's calendar for the remainder of January and February. No new dates for speaking engagements were identified. We then turned or focus to the coaches recruiting logs and Jerry provided the weekly phone logs for all the assistant coaches. Ray McCallum is short one weeks logs and will return it to my attention asap. Next we discussed the rules education componment of the meeting regarding telephone calls to prospects during competition related activities. Bylaw 13.1.7.2. We discussed the issue of Bylaw 17.1.5.4.7 and the Big Tens reversal of stance regarding taking two days off during a vacation period instead of the original response of one day off during thwe vacatioon period. We concluded our meeting at 9:31 AM. Ray McCallum approached me on my way out of the office to provise me with a copy of his weekly phone logs. Coach Sampson requested that I clarify he Big Tens reversal and why the timing has come this week? I informed him that I did not agree with the Big Ten's stance and would follow up with Jennifer and Chad Hawley for a resolution. I then met with Beth regarding the weekly phone logs and the Cyber sports database.
41	01.11.07	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer and Myself. The meeting began as usual with the reading of the first item on the agenda to include phone callrestrictions on Coach Sampson until May May 25th 2007 as well as assistant coaches reductions in the number of calls that they may make to prospects in their sophomorer and junior years. The exceptions for NLI and official visits were discussed. I also covered the information regarding Coach Sampson being able to meet with prospects on an official visit to IU within a 30 mile radius of campus. We next discussed the committee on infractions requirment of weekly meetings between compliance and the DOBO as well as the written report coming in May 2007. I then asked for and we reviewed coach Sampson's calendar for the remainder of January, February and March. Jerry indicated that the team was scheduled to work at a soup kitchen on Friday the 26th but at this point Coach Sampson was not scheduled to attend. No new dates for speaking engagements were identified. We then turned or focus to the coaches recruiting logs and Jerry provided the weekly phone logs for all the assistant coaches. Next we discussed the rules education componment of the meeting regarding Evaluations and the January recruiting calendar. We discussed Bylaw 13.02 and its relevance to basketball for the spring evaluation periods. We concluded our meeting at 9:45 am.
42	1.17.07	9-10 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Jeff Meyer and Myself. The meeting began as usual with the reading of the first item on the agenda to include phone callrestrictions on Coach Sampson until May May 25th 2007 as well as assistant coaches reductions in the number of calls that they may make to prospects in their sophomorer and junior years. The exceptions for NLI and official visits were discussed. I also covered the information regarding Coach Sampson being able to meet with prospects on an official visit to IU within a 30 mile radius of campus. We next discussed the committee on infractions requirment of weekly meetings between compliance and the DOBO as well as the written report coming in May 2007. I then asked for and we reviewed coach Sampson's calendar for the remainder of January, February and March. I asked that Jerry follow up on the date of February 23rd and the Heathcoat VIP session in Lansing, MI. Jerry indicated that he would with BJ & Coach. We then turned or focus to the coaches recruiting logs and Jerry provided the weekly phone logs for all the assistant coaches. Those logs were complete and had been input to the Cybersports datatbase. Then we turned the discussion to the rules education portion of the meeting to review information regarding official visits. We covered IU procedures for approval of visits as well as the regulations regarding the length of the visit as well as transportation and accomodations for the prospect. Last,

No.	Date	Time	Context
			we spent a brief minute on tickets for official visits regarding number permissible to disperse. The meeting then concluded at 9:35 am.
43	01.24.07	11-12 am	Attendees: Jerry Green, Jennifer Brinegar, and Myself. The meeting began as usual with the reading of the first item on the agenda to include phone call restrictions on Coach Sampson until May 25th 2007 as well as assistant coaches reductions in the number of calls that they may make to prospects in their sophomore and junior years. The exceptions for NLI and official visits were discussed. I also covered the information regarding Coach Sampson being able to meet with prospects only on an official visit to IU within a 30 mile radius of campus. We next discussed the committee on infractions requirment of weekly meetings between compliance and the DOBO as well as the written report coming in May 2007. I then asked for and we reviewed coach Sampson's calendar for the remainder of January, February, March & April. Five dates (2 in February and 3 in April) were identified as speaking/appearance engagements where Coach Sampson has agreed to appear. We then discussed the coaches recruiting logs and Jerry provided the weekly phone logs for all the assistant coaches which were complete and had been input to the Cybersports datatbase. Then we discussed the rules education supplement and reviewed the recruiting calendar for February (Evaluation period) and also a staff interpretation from last February examininig how to count, or not count, evaluations made by coaches at NCAA certified events in conjunction with the NCAA Championships. Lastly we began a review of Bylaws 17.32 & 30.7 regarding foreign tours. IU does not rwgard Labor Day as a holiday even though they do recognize the weekend as a holiday for faculty. Jennifer expressed that IU would have to pursue the matter with the NCAA via waiver to permit a labor day foreign tour. The meeting was conlcude at 11:56 am.
44	01.31.07	9 -10 am	Rules Ed topics are: Counting Recruiting Days at a Tournament; Preparation of Electronic Communication and Contact With a Student During Tournaments or Extended road trips. Christian discussed the Foreign Tour proposal with Jerry. No new dates identified for calendar. Attendees: Jerry Green, Grace Calhoun, Jennifer Brinegar and Christian Pope.
45	02.09.07	9 - 10 am	Rules Ed topic: New Legislation on Note Card restrictions. Reviewed Coach Sampson's speaking engagements on his calendar. Attendees: Jerry Green, Grace Calhoun and Jennifer Brinegar.
46	02.16.07	12 - 1 pm	Rules Ed topic: New proposals on freshman academic requirements – core curriculum time limitations. Reviewed Coach Sampson's speaking engagements on calendar. Attendees: Jerry Green, Grace Calhoun and Jennifer Brinegar.
47	02.23.07	11 am to noon	Rules Ed topic: Admissions and Graduation Data, Banned Drug List, and Initial-Eligibility Standards. Reviewed Coach Sampson's speaking engagements. Attendees: Jerry Green and Jennifer Brinegar.
48	03.01.07	2:30 - 3:30 pm	Rules Ed: Rules regarding summer school and permissible summer conditioning for prospects. Reviewed Coach Sampson's speaking engagements. Attendees: Jerry Green and Jennifer Brinegar.
49	03.07.07	11 am to noon	Rules Ed: New legislation and donations/fundraising (reviewed at compliance meeting on 3/6/07) (no supplement). Reviewed Coach Sampson's speaking engagements. Attendees: Jerry Green and Jennifer Brinegar.
50	03.13.07	11 am to noon	Rules Ed: Review of Upcoming Recruiting Calendar and Associated Rules Supplement was recruiting calendar for rest of 2007. Jerry asked about a philanthropy / promotional event with a fraternity and some IU basketball players. Ian followed up with Chuck and Jerry and the event never ended up occurring. Coach Sampson's calendar was handed in and checked. Cybersports and recruiting documentation review covered, and coaches' phone logs were handed in. Attendees: Jerry Green, Jennifer Brinegar and Ian Rickerby.
51	03.23.07	11 am to	Rules Ed: Review of Out of Season Athletically Related Activities. Discussion of current team and incoming

No.	Date	Time	Context
		noon	expectations for roster. Jerry had one or two camp questions, and Ian sent up the Camp and Clinics Guide for 2007-8 shortly after. Covered usual sanctions and Cybersports expectations. Calendar covered and additional dates verified. Attendees: Jerry Green, Jennifer Brinegar and Ian Rickerby.
52	03.28.07	9 - 10 am	Rules Ed: Educational Column – 17.5.5.1.1 – Qualifying Regular-Season Multi-Team Event. Discussed schedule and tour and details of the Chicago Invitational (qualifying event). Received preliminary copy of schedule. Handed out NCAA "Pro-Draft" rules ed piece. Covered calendar and usual recruiting documentation expectations. Attendees: Jerry Green, Jennifer Brinegar and Ian Rickerby.
53	04.04.07	2 - 3 pm	Rules Ed: Review of Summer Activities and Contact Period Reminders. Also, review of 13.4.1.1. Ian presented hand-out on contact limitations at tournaments, including the April contact period. Also discussed "Certified events" and other "on-the-road" recruiting restrictions. Covered Summer Activities and limits for players and coaches. Usual reminders. Attendees: Jerry Green, Jennifer Brinegar, Ian Rickerby, Kelvin Sampson, Jeff Meyer and Rob Senderoff.
54	04.12.07	10 -11 am	Ruled Ed: Review of 13.4.1.1 – (reviewed with entire coaching staff due to the secondary violation). - no supplement. Calendar approved; Cybersports and recruiting documentation review covered, and coaches' phone logs were handed in. Attendees: Jerry Green, Jennifer Brinegar and Ian Rickerby.
55	04.20.07	2 -3 pm	Rules Ed: Recruiting Person Days and after NLI signing contact restrictions. Calendar approved: Cybersports and recruiting documentation reminders. Attendees: Jerry Green, Grace Calhoun, Jennifer Brinegar and Ian Rickerby.
56	04.26.07	10:30 - 11:30 am	Rules Ed: Medical Exams. Calendar approved / usual reminders. Attendees: Jerry Green, Grace Calhoun, Jennifer Brinegar and Ian Rickerby.
57	05.03.07	10 - 11 am	Rules Ed: All-Star Games. Clarified the phone call / recruiting limitations and sanctions, including end dates. Ian requested recruiting documentation from last week - April contact period. Discussed off-campus outside competition for some current and incoming players for this summer. Calendar approved. Attendees: Jeff Meyer, Jennifer Brinegar and Ian Rickerby.
58	05.10.07	10 - 11 am	Rules Ed: May Classic Reminders - Ian covered handout on May Classic and various questions received by coaching staff in the preceding week. Reviewed Cybersports logs and recruiting documentation. Attendees: Jeff Meyer, Jennifer Brinegar and Ian Rickerby.
59	05.17.07	10 - 11 am	Rules Ed: Phone Calls and the Lifting of Coach Sampson's Off-Campus and Calling Restrictions as of May 25th, 2007 - Ian covered the end of the COI sanctions and what was permissible from May 25th on. No new calendar dates - plus restrictions now off for Coach Sampson's appearances. (Other than the usual NCAA restrictions). Requested Coach McCallum's phone logs and reminded Jeff about other Cybersports documentation. Attendees: Jeff Meyer, Jennifer Brinegar and Ian Rickerby.
60	05.23.07	10 am - 1 pm	Rules Ed: Comprehensive Review for the Coaches Certification Exam. Jennifer Brinegar and Ian Rickerby met with entire staff in Athletic Director's Conference room to cover all areas for upcoming recruiting test. 3 hours of review plus several follow up questions regarding Power Point presentations, some imperfect wording in the NCAA bylaws and a confirmation that a camp may begin in late May if it continues through to June. Attendees: Jeff Meyer, Jennifer Brinegar, Ian Rickerby, Kelvin Sampson, Ray McCallum, and Rob Senderoff.

Impermissible Three-Way Calls

The calls listed below were impermissible because the three-way calls involved Sampson in violation of Penalty L of NCAA Infractions Report No. 250.

Involved Coach	Individual Called[1]	Date	Time	Duration (minutes)
Senderoff cell	unknown (incoming)	5/31/2006	3:11 p.m.	7
Senderoff cell	DeJuan Blair's "Influential Person" (Darelle Porter)	5/31/2006	6:15 p.m.	1
Senderoff cell	DeJuan Blair's "Influential Person" (Darelle Porter)	5/31/2006	6:18 p.m.	8
Senderoff cell	unknown[2]	6/1/2006	7:58 p.m.	9
McCallum cell	unknown (incoming)	6/1/2006	11:07 p.m.	5
McCallum cell	unknown (incoming)	6/6/2006	7:54 p.m.	5
Senderoff cell	DeJuan Blair's grandmother	6/9/2006	5:11 p.m.	15
Senderoff cell	unknown (incoming)	6/19/2006	10:09 p.m.	2
Senderoff cell	Wil Buford's "Influential Person" (Keith McClure)	6/19/2006	10:25 p.m.	10
McCallum cell	unknown (incoming)	6/22/2006	9:22 p.m.	22
Senderoff cell	DeJuan Blair	8/22/2006	10:55 p.m.	34
Senderoff cell	DeJuan Blair	10/4/2006	9:51 p.m.	4
Senderoff cell	Ayodele Coker	10/4/2006	10:47 p.m.	5
Senderoff cell	[redacted]	1/29/2007	10:27 p.m.	1
Senderoff cell	[redacted]	1/29/2007	10:30 p.m.	9
Senderoff cell	Yancy Gates	2/7/2007	9:28 p.m.	12
Senderoff cell	DeAndre Thomas	4/5/2007	6:38 p.m.	6
Senderoff cell	Devin Ebanks' Mom	5/1/2007	9:49 p.m.	26

[1] All incoming calls (the numbers remain unknown) that include Sampson were assumed to be recruiting calls for the purposes of assessing the scope of the sanction issues and the appropriate penalties.

[2] This call was to a Detroit phone number. The University has not been able to identify the individual using that number as the number has been disconnected and reassigned. However, after consultation with Senderoff, the University is fairly certain the phone number was used previously by the AAU coach of a prospective student-athlete from Detroit. The call was thus likely, and is presumed to be, a recruiting call.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

August 1, 2006

Mr. Thomas E, Yeager
Acting Chair of the NCAA Division I
Committee on Infractions
Colonial Athletic Association

VIA FACSIMILE

Dear Mr. Yeager,

Attached please find Indiana University's report to the Committee on Infractions that is due by August 1, 2006. Since we are faxing this report to Jim Elworth at the NCAA, we will send another copy along with all of the attachments (documentation) in regular mail.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Brinegar

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director – Compliance
812-855-0451 (O)
812-327-0071 (C)
812-856-5155 (F)
jhooker@indiana.edu

cc: Rick Greenspan
Bruce Jaffee
Kelvin Sampson
Grace Calhoun

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2794
Fax: 812-856-5155
iuhoosiers.com

Indiana University
Report to the Committee on Infractions
August 1, 2006

This report is filed in compliance with the Committee on Infractions report dated May 25, 2006, that contained the findings and penalties imposed against Coach Kelvin Sampson. The report is organized as follows:

I. Review of Penalties.
II. Monitoring of the Men's Basketball Staff by Indiana University.
III. Rules Education Program for the Men's Basketball Staff by Indiana University.
IV. Appendices.

I. Review of Penalties:

A. The University of Oklahoma self-imposed a number of penalties on its men's basketball program. Indiana University believes that when violations occur, regardless of the intent, appropriate penalties must follow. Therefore, Indiana University adopted those penalties that related directly to Coach Sampson and placed additional requirements on the men's basketball program. The following are the *original* penalties Indiana imposed on Coach Sampson and the men's basketball program:

1. The director of compliance will meet, on a weekly basis, with the head coach or the director of men's basketball operations to review men's basketball recruitment activities and documentation for the previous and upcoming weeks. Furthermore, Indiana University will file a written report with the NCAA not later than August 31, 2007, detailing the implementation and fulfillment of the penalties which were transferred to Coach Kelvin Sampson upon his employment at Indiana University.

2. Reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school through July 31 of the prospect's junior year in high school from one call per month to one call every other month for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

3. Reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after August 1 of the prospect's senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

4. Restrict the number of days which Coach Kelvin Sampson may recruit off-campus to a maximum of 4 during the period of March 29, 2006, through June 30, 2006. (Coach Sampson used 15 of the 19 recruiting-person days he was permitted pursuant to the University of Oklahoma's self-imposed penalties while still employed at the University of Oklahoma).

5. Impose similar base and bonus compensation restrictions on Coach Kelvin Sampson, for the period beginning March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007, that were self-imposed by the University of Oklahoma.

These restrictions were addressed in a compliance agreement that was signed by the athletics director, faculty representative and head coach (see Appendix A for a draft of this document).

B. After the Committee on Infractions report dated May 25, 2006, the original compliance agreement dated April 19, 2006, was revised and noted that although Indiana University adopted and transferred Oklahoma's penalties regarding Coach Sampson, further recruiting restrictions were required. Therefore, we amended the earlier agreement to develop a revised compliance agreement that was executed on June 9, 2006 (see Appendix B). The complete list of corrective actions is now as follows:

1. The director of compliance or the assistant athletics director for compliance will meet, on a weekly basis, with the head coach or the director of men's basketball operations to review men's basketball recruitment activities and documentation, including telephone records. Coach Sampson will work with the compliance staff to establish effective monitoring systems and regular and effective rules education sessions.

2. Indiana University shall submit a report to the Committee on Infractions by August 1, 2006, detailing our monitoring of, and rules education sessions for, Coach Kelvin Sampson and his staff. The report will also include documentation of Indiana University's compliance with all other penalties adopted and transferred to IU. Furthermore, Indiana University will file a written report with the NCAA not later than August 31, 2007, detailing the implementation and fulfillment of the penalties which were transferred to Coach Sampson upon his employment at Indiana University, as well as those assessed by the committee on May 25, 2006.

3. Reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school through July 31 of the prospect's junior year in high school from one call per month to one call every other month for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

4. Reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after August 1 of the prospect's senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

5. Restrict the number of days which Coach Kelvin Sampson may recruit off-campus to a maximum of four during the period of March 29, 2006 through May 24, 2006. Coach Sampson used 15 of the 19 recruiting-person days he was permitted pursuant to the University of Oklahoma's self-imposed penalties while still employed at the University of Oklahoma and used the final four as the head coach at Indiana University prior to May 24, 2006 (see Appendix C).

6. Impose similar base and bonus compensation restrictions on Coach Kelvin Sampson, for the period beginning March 29, 2006 and concluding June 30, 2007, that were self-imposed by the University of Oklahoma.

7. Coach Kelvin Sampson is prohibited, for a period of one year beginning May 25, 2006 through May 24, 2007, from making any phone calls that relate in any way to recruiting or being present when members of his staff make such calls.

8. Coach Kelvin Sampson is prohibited, for a period of one year beginning May 25, 2006 through May 24, 2007, from engaging in any off-campus recruiting activities. The prohibition on off-campus recruiting activities shall apply to all off-campus appearances at which prospects may be in attendance, including banquets, booster functions and exceptions provided by Bylaw 13.1.9.

II. Monitoring of the Men's Basketball Staff by Indiana University:

A. Each week the director of compliance meets with the director of basketball operations. The agenda includes a review of the committee's sanctions on Coach Sampson and the men's basketball program and monitoring of schedules, speaking engagements, phone call logs, and contact and evaluation logs. The meetings also include rules education sessions and question and answer opportunities (see Appendix D). This weekly meeting also provides a necessary conduit for both the men's basketball office and the compliance office to express concerns and voice questions for consideration by each staff. The following topics are reviewed at each weekly meeting:

1. Review of sanctions.

2. Handwritten phone logs from each coach (see Appendix E).

3. Cybersports phone call reports signed by each coach (see Appendix F).

4. Handwritten contact/evaluation logs from each coach (see Appendix G).

5. Cybersports contact/evaluation reports signed by each coach (see Appendix H).

6. Coach Sampson's personal schedule for the month as well as the coming month (see Appendix I).

7. Rules education supplement (see Section III).

B. The primary focus to date in the monitoring of recruiting records has been that of phone logs.

1. Each month the coaching staff produces a statement indicating what phones they have utilized for recruiting purposes (see Appendix J).

2. Indiana University utilizes a software program (Cybersports) in which each recruiting coach inputs his handwritten recruiting records.

3. A report is produced weekly by an administrative assistant in men's basketball from the Cybersports data and then those reports as well as the coaches' handwritten records are forwarded to the compliance office (see Appendix K).

4. Additionally, each month each coach produces a personal cell phone bill which is itemized and cross referenced with his handwritten records to assure compliance with NCAA rules, as well as the current sanctions being imposed.

5. University phone logs which are forwarded to the compliance office by the business office monthly are also cross checked to assure that NCAA rules and COI restrictions are being met.

C. Contact and evaluation logs are currently the secondary focus for recruiting data:

1. The coach produces handwritten records for the administrative assistant to input to the Cybersports software.

2. The Cybersports report is generated and signed by each coach monthly (see Appendix H).

3. Both the handwritten records as well as the software reports are collected by the compliance office.

4. Those reports are reviewed to assure that NCAA rules and COI restrictions are being met.

D. Any and all clarification can and does precipitate further meetings during the week, both at the discretion of the compliance office as well as the basketball staff. Every effort is being expended to assure full and complete compliance on all levels.

III. Rules Education Program for the Men's Basketball Staff by Indiana University:

A. Indiana University has and will continue to take advantage of each opportunity to educate thoroughly every coaching staff member. As this applies to the men's basketball staff, the weekly meetings have proved to be opportune times to broach timely subjects in an effort to be proactive and avoid potential future infractions. Moreover, the meeting provides the opportunity to address supplemental data. This gives the staff a chance to review and become familiar with new or relevant information, as well as providing the staff the opportunity to ask questions and attempt follow through on any items which may need clarification.

All such meetings occur regularly in the office of the director of basketball operations on Tuesday mornings unless time sensitive materials need to be addressed. The following issues have been discussed to date (see Appendix L for the handouts from all of these meetings, unless otherwise indicated):

1. MBB New Coaches Compliance Meeting (04.03.06) (see Appendix M for the agenda and handouts). Attendees: Kelvin Sampson (head coach), Jerry Green (director of basketball Operations, Jeff Meyer and Ray McCallum (assistant coaches), Jennifer Brinegar (assistant athletics director – compliance), and Christian Pope (director of compliance).

2. MBB Spring Team Meeting (04.11.06) (see Appendix N for the agenda and handout). Attendees: All of the returning student-athletes, Meyer, McCallum, Rob Senderoff (assistant coach), Brinegar, Pope, Anitra House (eligibility and systems officer), Chip Armbruster (assistant compliance and eligibility officer), Kathy Arnold (assistant compliance and financial aid officer).

3. Men's Basketball, Administration and Compliance Staff Meeting (05.30.06) (see Appendix O for the agenda and handouts). Attendees: Sampson, Green, Meyer, McCallum, Senderoff, Rick Greenspan (athletics director), Bruce Jaffee (faculty representative), Grace Calhoun (associate athletics director – academic services), Mary Ann Rohleder (senior woman administrator), Tim Fitzpatrick (associate athletics director and liaison for the AD to MBB), Brinegar and Pope.

4. Indiana University Official Visits procedures and NCAA regulations (06.07.06). Attendees: Green, Meyer, Senderoff, McCallum, Armbruster and Pope.

5. Camps and Media Activities (06.13.06). Attendees: Green, Sampson and Pope.

6. Camp Initial-Eligibility Education Component (06.20.06) Attendees: Green, Senderoff and Pope.

7. Camp Initial-Eligibility Education Component (06.27.06) Attendees: Sampson and Brinegar

8. Noninstitutional/ Private Camps Restrictions (06.27.06) Attendees: Green and Pope.

9. July Dead and Evaluation Periods (06.30.06). Attendees: Green, Meyer, Senderoff, McCallum, Armbruster and Pope.

10. Dead Periods and July Evaluation Clarifications (07.11.06) Attendees: Green and Pope.

11. Contact Restrictions and Recruiting Coordination Functions (07.18.06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

12. Bylaw 13.1.7.2.2 and July 24, 2006 Educational Column update (07.25.06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

13. Bylaw 13.1.8.8 – Evaluation Days (08/01/06). Attendees: Green and Pope.

B. Moreover, Coach Sampson and his staff have been to and participated at each monthly compliance meeting since their arrival at IU.

C. Finally, Coach Sampson took and passed the NCAA coaches' certification exam on June 5, 2006, despite not being able to recruit off campus until May 24, 2007. All of the other coaches also took and passed the exam on June 5, 2006. The men's basketball staff averaged 38 points out of a possible 40 on the 2006-07 exam.

IV. Appendices

A. Compliance Agreement dated April 19, 2006.

B. Compliance Agreement dated June 9, 2006.

C. Coach Sampson's statement of recruiting dates utilized while representing Indiana University and declaration of cessation of off campus recruiting.

D. Weekly monitoring meeting agenda (July 18th only – sample) and assistant coaches' statements of understanding concerning infractions penalties.

E. Handwritten phone logs record (sample).

F. Cybersports phone log (sample).

G. Handwritten contact/evaluation log record (sample).

H. Cybersports contact/evaluation log (sample).

I. Coach Sampson monthly calendar printout

J. Monthly phone declaration from coaches (June only).

K. Cybersports phone log (countable calls).

L. Rules education items listed in section III.

M. New coaches meeting agenda and handouts.

N. MBB spring team meeting agenda and handout.

O. Men's basketball, administration and compliance staff meeting agenda.

Appendix A

Draft

Memorandum

To: Coach Kelvin Sampson

From: Rick Greenspan
Bruce Jaffee

Date: April 19, 2006

Re: Compliance Agreement

We agree, in light of the circumstances of which we are aware, that the University of Oklahoma imposed a number of significant penalties on its men's basketball program. Like Oklahoma, Indiana University believes that when violations occur, regardless of the intent, appropriate penalties must follow. Therefore, it is our plan to carry out those penalties that relate directly to you, as well as to place a few additional requirements on your program. Accordingly, the following corrective action will be implemented:

1. The director of compliance will meet, on a weekly basis, with the head coach or the director of men's basketball operations to review men's basketball recruitment activities and documentation for the previous and upcoming weeks. Furthermore, Indiana University will file a written report with the NCAA not later than August 31, 2007, detailing the implementation and fulfillment of the penalties which were transferred to Coach Kelvin Sampson upon his employment at Indiana University.

2. Reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school through July 31 of the prospect's junior year in high school from one call per month to one call every other month for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

3. Reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after August 1 of the prospect's senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June

30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

4. Restrict the number of days which Coach Kelvin Sampson may recruit off-campus to a maximum of 4 during the period of March 29, 2006, through June 30, 2006 (Coach Sampson used 15 of the 19 recruiting-person days he was permitted pursuant to the University of Oklahoma's self-imposed penalties while still employed at the University of Oklahoma).

5. Impose similar base and bonus compensation restrictions on Coach Kelvin Sampson, for the period beginning March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007.

It is understood that any additional sanctions imposed on you or IU by the NCAA and/or the Big Ten Conference will be followed as well.

By signing and dating this memo, all parties agree to abide by the penalties set forth above.

_____ _____

Kelvin Sampson (date)

_____ _____

Rick Greenspan (date)

_____ _____

Bruce Jaffee (date)

Appendix B

NDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

CONFIDENTIAL

Memorandum

To: Coach Kelvin Sampson

From: Rick Greenspan
Bruce Jaffee

Date: June 9, 2006

Re: Revised Compliance Agreement

This memorandum replaces the April 19, 2006, compliance agreement signed by all the parties listed above. The Committee on Infractions report dated May 25, 2006, noted that although Indiana University adopted and transferred the penalties listed below, further recruiting restrictions were warranted. Section 4.08 of your Employment Contract, dated April 20, 2006, states in part, "If the NCAA imposes sanctions against the Employee...or if the NCAA requires that the Employee's prior employer's (University of Oklahoma) sanctions against him be enforced, Indiana University shall impose those same sanctions against the Employee." Therefore, we have amended paragraphs 1 and 4, and added paragraphs 6 and 7 to this compliance agreement. The complete list of corrective actions is as follows:

1. The director of compliance or the assistant athletics director for compliance will meet, on a weekly basis, with the head coach or the director of men's basketball operations to review men's basketball recruitment activities and documentation, including telephone records. Coach Sampson will work with the compliance staff to establish effective monitoring systems and regular and effective rules education sessions.

2. Indiana University shall submit a report to the Committee on Infractions by August 1, 2006, detailing our monitoring of, and rules education sessions for, Coach Kelvin Sampson and his staff. The report will also include documentation of Indiana University's compliance with all other penalties adopted and transferred to IU. Furthermore, Indiana University will file a written report with the NCAA not later than August 31, 2007, detailing the implementation and fulfillment of the penalties which were transferred to Coach Sampson upon his employment at Indiana University, as well as those assessed by the committee on May 25, 2006.

FFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

55-1966
Fa 2-855-0448
iuhoosiers.com

3. Reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school through July 31 of the prospect's junior year in high school from one call per month to one call every other month for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

4. Reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after August 1 of the prospect's senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

5. Restrict the number of days which Coach Kelvin Sampson may recruit off-campus to a maximum of 4 during the period of March 29, 2006 through May 24, 2006 (Coach Sampson used 15 of the 19 recruiting-person days he was permitted pursuant to the University of Oklahoma's self-imposed penalties while still employed at the University of Oklahoma).

6. Impose similar base and bonus compensation restrictions on Coach Kelvin Sampson, for the period beginning March 29, 2006 and concluding June 30, 2007.

7. Coach Kelvin Sampson is prohibited, for a period of one year beginning May 25, 2006 through May 24, 2007, from making any phone calls that relate in any way to recruiting or being present when members of his staff make such calls.

8. Coach Kelvin Sampson is prohibited, for a period of one year beginning May 25, 2006 through May 24, 2007, from engaging in any off-campus recruiting activities. The prohibition on off-campus recruiting activities shall apply to all off-campus appearances at which prospects may be in attendance, including banquets, booster functions and exceptions provided by Bylaw 13.1.9.

It is understood that any additional sanctions imposed on you or IU by the NCAA and/or the Big Ten Conference will be followed as well.

By signing and dating this memo, all parties agree to abide by the penalties set forth above.

Kelvin Sampson — 6-9-06 (date)

Rick Greenspan — 6/8/06 (date)

Bruce Jaffee — 6/13/06 (date)

Appendix C

Kelvin Sampson 3/29-5/25

4/18 Eric Gordon Evaluation
Lance Stemler Contact

4/25 Scott Martin Evaluation
Robbie Hummel Evaluation
E'Twaun Moore Evaluation

4/23 Pitt Jam Fest All Evaluations

Pitt Jam Fest

Dejuan Blair
Matt Howard
Jujuan Johnson
Eric Gordon
Dar Tucker
Dallas Lauderdale

4/30 King James Tournament - All evals per. T. Green 6-20-06

King James Tournament

Manny Harris
Gary McGhee
Josh Southern
Evan Turner
Demetri McCamey
Robbie Hummel
Scott Martin
Derrick Rose
Malcolm Delaney
Laval Lucas Perry

RECEIVED 6-20-06

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

June 19, 2006

This is to confirm that I have not recruited off campus since May 25, 2006 (including no off-campus contact with any high school, junior college or AAU coach).

Kelvin Sampson

Kelvin Sampson

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

11-2

Appendix D

Weekly Compliance Meetings
Director of Basketball Operations
July 18, 2006 (10:00-11:00 am)

Review of Sanctions

Reduction of phone calls

- **Coach Sampson is precluded from making phone calls nor can he be in the presence of an assistant coach who is making recruiting phone calls.**
- **From June 15 of the PSA's sophomore year through July 31st of the prospects junior year, IU coaches may make one call every other month concluding July 31st, 2007.**
- **From August 1st of the prospects senior year through July 31st, 2007 IU coaches may call a prospect only once per week.**

Exceptions include bylaw 13.1.3.3.2 (Official visit exception); 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent signing date exception); and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone calls subsequent to the national letter or intent signing or other written commitment)

Reduction of days off campus

- **The head coach is precluded from making any off-campus appearance at which prospects may be in attendance including exceptions provided by bylaw 13.1.9.**

2. *Indiana University's adoption of COI penalties review*

- **Indiana University will require weekly meetings to be conducted between the director of basketball operations and the compliance office on a weekly basis.**
- **Indiana University will provide to the committee on infractions a written report by August 1, 2006 details of the aforementioned meetings, rules education sessions conducted to include topics covered, recruiting data collected to date by the compliance office as well as monitoring methods utilized by IU.**

Review of Coach Sampson's current monthly calendar and dates of speaking engagements

a) New dates for approval: _____ _____ _____

b) All engagements must be cleared by compliance prior to going on Coach Sampson's calendar.

4. *Review of assistant coaches contact and evaluation logs to date (sign off statement)*

5. *Review of assistant coaches phone logs for the past week*

6. *Review of prospective student-athlete listing on Cybersports and written logs*

7. *Rules education sessions review & Topic of the week*

- *Topic of the week (Bylaw 13.1.7.2.2 Contact Restriction at Specific Sites)*

8. *Recap & questions session*

a) Compliance needs Jeff Meyer cell bills: (Hire until May 25 from MO)

b) Compliance needs Senderoff's cell bills from May 26 to the present.

c) Compliance needs McCallum's cell bills from June 10 to the present.

d) Q & A

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

June, 2006

This is confirmation that I know, and understand, all of the sanctions imposed on Coach Sampson and the Indiana University men's basketball program by the COI, including those carried over from Oklahoma.

Ray McCallum

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

June, 2006

This is confirmation that I know, and understand, all of the sanctions imposed on Coach Sampson and the Indiana University men's basketball program by the COI, including those carried over from Oklahoma.

Jeff Meyer

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

12-3

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

June, 2006

This is confirmation that I know, and understand, all of the sanctions imposed on Coach Sampson and the Indiana University men's basketball program by the COI, including those carried over from Oklahoma.

Rob Senderoff

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

12-4

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

June, 2006

This is confirmation that I know, and understand, all of the sanctions imposed on Coach Sampson and the Indiana University men's basketball program by the COI, including those carried over from Oklahoma.

Jerry Green

Jerry Green

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

12-5

RECEIVED 6-19-06

Appendix E

WEEK 6/25 → 7/1

2006

F-11-06

RECRUITING PHONE LOG

Date	Prospects Name	Phone Number Called	Phone Number Called From	Talked To:	Comments & Any Issues	Check
6/25	Scott Martin	(219) 464-9671	(812) 679-9086	Left Voice Message	8:56 pm	
6/25	" "	(219) 928-8760	"	" " "	8:57 pm	
6/25	Scott Martin	219 928-8760	(812)679 9086	" " "	8:58 pm	
6/26	Anthony Crater	810 836 5750	812 679 9086	Left Voice Messay	8:27 am	
6/26	Scott Martin	(219) 928 8760	"	" " "	2:07 p	
6/26	Scott Martin	(219) 464 9671	"	Scott > Elite Camp 8/5	2:08 p	
6/29	Robbie Hummel	(219) 362 7086	"	Left Voice Mail	2:02 p	
6/29	" "	(219) 241 8810	"	" " "	2:03 p	
6/29	" "	(219)241 8810	"	" " "	2:08 p	
6/29	" "	(219) 241 8810	"	" " "	2:11 p	
6/29	E'twaun Moore	(219) 796 4545	"	" " "	2:15 p	
6/29	Robbie Hummel	(219)241 8810	"	" " "	5:34 p	

Coach's Signature Jeff Meyer

13-1

WEEK - 6/25 - 7/1

7-11-06

RECRUITING PHONE LOG

Date	Prospects Name	Phone Number Called	Phone Number Called From	Talked To:	Comments & Any Issues	Check
6/25	Tyrone Nash	646-642-2865	cell			
6/26	Laval Lucas Perry	810-691-0245				
6/26	Yancy Gates	513-699-3192		message	NO CALL	
6/27	Yancy Gates	513-699 3192		message	NO CALL	
6/29	Yancy Gates	513-699-3192		Yancy		
6/28	Laval Perry SR	989-239-1623		Laval SR.	He Is An AAU Coach	

13-2

Coach's Signature

7-11-06

WEEK - 6/25 - 7-02/06

RECRUITING PHONE LOG

Date	Prospects Name	Phone Number Called	Phone Number Called From	Talked To:	Comments & Any Issues	Check
X/X	No Name Mike Dunnigan	773-602-1049	CELL	~~Voice mail~~ ELI Summer Events	AISCD, BIS Time, mach event	
	[redacted]	510-860-7953	Cell	Voice mail		
	[redacted]	773-488-6528	Cell	Voice mail	Littlefield ATL open Gym	
	NATE MILES	419-779-6581	"	Left Message Got Ex Girlfriend	NEW CELL NUMBER from	
	NATE MILES	419-779-6581	"	Ex Girl Friend NATE	Transfered me to	13-3
				Summer SCHEDULE: NIKE, PEACH JAM VEGAS		
	GREG Foster	317-833-8311	"	TALKED TO JOHN Summer Schedule	GREGS BROTHER 2000 SYF Hoosier Shootout 16 under Peach Jam	

Coach's Signature Ray McCallon

Appendix F

Indiana University
ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
TELEPHONE LOG FORM

SPORT: Men's Basketball Coach: Coach Sampson

..lled	Prospect Called	Phone No.	Comments
04/18/2006 09:18:45	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
04/23/2006 09:38:23	ETwaun Moore	2193976010	called from Coach Sampson's cell
04/24/2006 12:00:00	DeJuan Blair	4122518981	Called from cell 219-5620
04/26/2006 12:00:00	Dar Tucker	989-754-3309	
04/27/2006 12:00:00	Dallas Lauderdale	4403499837	Called from 855-9550
04/27/2006 12:00:00	Scott Martin	2194649671	Phone Numbered called from 855-9550
04/30/2006 12:00:00	Hasheem Thabeet	281-755-2208	Called from cell 219-5620
05/01/2006 09:36:16	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
05/02/2006 12:00:00	DeJuan Blair	4122518981	Called from cell 219-5620
05/02/2006 12:00:00	Matt Howard	7658258940	Called from cell 219-5620
05/02/2006 12:00:00	Demetri McCamey	708-544-0915	Called from cell 219-5620
05/02/2006 12:00:00	Evan Turner	773-557-8446	Called from cell 219-5620
05/03/2006 12:00:00	Evan Turner	317-446-4174	Recieved call from prospect - 317-446-4174

Christian,
Please work w/ Cyberboard to better define either the query or the category ("prospect called") b/c otherwise you will be chasing your tail tracking down + verifying a lot of calls that are actually going to the prospects' coaches
Thanks!
JB
Kelvin Sampson

I certify that I have reported all telephone calls with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospects' parents.

Signature of Coach KS Date: 06/23/2006

Indiana University
ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
TELEPHONE LOG FORM

SPORT: Men's Basketball Coach: Ray

Called	Prospect Called	Phone No.	Comments
06 12:00:00	Hasheem Thabeet	832-715-6027	Called from cell
04/23/2006 12:00:00	Hasheem Thabeet	281-664-0217	Called from cell
04/23/2006 08:33:38	Deandre Jordan	832-473-0129	Called from cell
05/01/2006 12:00:00	Josh Southern	989-213-3914	Called from cell
05/01/2006 08:35:13	Deandre Jordan	713-521-8110	Called from Cell
05/01/2006 08:36:36	Deandre Jordan	832-473-0129	Called from cell
05/01/2006 10:40:10	Mike White	281-660-2923	Called from cell
05/01/2006 10:46:39	Hasheem Thabeet	832-715-6027	Called from cell
05/01/2006 10:57:25	Josh Southern	989-399-6078	Called from cell
05/02/2006 11:48:17	Gary McGee	765-356-0262	Called from
06/15/2006 12:28:25	Julius Mays	765-251-4084	Called From cell
06/15/2006 12:31:54	Jay Edwards Jr.	765-651-0456	Called from cell

14-2

I certify that I have reported all telephone calls with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospects' parents.

Signature of Coach Ray McCallum 6/26/06 Date: 06/23/2006

Indiana University
ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
TELEPHONE LOG FORM

SPORT: Men's Basketball Coach: Jeff

Date Called	Prospect Called	Phone No.	Comments
006 03:46:48	JuJuan Johnson	3175251679	Called from cell
05/24/2006 12:00:00	Jarryd Cole	913-593-5723	Called from cell
05/25/2006 03:45:27	Matt Howard	765-414-3169	Called from cell

14-3

I certify that I have reported all telephone calls with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospects' parents.

Signature of Coach Jeffrey D Meyer Date: 06/23/2006

Indiana University

ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
TELEPHONE LOG FORM

SPORT: Men's Basketball Coach: Rob

Date Called	Prospect Called	Phone No.	Comments
)/2006 09:28:47	Dante Jackson	9379813726	Called from cell
04/24/2006 12:00:00	Jerai Grant	240-603-4536	Called from cell
04/24/2006 04:44:15	Jeff Robinson	609-977-4673	Called from cell
04/24/2006 04:45:04	Marcus Morris	215-520-3318	Called from cell
04/24/2006 04:46:03	Markieff Morris	215-520-3318	Called from cell
04/24/2006 04:47:03	Malcolm Delaney	443-278-6032	Called from cell
05/02/2006 12:00:00	Leon Freeman	734-480-0581	Called from cell
05/02/2006 04:41:04	Laval Lucas-Perry – TALKED W/ DAD	989-239-1623	Called from cell
05/07/2006 12:00:00	Manny Harris	3135921980	Called from cell
05/08/2006 12:00:00	Evan Turner	773-557-8446	Called from cell
05/09/2006 12:00:00	Demetri McCamey	7085440915	Called from cell
05/09/2006 12:00:00	Alex Tyus	314-837-5823	Called from cell
05/09/2006 09:31:01	Dante Jackson	9379813726	Talked to prospect during week of 05/7-13/06
05/16/2006 03:50:54	DeJuan Blair	412-913-9473	Called from cell
05/16/2006 03:52:53	Brandon Wood	765-438-9994	Called from cell
05/23/2006 03:48:50	Markieff Morris	215-606-8782	Called from cell
06/01/2006 11:03:21	Delvon Roe	216-404-0374	Called from cell *
06/09/2006 12:19:15	Jason Washburn	269-209-5197	Called from cell

5/2 Laval Lucas Perry call doesn't count - I talked w/ his dad, who is an AAU coach Didn't talk w/ LAVAL

6/1 Delvon Roe SR is A Coach – DID NOT TALK W/ KID until 6/15

4/24 called Marcus Morris' cell + marcus only

6/9 - call was made 6/10 to Jason Washburn the call was to Jason's Dad + it was a return call about elite camp DOES not count

14-4

I certify that I have reported all telephone calls with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospects' parents.

Signature of Coach _____ Date: 06/23/2006

Indiana University
ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
TELEPHONE LOG FORM

SPORT: Men's Basketball Coach: Coach Sampson

..alled	Prospect Called	Response	Phone No.	Comments
04/18/2006	[redacted]	Left Message	[redacted]	[redacted]
04/23/2006	E'Twaun Moore	Talk to Prospect	2193976010	called from Coach Sampson's cell
04/24/2006	DeJuan Blair	Talk to Prospect	4122518981	Called from cell 219-5620
04/26/2006	Dar Tucker	Talk to Prospect	989-754-3309	
04/27/2006	Dallas Lauderdale	Left Message	4403499837	Called from 855-9550
04/27/2006	Scott Martin	Left Message	2194649671	Mother called back, left return # - Mother has MS Phone Numbered called from 855-9550
04/30/2006	Hasheem Thabeet		281-755-2208	Called from cell 219-5620
05/01/2006	[redacted]	Talk to Prospect	[redacted]	7'3" Kid from Houston Called from cell, 219-5620
05/02/2006	DeJuan Blair	Left Message	4122518981	Very Good Conversation Called from cell 219-5620
05/02/2006	Matt Howard	Talk to Prospect	7658258940	Called from cell 219-5620
05/02/2006	Demetri McCamey	Talk to Prospect	708-544-0915	Very good conversation Called from cell 219-5620
..2006	Evan Turner	Left Message	773-557-8446	Talked to Demitri and his mom, very good conversation Called from cell 219-5620
05/03/2006	Evan Turner	Talk to Prospect	317-446-4174	Called 4-5 times/ no answer Recieved call from prospect - 317-446-4174

Kelvin Sampson

14-5

I certify that I have reported all telephone calls with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospects' parents.

Signature of Coach _____ Date: 07/10/2006

Indiana University

ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
TELEPHONE LOG FORM

SPORT: Men's Basketball Coach: Ray

Date Called	Prospect Called	Response	Phone No.	Comments
/0200	Greg Foster	Talked to Other	317-833-8311	called from cell, Talked to John , Greg's brother about summer schedule
04/23/2006	Hasheem Thabeet	Talked to Other	832-715-6027	Called from cell
04/23/2006	Hasheem Thabeet	Talked to Other	281-664-0217	Talked to Al Jones, spring events Called from cell
04/23/2006	Deandre Jordan	Talked to Other	832-473-0129	Talked to Mark McClanahan, Cypress Christian H.S. Coach, about academics Called from cell
04/23/2006	Phil Jones	Talked to Other	917-306-2307	Talked to Byron Smith about best of Texas Schedule called from cell, Talked to Rodney Black, AAU Coach
04/23/2006	Phil Jones	Talked to Other	631-764-8024	called from cell, Talked to Billy Reid about transcript, called
04/23/2006	Josh Southern	Talked to Other	989-213-3914	coaches cell called from cell, talked to Lou Dawkins, coaches cell about
04/23/2006	Mike White	Talked to Other	281-664-0217	getting Josh on an unoffical visist called from cell, talked to Roy Chamagne about academic
04/23/2006	Gary Johnson	H.S. COACH	713-480-9771	progress called from cell, talked to Zeke Smith, H.S. Coach, Aldine
04/23/2006	Rashaud Woods	Talked to Other	281-660-2922	interst in IU called from cell, Talked to Jum Wilson, Coach at Lee College
04/23/2006	Frantz Dorsainvil	COACH	812-890-1427	about Woods coming to Lee called from cell, Talked to Everick Sullivan, Head Coach at
. ?006	Tommy Braeuax	COACH	281-989-7705	Vincennes, about a visit to IU called from cell, talked to Steve Spurling about academic
04/30/2006	Herbert Terry	Talk to Prospect	317-308-1002	progress called from cell, Interested in IU
05/01/2006	Josh Southern	Talked to Other	989-213-3914	Called from cell, Talked to Lou Dawkin about being
05/01/2006	Deandre Jordan	H.S. COACH	713-512-8110	interested in Josh Called from Cell
05/01/2006	Deandre Jordan	Talked to Other	832-473-0129	Talked to Bobby Snders, High School Coach Called from cell
05/01/2006	[redacted]	Talked to Other	[redacted]	Talked to Byron Smith about DeAndre being interested in IU Called from cell
05/01/2006	Hasheem Thabeet	Talked to Other	832-715-6027	Talked to Ping Wilson about Academic projects Called from cell
05/01/2006	Josh Southern	Talked to Other	989-399-6078	Talked to AJ Jones - AAU Coach, Westside All Stars Called from cell, Talked to Lou Dawkins- Transcript
05/01/2006	Phil Jones	Talk to Prospect	917-306-2307	called from cell, official visit to IU
05/01/2006	Phil Jones	Talked to Other	631-764-8028	called from cell, Talked to Billy Reid about needing a transcript
05/01/2006	[redacted]	Talked to Other	[redacted]	[redacted]
05/01/2006	Craig Anderson	Talked to Other	270-779-9851	called from cell, talked to Coach Anderson about son that is a
05/02/2006	Gary McGee	Talked to Other	765-356-0262	07 2 guard Called from
				Talked to Dad, Gary Sr. , talked about the Elite Camp

14-60

I certify that I have reported all telephone calls with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospects' parents.

Signature of Coach Ray McCallum 7/17/06 Date: 07/10/2006

Indiana University

ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
TELEPHONE LOG FORM

05/06/2006	Herbert Terry	Talked to Other	260-602-4904	called from cell, spoke to Eric Vaugh about recruiting interest
06/07/2006	Phil Jones	Left Message	917-306-2307	called from cell
7/2006	Cameron Carlton	Talked to Other	317-201-2070	called from office phone, spoke to Ron Carlton, father,
06/10/2006	Orlando Williams	Talked to Other	513-266-0965	informed me about his son called from cell ,Talked to Orlando Sr. -
06/15/2006	Julius Mayes	Talk to Prospect	765-251-4084	Return call about camp-doesn't count Called From cell, Talked to about coming to Elite Camp
06/15/2006	Jay Edwards Jr.	Talk to Prospect	765-651-0456	Called from cell
06/15/2006	Phil Jones	Left Message	917-306-2307	Talked to about summer called from cell
06/15/2006	Chad Sater	Talked to Other	812-322-3980	called from cell, Talked to Mark about D-1 Baksetball
06/18/2006	[redacted]	Left Message	[redacted]	Called from cell
06/18/2006	[redacted]	Left Message	[redacted]	Called from cell
06/18/2006	[redacted]	Left Message	[redacted]	Called from cell
06/18/2006	Gary McGhee	Talk to Prospect	765-356-0262	called from cell, Returned call about Elite Camp
06/18/2006	Eushante Jones	Talk to Prospect	260-715-0269	Called from cell, we are in top 3
06/18/2006	Keenan Ellis	Talk to Prospect	317-258-1087	called from cell, he will reclassify 2008
06/18/2006	Julius Mayes	Left Message	765-251-4084	called from cell, voicemail about camp
06/18/2006	Tyler Kitchel	Left Message	317-319-7667	Called from cell, left voicemail about camp
06/25/2006	Mike Dunigan	Left Message	7736021047	called from cell
06/25/2006	[redacted]	Left Message	[redacted]	[redacted]
06/25/2006	Nate Miles	Left Message	419-779-6581	called from cell, left message with ex girlfirend and got new #
2006	Nate Miles	Talk to Prospect	419-779-6581	called from cell, ex-girlfriend transfered me to Nate, talked
06/25/2006	[redacted]	Left Message	[redacted]	about summer schedule: Nike, Peach Jam, Vegas called from cell
06/30/2006	Gary McGhee		765-356-0262	

14-7

I certify that I have reported all telephone calls with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospects' parents.

Signature of Coach_____ Date: 07/10/2006

Indiana University
ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
TELEPHONE LOG FORM

SPORT: Men's Basketball Coach: Jeff

Date Called	Prospect Called	Response	Phone No.	Comments
)06	JuJuan Johnson	Talked to Other	3175251679	Called from cell
05/24/2006	Jarryd Cole	Left Message	913-593-5723	will visit campus in May Called from cell
05/25/2006	Matt Howard	Talked to Other	765-414-3169	Called from cell
06/23/2006	Anthony Crater	No Answer	810-836-5750	Talked to Dad for 2 minutes called from cell
06/23/2006	Anthony Crater	Left Message	810-836-5750	called from cell
06/25/2006	Scott Martin	Left Message	2194649671	called from cell @ 8:56pm
06/25/2006	Scott Martin	Left Message	219-928-8760	called from cell @ 8:57pm
06/25/2006	Scott Martin	Left Message	219-928-8760	called from cell @ 8:58pm
06/26/2006	Anthony Crater	Left Message	810-836-5750	called from cell
06/26/2006	Scott Martin	Left Message	219-928-8760	called from cell @2:07pm
06/26/2006	Scott Martin	Talk to Prospect	2194649671	called from cell, Talked to Scott about Elite Camp on 8/5 @ 2:08pm
06/29/2006	Robbie Hummel	Left Message	219-362-7086	called from cell
06/29/2006	Robbie Hummel	Left Message	219-241-8810	called from cell
06/29/2006	Robbie Hummel	Left Message	219-241-8810	called from cell
/29/2006	Robbie Hummel	Left Message	219-241-8810	called from cell
)06	ETwaun Moore	Left Message	219-796-4595	called from cell
06/29/2006	Robbie Hummel	Left Message	219-241-8810	called from cell
06/29/2006	[redacted]	Left Message	[redacted]	called from cell
06/29/2006	Robbie Hummel	Left Message	219-241-8810	called from cell
06/29/2006	ETwaun Moore	Talk to Prospect	2193976010	called from cell, Talk to ETwaun about Elite camp on 8/5
06/29/2006	Robbie Hummel	Talk to Prospect	219-362-7086	Robbie called Coach Meyer
06/30/2006	Jeff Teague	Talked to Other	317-985-5125	called from cell, Talked to Shawn Teague, Jeff's dad

14-8

I certify that I have reported all telephone calls with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospects' parents.

Signature of Coach Jeffrey D Meyer Date: 07/10/2006

Indiana University
ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
TELEPHONE LOG FORM

SPORT: Men's Basketball Coach: Rob

Date Called	Prospect Called	Response	Phone No.	Comments
2006	Dante Jackson	Talk to Prospect	9379813726	Called from cell
04/24/2006	Jer ii Grant	Talk to Prospect	240-603-4536	Introduction Called from cell
04/24/2006	Jeff Robinson	NONE	609-977-4673	Called from cell
04/24/2006	Marcus Morris	Talked to Other	215-520-3318	Called from cell
04/24/2006	Markieff Morris	Talked to Other	215-520-3318	Talked to mother - Angel Called from cell LEFT MESSAGE
04/24/2006	Malcolm Delaney	Talked to Other	443-278-6032	Talked to mother -Angel Called from cell
05/02/2006	Leon Freeman	Talked to Other	734-480-0581	Talked to Dad-Vince, talked about IU Called from cell
05/02/2006	Laval Lucas-Perry	Talked to Other	989-239-1623	Talked to Mrs. Freeman Called from cell
05/07/2006	Manny Harris	Talked to Other	3135921980	Talked to Mr. Lucas-Perry who is an AAU Coach Called from cell
05/08/2006	Evan Turner	Talked to Other	773-557-8446	Talked to Mom Called from cell
05/09/2006	Demetri McCamey	Talk to Prospect	7085440915	Talked to Iris Turner, Mom Called from cell
05/09/2006	Alex Tyus	Talked to Other	314-837-5823	Called from cell
05/09/2006	Dante Jackson	Talk to Prospect	9379813726	Talked to dad Talked to prospect during week of 05/7-13/06
05/16/2006	DeJuan Blair	Talked to Other	412-913-9473	Called from cell
05/16/2006	Brandon Wood	Talk to Prospect	765-438-9994	Talked to Grandmother Donna, only talked for 2 minutes, DeJuan wasn't home Called from cell
05/23/2006	Markieff Morris	Talk to Prospect	215-606-8782	Called from cell
06/01/2006	Delvon Roe	Talked to Other	216-404-0374	Called from cell
06/09/2006	Jason Washburn	Talked to Other	269-209-5197	Talked to Delvon Sr., he is a H.S. Assistant/ AAU Coach Called from cell, Talked to Bob, who is Jason's father
06/15/2006	Darius Miller	Left Message	606-584-4656	return of camp call called from cell
06/15/2006	Melquan Bolding	Talk to Prospect	845-857-0158	called from office
06/15/2006	Nick Fruendt	Talk to Prospect	630-406-0979	called from office
06/15/2006	Delvon Roe	Left Message	216-404-0374	called from cell
1 6	Delvon Roe	Talk to Prospect	216-965-4630	called from cell
/2006	William Buford Jr.	Talked to Other	419-243-6635	called from cell, Talked to Will Sr.

I certify that I have reported all telephone calls with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospects' parents.

Signature of Coach RC 14-9 Date: 07/10/2006

Indiana University
ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
TELEPHONE LOG FORM

06/15/2006	Luke Babbitt	Left Message	775-750-5044	called from cell
06/15/2006	Laval Lucas-Perry	Talked to Other	989-239-1623	called from cell, talked to Laval Sr., he is an AAU Coach
06/15/2006	Sylvan Landesberg	Talk to Prospect	917-337-0376	(Doesn't Count) called from office, talked to Sylvan and Dad
06/15/2006	Justin Bond	Talked to Other	317-525-7389	called from cell, Talked to Mrs. Bond about camp, does not count
06/16/2006	Kenny Frease	Left Message	330-309-6730	called from cell
06/17/2006	Kenny Frease	Left Message	330-309-6730	called from cell
06/17/2006	Kenny Frease	Left Message	330-309-6730	called from cell
06/17/2006	Yancy Gates	Left Message	513-699-3192	called from cell
06/18/2006	Josh Crittle	Left Message	708-415-4866	called from cell, left message
06/18/2006	Tyler Storm	Left Message	309-945-8265	called from cell
06/19/2006	Josh Crittle	Talked to Other	708-493-0705	called from cell, spoke with mom
06/19/2006	Luke Fabrizius	Talk to Prospect	847-736-1285	called from cell
06/19/2006	Sean Mosely	Left Message	443-224-4445	called from cell
06/19/2006	Angel Garcia	Talk to Prospect	787-504-3795	called from cell
06/20/2006	Jason Washburn	Left Message	269-209-5197	called from cell
06/20/2006	Sean Mosely	Talked to Other	443-983-4675	called from cell, talked to Dad
06/22/2006	Rob Wilson	Talk to Prospect	440-945-6313	called from cell, was at our Elite camp and got hurt, checked in on him
06/25/2006	Tyrone Nash	Talk to Prospect	646-642-2865	called from cell
06/26/2006	Laval Lucas-Perry	Talk to Prospect	810-691-0245	called from cell
06/27/2006	Yancy Gates	Left Message	513-699-3192	called from cell, No call
06/27/2006	Yancy Gates	Left Message	513-699-3192	called from cell, no call
06/28/2006	Laval Lucas-Perry	Talked to Other	989-239-1623	called from cell, talked to Laval Peery Sr., Laval's father, He is an AAU Coach
06/29/2006	Yancy Gates	Talk to Prospect	513-699-3192	called from cell
06/30/2006	Darius Miller	Talk to Prospect	606-584-4656	called from cell

I certify that I have reported all telephone calls with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospects' parents.

Signature of Coach [signature] 14-10 Date: 07/10/2006

Appendix G

RECEIVED 6-21-06

WEEKLY CONTACT/EVALUATION SUMMARY (7/98)

4B

Sport: MENS BASKETBALL Coach: Ray McCallum Dates: _____

	Name of Prospect/Parent	C=Contact E=Evaluation	Day/ Date	Time/ Length	Persons Present (Contacts Only)	City	Site	School Administrator (Contacts Only)
1.	[redacted]	C	4/5/06	1 HR.	mom	[redacted]	H.S.	
2.	Tony Beaux		4/6/06	1 HR.	College Coach	Blinn Tx	College	
3.	TEAM Ind Elite	E	4/15/06			Fayetteville	Ark.	
4.	[redacted]	E	"			Real Deal on the Hill	Tourney	
5.	Stephen VanTrece	E	"			"		
6.	DeAndre Liggins	E	"			"		
7.	Tyler Zeller	E	"			"		
8.	ILLINOIS Warriors	E	"			"		
9.	[redacted]	E	"			"		
10.	Aaron Johnson	E	"			"		
11.	Houston Swoosh	E	4/16/06			Houston Tx	Pearland	classic
12.	DeAndre Jordan	E				"		
13.	T-MAC All STARS	E				"		
14.	B.J. Holmes	E				"		
15.	[redacted]	E	4/18/06			[redacted]		
16.	Phil Jones	C	4/21/06	1 HR.		N.Y.	Brooklyn	
17.	Kingwood Classic		4/22/06			Houston Tx		
18.	DeAndre Jordan	E	"			"		
19.	O.J. MAYO	E	"			"		
20.	B.J. Holmes	E	"			"		
21.	Josh Southern	E	4/24/06			Saginaw	Mich	
	Da Tucker	E	"			Saginaw		

1-51

RECEIVED 6-20-06

WEEKLY CONTACT/EVALUATION SUMMARY (7/98)

4B

Sport: M33 Coach: ROB SENDEROFF Dates: APRIL RECRUITING

	Name of Prospect/Parent	C=Contact E=Evaluation	Day/ Date	Time/ Length	Persons Present (Contacts Only)	City	Site	School Administrator (Contacts Only)
1.	[redacted]	C	4/18	2hr	[redacted] COACH	[redacted]		
2.	SOLOMON ALIBI	E	4/19	2hr		MONTVERDE	FL	
3.	JOSEPH KATUKA	E	4/19	2hr		MONTVERDE	FL	
4.	KOSTA KOUFAS	E	4/20	1hr		AKRON	OH	
5.	DALLAS LAUDERDALE	E	4/21	1hr		SOLON	OH	
* 6.	AAU TOURNAMENT PITT	E	4/22+23			PITTSBURGH	PA	
7.	JAM FEST							
8.	MAC KOSHWAL	E	4/25	1hr		CHICAGO	IL	
9.	EVAN TURNER	E	4/25	2hr		CHICAGO	IL	
10.	DEMETRI MCCAMEY	E	4/25	2hr		CHICAGO	IL	
11.	MANNY HARRIS	E	4/26	2hr		DETROIT	MI	
* 12.	KING JAMES TOURNAMENT	E	4/29+4/30			AKRON	OH	
13.								
14.								
15.								
16.								
17.								
18.								
19.								
20.								
21.								

* attach rents

2-51

RECEIVED 6-20-06

WEEKLY CONTACT/EVALUATION SUMMARY (7/98)

4B

Sport: MBB Coach: JEFF MEYER Dates: _____

	Name of Prospect/Parent	C=Contact E=Evaluation	Day/ Date	Time/ Length	Persons Present (Contacts Only)	City	Site	School Administrator (Contacts Only)
1.	Bryan Bouchie	E	4-5-06	2 hr		Washington	HS	
2.	Tyler Zeller	E	4-5-06	3-5pm		Washington IN	HS	
3.								
4.	Takais Brown	C	4-6-06	3-5pm	Takais Brown	Harrisburg	SEIC	Coach Todd Franklin
5.	[redacted] Hoosiers	E	4-6-06	7-9pm		Mt Carmel IL	Wabash Valley	
6.								
7.	Matt Howard	E	4-15-06	11-12am		Fayetteville	Univ of	
8.	Jujuan Johnson	E	4-15-06	11-12am		NC	Arkansas	
9.	[redacted]	E	4-15-06	10-11 am				
10.	Tyler Zeller	E	4-15-06	4-5pm				
11.	Stephen VanTreese	E	4-15-06	8-9 pm				
12.	DeAndre Liggins	E	4-15-06	10-11am				
13.								
14.	[redacted]	C	4-18-06	7-9	[redacted]			
15.					KeLuan Sampson	[redacted]		
16.	[redacted]	E	4-18-06	3-5	[redacted]	[redacted]		
17.	Vaughn Duggins	E	4-19-06	3-5	Vaughn + Coach Joe Buck	Pendleton IN	Pendleton Heights HS	Coach Joe Buck
18.	Jeff Teague	E	4-20-06	3-5		Indianapolis	Pike HS	
19.	JuJuan Johnson	E	4-20-06	7-9		"	Franklin Central HS	
20.								
21.	E'Twaun Moore	E	4-22-06	9-10a		Houston TX	HS	

15-3

Appendix H

Indiana University
ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
RECORD OF CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS

Coach: Jeff

Sport: Basketball

Name of Prospect/Parent or Event	Contact Evaluation	Date	Persons Present (Contacts Only)	Location of Contact/Evaluation (i.e., home, other) Provide City & State
Bryan Bouchie	Evaluation	04/05/2006		HS - Washington, IN
Tyler Zeller	Evaluation	04/05/2006		HS - Washington, IN
Takais Brown	Contact	04/06/2006	Takais Brown, Coach Todd	Other - Harrisburg,IL,
Desmond Hendrix	Evaluation	04/06/2006		Other - Mt. Carmel,
[redacted]	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayetteville, ~~AR~~ ARKANSAS
Matt Howard	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayetteville, ~~AR~~ "
JuJuan Johnson	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayetteville, ~~AR~~ "
DeAndre Liggins	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayetteville, ~~AR~~ "
Stephen VanTreese	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayetteville, ~~AR~~ "
Tyler Zeller	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayetteville, ~~AR~~ "
[redacted]	Evaluation	04/18/2006		HS - Indianapolis, IN
[redacted]	Contact	04/18/2006	[redacted] Co. Senderoff, Co.	[redacted]
Vaughn Duggins	Contact	04/19/2006	Vaughn & Co. Joe Buck	HS - Pendelton, IN,
JuJuan Johnson	Evaluation	04/20/2006		HS - Indianapolis, IN
Jeff Teague	Evaluation	04/20/2006		HS - Indianapolis, IN
John Bradenburg	Evaluation	04/22/2006		HS - Houston, MO
Tyler Griffey	Evaluation	04/22/2006		HS - Houston, TX,
Robbie Hummel	Evaluation	04/22/2006		HS - Houston, IN
[redacted]artin	Evaluation	04/22/2006		HS - Houston, IN
Gary McGhee	Evaluation	04/22/2006		HS - Houston, TX, IN
ETwaun Moore	Evaluation	04/22/2006		HS - Houston, IN
Armon Bassett	Evaluation	04/25/2006		~~Terre Haute, IN~~ Chatham VA
ETwaun Moore	Evaluation	04/25/2006		HS - East Chicago, IN
Desmond Hendrix	Evaluation	04/26/2006		HS - Connersville,
Matt Howard	Evaluation	04/27/2006		HS ~~Connersville, IN~~ Mt Carmel IL
Stephen VanTreese	Evaluation	04/27/2006		HS - Lawrence North, IN
JuJuan Johnson	Evaluation	04/29/2006		HS - Indianapolis, IN
Julius Mayes	Evaluation	04/29/2006		HS - Indianapolis, IN, IN
Tyler Zeller	Evaluation	04/29/2006		HS - Indianapolis, IN
Vaughn Duggins	Evaluation	04/30/2006		HS - Indianapolis, IN,

[redacted]rtify that I have all contacts and evaluations with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospect's parents.

SIGNATURE OF COACH Jeffrey D Meyer 16-1 Date: 07/17/2006

Indiana University
ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
RECORD OF CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS

Coach: Ray

Sport: Basketball

Name of Prospect/Parent or Event	Contact Evaluation	Date	Persons Present (Contacts Only)	Location of Contact/Evaluation (i.e., home, other) Provide City & State
[redacted]	Contact	04/05/2006	mom	[redacted]
Tony Branx	Contact	04/06/2006	College Coach	Other - Blinn, TX,
Johnson Aaron	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayettville,
[redacted]	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayetteville, IN
Aaron Johnson	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayettville,
DeAndre Liggins	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayettville, IL
[redacted]	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayettville, IL
Stephen VanTreese	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayettville, IN
Tyler Zeller	Evaluation	04/15/2006		Other - Fayetteville, IN
BJ Holmes	Evaluation	04/16/2006		- Houston, TX
Deandre Jordan	Evaluation	04/16/2006		Other - Houston,TX, TX
[redacted]	Evaluation	04/18/2006		[redacted]
Phil Jones	Contact	04/21/2006		- Brooklyn, NY,
BJ Holmes	Evaluation	04/22/2006		- Houston, TX
Deandre Jordan	Evaluation	04/22/2006		- Houston, TX, TX
O J Mayo	Evaluation	04/22/2006		- Houston, OH
Josh Southern	Evaluation	04/24/2006		- Saginaw, MI, MI
Dar Tucker	Evaluation	04/24/2006		- Saginaw, MI
[redacted] Mayes	Evaluation	04/26/2006		HS - Marion, IN
[redacted] Hummel	Evaluation	04/29/2006		- Akron, IN
Gary McGhee	Evaluation	04/29/2006		HS - Akron, OH, IN
Derrick Rose	Evaluation	04/29/2006		- Akron, IL
Josh Southern	Evaluation	04/29/2006		- Akron, OH, MI
Deandre Jordan	Evaluation	04/30/2006		- Austin, TX, TX
Nate Miles	Evaluation	04/30/2006		- Austin, TX

I certify that I have all contacts and evaluations with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospect's parents.

SIGNATURE OF COACH RyMcCall 7/17/06 16-2 Date: 07/17/2006

Indiana University
ATHLETICS COMPLIANCE PROGRAM
RECORD OF CONTACTS AND EVALUATIONS

Coach: Rob

Sport: Basketball

Name of Prospect/Parent or Event	Contact Evaluation	Date	Persons Present (Contacts Only)	Location of Contact/Evaluation (i.e., home, other) Provide City & State
Solomon Alabi	Evaluation	04/19/2006		Other - Montverde, FL
Joseph Katuka	Evaluation	04/19/2006		Other - Montverde, FL
Kosta Koufas	Evaluation	04/20/2006		- Akron,
Dallas Lauderdale	Evaluation	04/21/2006		Other - Solon, OH
DeJuan Blair	Evaluation	04/22/2006		- Pittsburgh, PA
[redacted]	Evaluation	04/22/2006		Other - Pittsburgh, IN
Jerai Grant	Evaluation	04/22/2006		Other - Pittsburgh, MD
Matt Howard	Evaluation	04/22/2006		Other - Pittsburgh, IN
Dante Jackson	Evaluation	04/22/2006		Other - Pittsburgh, OH
JuJuan Johnson	Evaluation	04/22/2006		Other - Pittsburgh, IN
Marcus Morris	Evaluation	04/22/2006		Other - Pittsburgh,
Markieff Morris	Evaluation	04/22/2006		- Pittsburgh,
Earl Pettis	Evaluation	04/22/2006		Other - Pittsburgh,
Dar Tucker	Evaluation	04/22/2006		Other - Pittsburgh, MI
Demetri McCamey	Evaluation	04/25/2006		Other - Chicago, IL
Evan Turner	Evaluation	04/25/2006		Other - Chicago, IL
Manny Harris	Evaluation	04/26/2006		- Detroit, MI
Malcolm Delaney	Evaluation	04/29/2006		- Akron, MD
[redacted] Harris	Evaluation	04/29/2006		- Akron, MI
[redacted] Hummel	Evaluation	04/29/2006		- Akron, IN
Laval Lucas-Perry	Evaluation	04/29/2006		- Akron, MI
Scott Martin	Evaluation	04/29/2006		- Akron, IN
Demetri McCamey	Evaluation	04/29/2006		- Akron, OH, IL
Gary McGhee	Evaluation	04/29/2006		Other - Akron, OH, IN
Derrick Rose	Evaluation	04/29/2006		- Akron, IL
Josh Southern	Evaluation	04/29/2006		- Akron, OH, MI
Evan Turner	Evaluation	04/29/2006		Other - Akron, OH, IL

[redacted]rtify that I have all contacts and evaluations with prospects or prospects' parents during the indicated time period. I certify that I fully complied with all NCAA, Conference and institutional rules during my recruitment of the above listed prospects and prospect's parents.

SIGNATURE OF COACH R L Snell 16-3 Date: 07/17/2006

Appendix I

May 2006

May 2006

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

June 2006

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Sat/Sun
May 1	2 10:00am Compliance Mtg in Hoosier Rm	3 12:30pm BVCB Golf Outing	4 Brian Piecuch's B/D 10:00am BB Staff w/ Kevin Clark, ADs conf room 2:00pm Mtg w/Marty Clark re: practice gear 7:00pm Dinner w/Pres Herbert & Trustees	5 Evening Reception in Indy-Truste	6 7
8 9:30am Mtg with architects 11:00am Mtg. w/Dan Reeves/HR 12:00pm Lunch-Varsity Club Natl Bd of Dir., BB Press Room	9 8:30am Head Coaches Metg. E. Conf. Rm 10:30am Fox News Radio 11:00am Mtg w/Beth McLaughlin 1:00pm Cybersports Recruiter Training	10 10:00am Meet w/Media in press room 1:00pm Individual call with Jim DeLaney 5:30pm VC Louisville event	11 Darby's B/D 9:00am Mtg w/Tom Martin, car dealer 11:00am Group Coaches call with Delaney	12 Leave for OK	13 6:00 pm Renzi's Wedding 14 Return from OK
15 Karen back from OK	16 Leave for Chicago	17 Big 10 Coaches Meeting, Chicago	18 11:55 Leave Chicago	19 6:00pm Boys&Girls Club Banquet, IMU (Mrs. Fitzpatrick)	20 Garls' Anniversary Matt's B/D 12:00pm I-Men's Golf Outing, 21
22 Kuwait	23 Kuwait	24 Chris' B/D Kuwait	25 Kuwait	26 Rob & Lauren's Ann Kuwait	27 28 Kuwait
29	30 Meg's B/D 10:00am Apt. with Heather at Mira 12:00pm Mtg in AD conf. rm w/Rick, our BB staff, C Pope and J Brinegar	31 8:30am Mtg. w/Rick Greenspan 1:00pm Golf w/Criss Beyers, Bigtn. CC			

June 2006

June 2006

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	

July 2006

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Sat/Sun
			June 1 Jim's B/D	2 7:30pm-Blgtn. Heart Gala (Rink)	3 10-12 DJ Byrd visit
					4
5 9-11 Coaches Certification Exam, 6:30pm Dinner w/J Cohen group at Gray res. in Carmel	6 8:30am Mtg w/Tim Garl 10:00am Compliance Mtg,Hoosier Room	7 8:30am Mtg. w/Rick Greenspan 11:00am Mtg w/Terry Hutchens 2:00pm Mtg w/Doug Wilson - HT 3:00pm NABC Conference Call	8	9	10 10:00am Don Fischer, IU Course
					11 Overnight Camp Angie's B/D
12 Overnight Camp Lil' Ray's B/D	13 8:30am Head Coaches Mtg, E. Conf. Rm 9:30am Apt. @ College Mall Pain Clinic/Garl 5:00pm Blgtn Airport, Izzo, to Elkhart, Air Force eve	14	15 IN Mayors,Evansville, plane 7pm	16 HAPPY ANNIVERSARY! 10:30am Pres. Herbert-Foun. Bd, @ Foundation 6:30pm Distinguished Alumni Service Award dinner	17
					18 Kellen's B/D
19 9:00am Speak at Ray Tolbert's camp in Indy 12:30pm Lunch mtg w/ Pres. Herbert and Lacy Jo 2:00pm Ellerbe Becket Interview	20 Errek's B/D 9:30am Mtg. with Bob Kravitz	21 Elite Camp 9:00 am - Pete DiPrimio interview Jeff's B-day	22	23 Team Camp Nancy's B/D	24
					25 Team Camp Karen coming to Blgtn.!
26 10-2 Luncheon in Indy, Greenspa	27 9:00am Mtg w/Kelly Reed, Int Des. 10:30am Mtg w/Jennifer Brinegar	28 Day Camp	29 7:30-8:30 speak to North Centra	30	

2-4

July 2006

July 2006

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

August 2006

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Sat/Sun
					July 1
					2 12:00pm Lunch w/Bob Ozelie group (ltr)
3	4	5 Travis' B/D 8:30am Mtg w/Rick Greenspan 10:30am Diana Crider/Office Decor	6 Evaluation Period Mark Adams-Golf	7	8 9 Evaluation Period More Items...
10	11	12 Evaluation Period	13	14 9:00am Diana Crider 10:30am VC Donors-The Bryants 11:00am Kimya Massey	15 16 Dead Period
17 NBA League-Las Vegas 9:00am Gary Wofford Phone Int 10:30am A Thompson 1:00pm Rick Bozich Interview 6:30pm Batesville Banquet	18 9:00am Terry Hutchens 10:00am Pete Rhoda 1:30pm Gary Parrish, CBS	19 Dead Period IN BB Hall of Fame Celeb Golf To	20 Coach & Karen in NC	21	22 Evaluation Period 23 Coach & Karen in NC Evaluation Period
24 11:30-Bob Hammel, CO Steakhou	25 7:30 a.m. Speak at Chamber of C Rob's B/D	26 Evaluation Period Meet w/Bob Menke, VC, Huntingb 8:30am Mt. w/Rick Greenspan	27 9am Scott Dolson	28 BJ off	29 Roderick's B/D 30 Evaluation Period
31 Evaluation Period					

17-3

Appendix J

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

Month/Year April, 2006

I did / did not use my home phone for recruiting purposes.
(circle one)

Kelvin Sampson
Print name

Kelvin Sampson
Signature

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
nbasket@indiana.edu

NDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

Month/Year May, 2006

I did / (did not) use my home phone for recruiting purposes.
(circle one)

Kelvin Sampson
Print name

Kelvin Sampson
Signature

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
ibasket@indiana.edu

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

Month/Year June '06

I used my for recruiting purposes

- o Home Phone
- o Office Phone
- o Cell Phone
- o Additional Phone

None of the Above

for the month indicated above.

Print Name

Kelvin Sampson

Signature

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

Month/Year April, 2006

I did / did not use my home phone for recruiting purposes.
(circle one)

Jeff Meyer
Print name

Jeff Meyer
Signature

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

Month/Year May, 2006

I did / did not use my home phone for recruiting purposes.
(circle one)

Jeff Meyer
Print name

Jeff Meyer
Signature

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

Month/Year June 2006

I used my for recruiting purposes

- ○ Home Phone
- ● Office Phone
- ● Cell Phone
- ○ Additional Phone

for the month indicated above.

Jeff Meyer
Print Name

Jeff Meyer
Signature

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

[redacted]5-2238
Fax [redacted]-855-7051
ibasket@indiana.edu

18-6

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

Month/Year April, 2006

I did / did not use my home phone for recruiting purposes.
(circle one)

ROB SENDEROFF
Print name

Signature

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

Month/Year May, 2006

I did / did not use my home phone for recruiting purposes.
(circle one)

Rob Senderoff
Print name

Signature

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

Month/Year June, 2006

I used my for recruiting purposes

- o Home Phone
- ø Office Phone
- ø Cell Phone
- o Additional Phone

for the month indicated above.

Rob Senderoff
Print Name

Signature

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

18-9

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

Month/Year April, 2006

I did / did not use my home phone for recruiting purposes.
(circle one)

Ray McCallum
Print name

Ray McCallum
Signature

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

18-10

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

Month/Year May 1, 2006

I did / did not use my home phone for recruiting purposes.
(circle one)

Ray McCallum
Print name

Ray McCallum
Signature

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

DIANA UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

Month/Year June, 2006

I used my for recruiting purposes

- o Home Phone
- o Office Phone
- ✓ Cell Phone
- o Additional Phone

for the month indicated above.

Ray McCallum
Print Name

Ray McCallum
Signature

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Assembly Hall
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana
47408-1590

812-855-2238
Fax: 812-855-7051
mbasket@indiana.edu

18-12

Appendix K

Men's Basketball

RECEIVED 6-19-06

Prospect Contact Phone Number List (Countable)

ike Babbitt 2008 Rob Senderoff

Mother's Phone #s: H: 775-853-0901 W: 775-848-8208 C:
Father's Phone #s: H: 775-853-0901 W: 775-530-7843 C:
Guardian's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Prospect's Phone #'s: H: 775-853-0901 C: 775-750-5044

06/15/2006	Prospect Mobile	775-750-5044	Left Message

Melquan Bolding 2008 Rob Senderoff

Mother's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Father's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Guardian's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Prospect's Phone #'s: H: C: 845-857-0158

06/15/2006	Prospect Mobile	845-857-0158	Talk to Prospect

William Buford Jr. 2008 Rob Senderoff

Mother's Phone #s: H: W: C: 419-870-0299
Father's Phone #s: H: W: C: 419-574-1337
Guardian's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Prospect's Phone #'s: H: 419-243-6635 C:

06/15/2006	Prospect Phone	419-243-6635	Talked to Other

Anthony Crater 2008 Jeff Meyer

Mother's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Father's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Guardian's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Prospect's Phone #'s: H: 810-836-5750 C:

06/23/2006	Prospect Phone	810-836-5750	No Answer
06/23/2006	Prospect Phone	810-836-5750	Left Message
06/26/2006	Prospect Phone	810-836-5750	Left Message

Josh Crittle 2008 – Rob Senderoff

Mother's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Father's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Guardian's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Prospect's Phone #'s: H: 708-493-0705 C: 708-415-4866

06/18/2006	Prospect Mobile	708-415-4866	Left Message
06/19/2006	Prospect Phone	708-493-0705	Talked to Other

Mike Dunigan 2008 Ray McCallum

Mother's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Father's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Guardian's Phone #s: H: W: C:
Prospect's Phone #'s: H: 7736021047 C:

06/25/2006	Prospect Phone	7736021047	Left Message

Appendix L

6-7-06
mtg. @ 9:00
(Sandcroft, Meyer, Green, McCallum + Chip)

Official Visit Procedures

Pre-Approval

1. Documentation of Official Visit
2. A copy of Everything in Recruiting Folder
3. Business Office

Visit

1. Transportation, without delay
2. 48 hours
3. Lodging
4. Meals
5. Hosts and Host Money
6. Complimentary Admissions
7. Parking

Post Visit

1. Post Visit Paper Work
   a. Official Visit Paid Itinerary
   b. Meals and Receipts
   c. Student Host Form
   d. Prospective Student Athlete Form

2. Business Office
   a. Returned Revolving Fund Money
   b. Travel Re-imbursement (Not part of recruiting).

SAMPLE
OFFICIAL VISIT NOTIFICATION LETTER

Date

Dear (name of PSA),

We are pleased that you have made the decision to make an official visit to Indiana University. IU is committed to conducting all recruiting activities within applicable NCAA and Big Ten rules and is committed to the highest standards of behavior and practices in all areas, including recruiting. IU seeks to provide you, during your official visit, with a comprehensive and realistic look at what your experience could be like should you choose to attend IU.

Recruiting visits are intended to determine whether you and Indiana University are a good fit for each other in terms of educational, athletic, and social expectations. The primary consideration, therefore, in selecting activities for these visits must be to provide information that will assist you and your family in making that decision. As such, all official visits at Indiana University include a review of academic expectations and a meeting with an academic advisor from student-athlete services and/or a college or school advisor or faculty member.

In accordance with NCAA regulations, a prospective student-athlete is permitted to make a maximum of five official visits (expense-paid visits), with no more than one such visit permitted to any single institution. Your official visit to Indiana University, which is tentatively scheduled for [redacted] counts as your one official visit to our campus.

Furthermore, NCAA regulations require that **prior** to making an official visit, a prospective student-athlete **must present the institution with a score from the SAT, PSAT, ACT or PACT Plus test and a high school transcript**. If you have not done so already, please make arrangements to send us this documentation as soon as possible. Additionally, although not required for an official visit, we strongly encourage you to register with the NCAA Initial Eligibility Clearinghouse, www.ncaaclearinghouse.net as soon as possible.

Please carefully review the attached *Official Visit Information for Prospective Student-Athletes* which provides important information regarding NCAA, Big Ten and institutional regulations and expectations of appropriate behavior during official visits.

We are looking forward to your visit to our campus. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Coach ___

(Attach a copy of the letter to the pre-approval form)

INDIANA UNIVERSITY ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT
OFFICIAL VISIT INFORMATION FOR PROSPECTIVE STUDENT-ATHLETES

The following list contains important information regarding your official visit to Indiana University:

1. You are permitted to receive **one official visit (expense paid) to Indiana University** and this visit counts as your one such visit. Additionally, this visit counts as one of your five permissible official (expense paid) visits during your senior year.

2. Your visit should not last longer than **48 hours**. This includes time spent on campus only, not travel time, unless a coach drives you, in which case the 48-hours begin when the coach first makes contact with you.

3. Appropriate conduct and adherence to applicable rules (university, Big Ten and NCAA) is required of all prospects, their parents/legal guardians, friends and relatives, IU student-athletes, coaches and staff during the official visit. Some examples of activities that are considered to be inappropriate during your official visit include, but are not limited to the following: Participation in any illegal activity (violation of NCAA, Big Ten, or institutional rules, or federal or state laws); possession or the use of alcohol, illegal drugs or substances; participation in hazing activities; participation in gambling activities, and participation in activities which visit a common nuisance upon the community.

4. The coaches and student host(s) must entertain you within a **30-mile radius of Indiana University Bloomington campus.** Strip clubs, gambling/gaming venues, or other such establishments are "off limits" during official visits.

5. Student hosts and prospects are prohibited from using alcoholic beverages and illicit drugs in conjunction with official visits. Prospects found to be in violation of university, city, state, or federal rules and laws (including alcohol use, illicit drug use and criminal activities) will be subject to disciplinary review.

6. Hotel or dorm accommodations for you and your parents/legal guardians or spouse are permissible. Brothers/sisters, coaches or other people accompanying you must pay for their own room accommodations. We are not permitted to pay for incidental expenses (e.g., telephone calls, movies) that you incur during your visit. **These types of expenses are your responsibility and must be paid upon check-out.**

7. Coaches and student-athletes are expected to return you to your room at a time that is consistent with the schedule of activities during the visit and provides you with sufficient sleep time in order take advantage of the academic, athletic, and student life aspects of your visit.

8. **Meals** for you and your parents/legal guardians or spouse are permissible during the official visit. Brothers/sisters, your coach or other people accompanying you must pay for their own meals. Your siblings may receive a dessert or after-dinner snack at the home of an institutional staff member (e.g., the director of athletics, coach, faculty member or the institution's president) at no additional charge.

9. The student host, if one is assigned to you, may be given no more than **$30 per day** to use for entertainment purposes. **It is not permissible to use this money to purchase souvenirs (e.g., t-shirt, hat, etc.) or other merchandise for you**, only for entertainment and food.

10. Any recreational or physical activity that you take part in during your visit cannot be organized or observed by members of the coaching staff and cannot be designed to test your athletic ability for recruiting purposes. **Any workouts must be initiated by you and the coach can in no way be involved.**

11. The coaching staff and student host(s) should make every effort to avoid contacts with representatives of our athletics interests ("reps") during your visit. NCAA rules prohibit reps from being involved in the recruitment process. If you happen to meet a rep during the course of your visit, you must keep the conversation to an exchange of pleasantries (i.e., "hello") and make every effort not to discuss your recruitment with them.

12. We are permitted to provide **complimentary admissions** to a campus athletics event to you and any two people accompanying you on your official visit to IU. These complimentary admissions must be issued through a pass list only (no "hard tickets" may be issued).

This information is provided in order to give you a better knowledge and appreciation of NCAA, Big Ten and Indiana University rules, regulations and policies regarding your official visit to our campus. Indiana University does not want to jeopardize your eligibility and making you aware of the rules is important in this effort.

I have read the above statements and agree to abide by all applicable rules and regulations governing my official visit at Indiana University .

_____
(PSA Signature)

20-3

Compliance

Indiana University

Official Visit Pre-Approval Form (Bylaw 13.6.2.2.2 and 13.6.3)

**Must be submitted to the compliance office at least two weeks prior to the scheduled visit*

Part I: TO BE COMPLETED BY COACH

PSA Name: _____ Sport: _____

SS# _____ Telephone: _____

Home Address: _____

HS/JC/University: _____ JC Graduation Date: _____

H.S. Graduation Date: _____ Date of Birth: _____

Arrival Date & Time: _____ Departure Date & Time: _____

Official Visit Information Sheet: (date sent to prospect): _____

Part II: REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

IU Clearinghouse List _____ Core _____ Test _____

or

Transcript High School _____ College/JC _____ Test Scores _____

Eligible to Visit? Yes _____ No _____ Notes: _____

Signature of Compliance Coordinator _____ Date: _____

**Must be taken on a national testing date under national testing condition. The score must be presented through an official high school or testing agency document.*

Part III: Admissions and Eligibility Concerns

Transcript reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Potential Admission or
Eligibility Concerns: Yes _____ No _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

**Completed form and transcript evaluation will be returned to coach upon approval.*

Indiana University Unofficial Transcript Evaluation Form

Name:	Sport:

Course Name and Number (4) ENGLISH	Grade/Points		X	Units		Quality Points
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		Unit Total:				Qual Pt Total

Course Name and Number (2) MATH	Grade/Points		X	Units		Quality Points
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		Unit Total:				Qual Pt Total

Course Name and Number (2) NAT. & PHYS. SCIENCE	Grade/Points		X	Units		Quality Points
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		Unit Total:				Qual Pt Total

Course Name and Number dditional year ENGLISH, MATH, or NATURAL & PHYSICAL SCIENCE (IU Admissions Wants 3 Yrs)	Grade/Points		X	Units		Quality Points
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		Unit Total:				Qual Pt Total

Course Name and Number (2) SOCIAL SCIENCES	Grade/Points		X	Units		Quality Points
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		Unit Total:				Qual Pt Total

Course Name and Number (3) ADDITIONAL COURSES (FORLANG, CP, PHIL, or REL)	Grade/Points		X	Units		Quality Points
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		( )	X		=	
		Unit Total:				Qual Pt Total

Total Qual. Pts.	÷	Total Core Course Units	=	NCAA GPA (To 3 Decimals, No Rounding)

TEST SCORES

	Eng.	Math	Reading	Sci. Reas.	Sum Total		SAT:	Verbal	Math	Total
ACT:	Eng.	Math	Reading	Sci. Reas.	Sum Total		SAT:	Verbal	Math	Total
			ACT (68 Minimum)		Best Sum					Best Sum

20-5

Compliance

Indiana University

Official Paid Visit Itinerary (Bylaws 13.4; 13.5; 13.6; 13.7)

**To be completed by the appropriate IU coach at the conclusion of the prospect's visit and submitted to the business office with all receipts within one week after visit.*

Name of Prospect: _____ Sport: _____

Coach: _____

Official Visit Began: _____ Official Visit Ended: _____

Date Time Date Time

Name(s) of person(s) accompanying PSA: _____ Relationship: _____

Site of Lodging: _____ Cost: $ _____

Persons Receiving Accommodations: _____

Mode of Transportation: _____ Cost: $ _____

Departure City: _____ Return City: _____

Mode of Transportation on campus: _____ Driver: _____

Name(s) of Student Host: _____

Student Host Entertainment Funds: $ _____ Parking: $ _____

Miscellaneous (Describe): _____ $ _____

Total Meal Cost and Direct Bills *Use the meals worksheet on the second page $ _____ $ _____

Cash DB

Names of athletic personnel who met with prospect during the official visit (other than sport coaches):

Name	Title	Date

Non-athletic personnel (Admissions, Faculty, etc.) who met with prospect during official paid visit:

Name	Title	Date

Complimentary Admissions

Event	Number of Admissions	Date

Allowable materials provided to prospect during visit (per NCAA Bylaw 13.4.1):

Media Guide or Recruiting Brochure	Yes	No
Game Program	Yes	No
NCAA Educational Video	Yes	No
Pre-enrollment information	Yes	No
Academic, Admissions material	Yes	No
Questionnaire	Yes	No
Summer Camp Brochure	Yes	No

Meals

Day One	Date	Location	Who Ate	Cost
Breakfast				$
Lunch				$
Dinner				$
Snack				$

Day Two	Date	Location	Who Ate	Cost
Breakfast				$
Lunch				$
Dinner				$
Snack				$

Day Three	Date	Location	Who Ate	Cost
Breakfast				$
Lunch				$
Dinner				$
Snack				$
			Total Visit Meal Cost	$

Others served at own expense: (e.g. student-athletes, brother/sister of the prospect)

Name	Location	Date

Coach's Signature — Date

Compliance Coordinator's Signature — Date

11/2/04

4.14 Official Visit Chart of Permissible Activities:

Permissible Official Visit Activities (as of April 2006)

	Airport Transportation	Complimentary Meals*	Participate in OV Entertainment Activities	Complimentary Admission
Head/Assistant Coach	Yes [13.5.2.4]	Yes (includes spouses & children) [13.1.2.2(e)]	Yes	Yes, if available per IU ticket office policy
Volunteer Coach	Yes [S 10/14/98]	Yes [11.01.5(c)]	No [11.01.5]	No [11.01.5(b)]
Student Coach	Yes [S 10/14/98]	No unless serving as student host	No unless serving as student host	No unless serving as student host
Manager	No (BT 12/2/04]	No [13.6.6.5]	No [Proposal 2004-96 Eff. 8/04]	No [13.6.6.5]
Student Host	No [S 9/13/91]	Yes [13.6.6.5(b)] Only one student host per prospect	Yes [13.6.6.5(a)]	Yes [13.6.6.5(c) & Big Ten 16.2.1.3 A.1]
Other SA	No [9/13/91]	No [13.6.6.5.2] May attend and pay for own meal	Yes [13.6.6.5.2]	No
Other Athletic Staff	Yes [13.5.2.4]	Yes [S 10/12/88]	Yes [10/23/92]	Yes, if available per IU ticket office policy
IU Faculty	No [13.5.2.4 & 13.1.2.3(a)]	Yes-[13.1.2.3(a)]]	Yes-[13.1.2.3(a)]	Check with IU athletics administration for approval.
Enrolled SA's Parent/Booster/Alumni	NO CONTACT WITH PSA!	NO CONTACT WITH PSA!	NO CONTACT WITH PSA!	NO CONTACT WITH PSA!

Deleted: NA

*GA coach in the sport of football may receive a meal with a PSA during the official visit within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus. [S 10/14/98]

7-0-2

13.12.2.3.2 Institutional/Noninstitutional Privately Owned Camps/Clinic -- Basketball

In basketball, an institution's basketball coach and noncoaching staff members with responsibilities specific to basketball **may be employed only at their own camps/clinics**. Participation in such camps or clinics is limited to the months of June, July and August or any calendar week (Sunday through Saturday) that includes days of those months, unless such activities meet the provisions regarding developmental clinics set forth in Bylaw 13.11.3.1. It is not permissible for a basketball coach or noncoaching staff member with responsibilities only in basketball to be employed at other institutional camps or clinics or at noninstitutional privately owned camps or clinics. *[Adopted: 4/28/05 effective 8/1/05 - women's basketball; immediate - men's basketball. Contracts signed prior to July 20, 2004, may be honored, provided the camp or clinic is operated in accordance with restrictions applicable to institutional camps (e.g., open to any and all entrants, no free or reduced admissions to or employment award winners.)]*

Employment of Basketball Student Managers at Camps and Clinics (I)

Date Issued: Jul 13, 2005
Type: Official
Item Ref: 1

Interpretation:

The committee determined that **student managers who are full-time students and have responsibilities specific to basketball may be employed at institutional or noninstitutional camps or clinics other than their own institution's camps or clinics.** [References: NCAA Bylaw 13.13.2.3.1 (institutional/noninstitutional privately owned camps/clinics -- basketball)]

Pope, Christian Dean

From: Pope, Christian Dean

Sent: Wednesday, June 14, 2006 10:50 AM

To: Rob Senderoff; Barbara JMcelroy (bjmcelro); Fitzpatrick, Timothy Martin (tmfitzpa@indiana.edu); Greenspan, Richard I (rgreensp@indiana.edu); Jeff Meyer; Jerry Green; Ray McCallum; Sampson, Kelvin Dale; Tim CGarl (tgarl)

Subject: July recruiting/ DEAD period

Coach,

Please be aware of the parameters of the NCAA concerning July recruiting periods. The specifics are as follows

May 1 through July 5, 2006, except for (1) below:	Quiet Period
(1) NBA Predraft camp:	Evaluation Period
July 6-15, 2006:	Evaluation Period
July 16-21, 2006, [except for (1) below]:	**Dead Period**
(1) It is permissible for an institution to have contact with a prospect who is enrolled in the institution's summer term (i.e., summer session or summer bridge program) and has signed a National Letter of Intent or other written commitment to attend the institution. *(Adopted: 4/25/02)*	
July 22-31, 2006:	Evaluation Period

I know I need not remind you that this applies only to the assistant coaches as Coach Sampson must not be off-campus for any purpose concerning recruiting.
Please do not hesitate to contact my office with any concerns or questions. Thanks.

Christian D. Pope
Director of Compliance
Indiana University
1001 East 17th Street
Bloomington, IN 47408-1590
812-856-6074
Go Hoosiers!

DOBO meeting Supplement – (07.10.06)

13.02.4.4 Dead Period

A dead period is that period of time when it is not permissible to make in-person recruiting contacts or evaluations on or off the member institution's campus or to permit official or unofficial visits by prospective student-athletes to the institution's campus. The provision of complimentary admissions to a prospective student-athlete during a dead period is prohibited, except as provided in Bylaw 13.7.2.5 for a prospective student-athlete who visits an institution as part of a group. During such a dead period, a coaching staff member may not serve as a speaker at or attend a meeting or banquet at which prospective student-athletes are in attendance, except as provided in Bylaw 13.1.9.1, and may not visit the prospective student-athletes' educational institutions. **It remains permissible, however, for an institutional staff member to write or telephone prospective student-athletes during such a dead period.**

2005 Division I Hot Topic No. 6 - Basketball Summer Recruiting Restrictions

Date Issued: Jun 29, 2005 **Type:** Ed. Column **Item Ref:** 1

Interpretation: Institutions should note that July 6-15 and July 22-31 are evaluation periods for **basketball**. As such, it is not permissible to have recruiting contacts with prospective student-athletes during these periods. In addition, institutions should note that pursuant to NCAA Bylaw 11.7.4, there is a limit of three coaches who may evaluate prospects at any one time during the evaluation periods.

Institutions should note that pursuant to Bylaw 13.1.7.2.2-(b), all communication with a prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardians, the prospect's coach or any individual associated with the prospect as a result of the prospect's participation in **basketball**, directly or indirectly, is prohibited during the time period in which the prospect is participating in the summer certified event. However, printed materials (e.g., letters, recruiting brochures, questionnaires) may be sent via regular mail (see Bylaw 13.4.1) to a prospect's home while the prospect is participating in a certified event. Pursuant to Bylaw 13.1.7.2.2.1, an institutional coaching staff member may have telephone contact with a prospect's high-school coach (or high-school administrator) while the prospect is participating in a summer certified event, provided the high-school coach or administrator is not in attendance at that summer certified event.

The following questions and answers are intended to clarify the application of Bylaw 13.1.7.2.2.

1. Question. If a prospect is participating in a tournament that occurs on consecutive days and at the same site, at what point may a coach initiate communication with a prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardians, the prospect's coach or any individual associated with the prospect as a result of the prospect's participation in the certified event?

Answer. A coach may only communicate with such an individual after the prospect's team has been eliminated from the event and the appropriate authorities have released the prospect, except for telephone contact with a prospect's high-school coach (or administrator) as permitted in Bylaw 13.1.7.2.2.1.

2. Question. If a prospect is participating in extended competition (i.e., traveling directly from one competition site to another on an extended road trip), at what point may a coach initiate communication with a prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardians, the prospect's coach or any individual associated with the prospect as a result of the prospect's participation in the certified events?

Answer. Once a prospect reports on call to travel with his or her team at the beginning of the extended road trip, it is not permissible for an institutional coaching staff member to have any type of communication with the prospect, the prospect's parents or legal guardians, the prospect's coach or any individual associated with the prospect as a result of the prospect's participation in **basketball** [except for telephone contact with a prospect's high-school coach (or administrator) as permitted in Bylaw 13.1.7.2.2.1] until completion of the team's final competition of the road trip and the prospect has been released by the appropriate authorities. This restriction on communication should reinforce that collegiate coaches' attendance at events during the July evaluation period should be for observation only and not a venue whereby contacts with outside influences are designed to be made in an effort to recruit particular **basketball** prospects.

3. Question. A certified event is scheduled to take place July 8-10. Is it permissible for coaches to meet with a prospect's coach the evening prior to the event?

Answer. A coach could not communicate with a prospect's coach on the evening prior to the certified event if the team is in the locale of the event (i.e., team has traveled to the event) and the prospect has reported on call.

4. Question. Is it permissible for a coach to evaluate a prospect who is participating in an organized high school practice during the July evaluation period?

Answer. It would be permissible for an institutional coaching staff member to evaluate a prospective student-athlete participating in a high-school practice (as opposed to a nonscholastic team practice), provided the ability to have organized practice is approved or sanctioned by the appropriate state high-school athletics governing body and the practice is held at the direction and under the supervision of the high school coach. It remains impermissible to attend nonscholastic practices in preparation for a certified event unless that practice time has been designated as part of the certified event.

5. Question. Is it permissible for a coach to have contact with a prospect who has signed a National Letter of Intent with the coach's institution?

Answer. Pursuant to a 8/13/03 official interpretation (reference: Item No. 1) it is not permissible for an institutional coaching staff member to communicate in any way with a prospect who is participating in a summer-certified event under any circumstances, including contact with a prospect who has signed a National Letter of Intent. However, it would be permissible for an institutional coaching staff member to communicate with a prospect who is in attendance at a summer-certified event only if the prospect is not participating in the event and is not associated with any team participating in the event (e.g., prospect travels to event at his or her own expense, prospect is not under the authority of the coach at any time, prospect does not participate in team functions).

DOBO meeting Supplement – (07.18.06)

13.1.7.2.2 Additional Restrictions - Men's Basketball Effective Date: Aug 01, 2006

In men's the following additional restrictions shall apply:

- In men's basketball, **contact shall not be made with a prospective student-athlete at any basketball event during the academic year that is not part of a prospective student-athlete's normal high school, preparatory school or two-year college season,** or any event that is not approved, sanctioned, sponsored or conducted by the applicable state high school or two-year college association, National Federation of State High School Associations or the National Junior College Athletic Association.

- In men's basketball, **all communication with a prospective student-athlete, the prospective student-athlete's relatives or legal guardians, the prospective student-athlete's coach or any individual associated with the prospective student-athlete as a result of the prospective student-athlete's participation in basketball, directly or indirectly, is prohibited during the time period in which the prospective student-athlete is participating in a summer certified event or a nonscholastic event during the April contact period.** However, printed materials (e.g., letters, recruiting brochures, questionnaires) may be sent via regular mail (see Bylaw 13.4.1) to a prospective student-athlete's home while the prospective student-athlete is participating in a certified or nonscholastic event.

11.7.1.2 Recruiting Coordination Functions Effective Date: Aug 01, 2006

All recruiting coordination functions (except routine clerical tasks) **must be performed by the head coach or one or more of the countable assistant coaches** (see Bylaw 11.7.4). Such functions include:

(a) Activities **involving athletics evaluation and/or selection of prospects.**

(b) **Telephone calls to prospective student-athletes (or prospective student-athletes' parents, legal guardians or coaches).**

(c) **Preparation of general recruiting correspondence to prospective student-athletes (or prospective student-athletes' parents or legal guardians).**

Weekly Compliance Meetings
Director of Basketball Operations
July 25, 2006 (2:00-3:00 pm)

1. *Review of Sanctions*

Reduction of phone calls

- **Coach Sampson is precluded from making phone calls nor can he be in the presence of an assistant coach who is making recruiting phone calls.**
- **From June 15 of the PSA's sophomore year through July 31st of the prospects junior year, IU coaches may make one call every other month concluding July 31st, 2007.**
- **From August 1st of the prospects senior year through July 31st, 2007 IU coaches may call a prospect only once per week.**

Exceptions include bylaw 13.1.3.3.2 (Official visit exception); 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent signing date exception); and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone calls subsequent to the national letter or intent signing or other written commitment)

Reduction of days off campus

- **The head coach is precluded from making any off-campus appearance at which prospects may be in attendance including exceptions provided by bylaw 13.1.9.**

2. *Indiana University's adoption of COI penalties review*

- **Indiana University will require weekly meetings to be conducted between the director of basketball operations and the compliance office on a weekly basis.**
- **Indiana University will provide to the committee on infractions a written report by August 1, 2006 details of the aforementioned meetings, rules education sessions conducted to include topics covered, recruiting data collected to date by the compliance office as well as monitoring methods utilized by IU.**

3. *Review of Coach Sampson's current monthly calendar and dates of speaking engagements*

a) New dates for approval: _____ _____ _____

b) All engagements must be cleared by compliance prior to going on Coach Sampson's calendar.

4. *Review of assistant coaches contact and evaluation logs to date (sign off statement)*

5. *Review of assistant coaches phone logs for the past week*

6. *Review of prospective student-athlete listing on Cybersports and written logs*

7. *Rules education sessions review & Topic of the week*

- *Topic of the week (Bylaw 13.1.7.2.2 & July 24, 2006 Education Column update)*

8. *Recap & questions session*

a) Compliance needs Jeff Meyer cell bills: June 26-Present.

b) Compliance needs Senderoff cell bills: June 26-Present.

c) Compliance needs McCallum cell bills: June 10-Present.

d) Compliance needs Sampson cell bills: June 10-present.

e) Compliance needs McCallum's handwritten phone logs May 29 –June 6.

f) Q & A session

DOBO meeting Supplement – (07.25.06)

13.1.7.2.2 Additional Restrictions - Men's Basketball Effective Date: Aug 01, 2006

In men's the following additional restrictions shall apply:

- In men's basketball, **contact shall not be made with a prospective student-athlete at any basketball event during the academic year that is not part of a prospective student-athlete's normal high school, preparatory school or two-year college season,** or any event that is not approved, sanctioned, sponsored or conducted by the applicable state high school or two-year college association, National Federation of State High School Associations or the National Junior College Athletic Association.

- In men's basketball, **all communication with a prospective student-athlete, the prospective student-athlete's relatives or legal guardians, the prospective student-athlete's coach or any individual associated with the prospective student-athlete as a result of the prospective student-athlete's participation in basketball, directly or indirectly, is prohibited during the time period in which the prospective student-athlete is participating in a summer certified event or a nonscholastic event during the April contact period.** However, printed materials (e.g., letters, recruiting brochures, questionnaires) may be sent via regular mail (see Bylaw 13.4.1) to a prospective student-athlete's home while the prospective student-athlete is participating in a certified or nonscholastic event.

UPDATED - 2006 Educational Column -- NCAA Division I Proposal No. 2004-124 -- Communication with Basketball Prospects During the July Evaluation Periods (I)

Date Issued: Jul 12, 2006 **Type:** Ed. Column **Item Ref:** 1

Interpretation: NCAA Division I institutions should note that NCAA Division I Bylaw 13.1.7.2.2 specifies that, ***during the July evaluation periods in men's basketball, while a prospect is participating in a certified basketball event, all communication with a prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardians, the prospect's coach or any individual associated with the prospect as a result of the prospect's participation in basketball, directly or indirectly, is prohibited.*** This provision prohibits all forms of communication, including in-person contact, general correspondence (e.g., letters, faxes, text messaging, instant messages, e-mail) and telephone calls. ***In men's basketball, institutional staff members (limited to only a countable coach beginning August 1, 2006) may send general correspondence (except for text messages) to the prospect during the time period in which the prospect is participating in a noncertified event, provided it is sent directly to the prospect (e.g., front desk of hotel, the prospect's personal fax machine) and there is no additional party (e.g., camp employee, coach) involved in disseminating the correspondence. Text messaging is akin to the passing of notes, which is not permissible during the time period a prospect is participating in an athletics event.***

Finally, pursuant to Bylaw 13.02.11.1, those prospects who are enrolled in an institution's summer term and receiving athletics aid prior to initial full-time enrollment are no longer considered prospects for the purpose of applying contact restrictions and communication with such individuals is permissible.

[References: Division I Bylaws 13.02.11.1 (application), 13.1.7.2.2 (additional restrictions -- men's and women's basketball)].

Weekly Compliance Meetings
Director of Basketball Operations
August 01, 2006 (10:00-11:00 am)

1. *Review of Sanctions*

Reduction of phone calls

- **Coach Sampson is precluded from making phone calls nor can he be in the presence of an assistant coach who is making recruiting phone calls.**
- **From June 15 of the PSA's sophomore year through July 31st of the prospects junior year, IU coaches may make one call every other month concluding July 31st, 2007.**
- **From August 1st of the prospects senior year through July 31st, 2007 IU coaches may call a prospect only once per week.**

Exceptions include bylaw 13.1.3.3.2 (Official visit exception); 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent signing date exception); and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone calls subsequent to the national letter or intent signing or other written commitment)

Reduction of days off campus

- **The head coach is precluded from making any off-campus appearance at which prospects may be in attendance including exceptions provided by bylaw 13.1.9.**

2. *Indiana University's adoption of COI penalties review*

- **Indiana University will require weekly meetings to be conducted between the director of basketball operations and the compliance office on a weekly basis.**
- **Indiana University will provide to the committee on infractions a written report by August 1, 2006 details of the aforementioned meetings, rules education sessions conducted to include topics covered, recruiting data collected to date by the compliance office as well as monitoring methods utilized by IU.**

3. *Review of Coach Sampson's current monthly calendar and dates of speaking engagements*

a) New dates for approval: _____ _____ _____

b) All engagements must be cleared by compliance prior to going on Coach Sampson's calendar.

4. *Review of assistant coaches contact and evaluation logs to date (sign off statement)*

5. *Review of assistant coaches phone logs for the past week*

6. *Review of prospective student-athlete listing on Cybersports and written logs*

7. *Rules education sessions review & Topic of the week*

- *Topic of the week (Bylaw 13.1.8.8 Evaluation Days -Page 97 2006-07 NCAA Manual)*

8. *Recap & questions session*

a) Compliance needs Jeff Meyer cell bills: June 26-Present.

b) Compliance needs Senderoff cell bills: June 26-Present.

c) Compliance needs McCallum cell bills: June 10-Present.

d) Compliance needs Sampson cell bills: June 10-present.

e) **Request Sprint list phone calls by number called**

f) Q & A session

DOBO meeting Supplement – (08.01.06)

Page 97 2006-07 NCAA Manual

13.1.8.8 Evaluation Days -- Basketball

Men's Basketball. In men's basketball, each institution is limited to 130 recruiting-person days (see Bylaw 13.02.7) during recruiting periods (contact and evaluation periods) that occur during the academic year.

(1) Fall Contact Period.

Evaluations at sites other than the prospective student-athlete's educational institution are prohibited during the fall contact period. Live evaluations at prospective student-athlete's educational institution shall be limited to regularly scheduled high school, preparatory school and two-year college contests/tournaments and practices and regular scholastic activities involving prospective student-athletes enrolled **only** at that institution.

(2) Academic Year Evaluation Period.

All evaluations during the academic year evaluation period shall be limited to regularly scheduled high-school, preparatory school and two-year college contests/tournaments, practices and regular scholastic activities involving student-athletes enrolled only at that institution.

(3) April Contact Period.

(i) **Evaluations at Nonscholastic Events.** Evaluations at nonscholastic events during the April contact period are limited to **events that are approved, sanctioned, sponsored or conducted by the applicable state high school, preparatory school or two-year college association, National Federation of High School Associations or the National Junior College Athletic Association.** Coaching staff members may only attend such an event on Saturday and/or Sunday, and not on any weekend during which the PSAT, SAT, PLAN or ACT national standardized tests are administered, regardless of where the event occurs. If an approved nonscholastic event occurs at a high school, preparatory school or two-year college, it is not necessary to have a contact with a prospective student-athlete who attends the educational institution.

(ii) **Evaluations at a Prospective Student-Athlete's Educational Institution (Other Than Nonscholastic Events).** Evaluations are permissible at a prospective student-athlete's educational institution shall be limited to regularly scheduled preparatory school or two-year college contests/tournaments, practices and regular scholastic activities involving prospective student-athletes enrolled only at that institution, and only in conjunction with an off-campus contact.

(4) Summer Evaluation Period.

During the summer evaluation period, a member of an institution's basketball coaching staff may attend noninstitutional nonorganized events (e.g., pick-up games), institutional basketball camps per Bylaw 13.12.1.1 and noninstitutional organized events (e.g., camps, leagues, tournaments and festivals) that are certified per Bylaw 30.16.

(5) Predraft Camp Exception.

Evaluations conducted at National Basketball Association (NBA) official **predraft camps are not included in the 130 evaluation days.**

Appendix M

New Coaches Compliance Meeting
April 3, 2006

1. Brief overview
   a. No major violation since late 50s
   b. Average of 20-30 violations over last 5-7 years
   c. 2004 ~ 38 – 2005 ~ 25
   d. No one is immune to breaking the rules
   e. Ask before acting
   f. Shared responsibility
   g. Self-reporting – looked upon more favorably by NCAA/Big Ten

2. Ways to learn
   a. Annual coaches certification exam
   b. Monthly All-Staff/Compliance Meetings (mandatory)
   c. QOTW via email (notify us of your email address)
   d. Monthly ICN (Indiana Compliance Newsletter)
   e. Emails/memos from the compliance office (please read!!!)

3. Compliance Office set-up
   a. Jennifer's primary responsibilities include:
      1. Overseeing institutional compliance with NCAA, Big Ten, and IU rules and regulations (including student-athletes, IU Athletics staff, IU faculty/staff, boosters and merchants)
      2. Rules Education for coaches, athletics staff, IU staff, student-athletes, parents of student-athletes, and representatives of IU athletics interests (including local merchants)
      3. Investigating allegations of rules violations and reporting violations to the NCAA and/or Big Ten

   b. Christian's primary responsibilities include:
      1. Issuing rules interpretations
      2. Monitoring (w/assistance from his intern) and providing rules education in the following areas:
         a. Recruiting
         b. Camps and clinics
         c. Local sports clubs
         d. Playing and practice seasons, including ARA logs
         e. Volunteer coaches
         f. Complimentary tickets
         g. SA outside competition
         h. SA promotional activities

(over)

c. Anitra's primary responsibilities include:
   1. Developing, monitoring and maintaining in-house computer database system that tracks eligibility and financial aid for student-athletes
   2. International student-athlete initial eligibility
   3. Continuing eligibility – men
   4. Transfer eligibility (see handout for IU Admissions requirements)
   5. NCAA reports

d. Chip's primary responsibilities include:
   1. Initial eligibility, NCAA Clearinghouse and housing issues
   2. Continuing eligibility – Women
   3. Official visits (MBB – at 5 for the 05-06 recruiting cycle)
   4. Transfer releases and permission to contact

e. Kathy's primary responsibilities include:
   1. Financial aid issues (see handouts)
      a. NLI
      b. Tender issuance, renewals, nonrenewals
      c. SA Special Assistance Fund
      d. Squad Lists
   2. SA employment

4. Christian's review:

5. Questions???

2005-06 Guidelines for IU Athletics Staff Members

The following statements on ethical conduct, gambling and extra benefits summarize the NCAA rules on these issues. For more information, please refer to the NCAA Manual, the Big Ten Handbook and the IU Compliance Manual online at http://iuhoosiers.collegesports.com/compliance/ind-compliance.html.

Remember: When in doubt on any rule, check with the compliance office!

Ethical Conduct – NCAA Bylaw 10.01, 10.1

As an athletics department employee you are subject to the rules and regulations outlined by the NCAA. As such, you have the responsibility to act with honesty and sportsmanship at all times so that intercollegiate athletics shall represent the honor and dignity of fair play.

As defined by the NCAA, unethical conduct may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Refusal to furnish information relevant to an investigation of a possible violation of an NCAA regulation when requested to do so;
- Involvement in arranging for fraudulent academic credit or false transcripts for a student-athlete;
- Involvement in offering or providing a student-athlete an improper inducement, extra benefit, or improper financial aid;
- Furnishing IU or the NCAA false or misleading information concerning your involvement or knowledge of information regarding a possible NCAA rules violation; or
- Receipt of benefits for facilitating or arranging a meeting between a student-athlete and an agent, financial advisor or representative of an agent or advisor (e.g. "runner").

All institutional staff members have the responsibility to self-report any NCAA rules violation.

Gambling – NCAA Bylaw 10.3

As an athletics department employee, you are not permitted to gamble on ANY college or professional athletics competition in a sport that is sponsored by the NCAA (including Fantasy Football, internet sports wagering, and other such organized sport gambling activities).

Specifically, you are not permitted to:

- Provide information to individuals involved in organized gambling activities concerning intercollegiate athletics competition;
- Solicit a bet on any intercollegiate team;
- Accept a bet on any team representing the institution;
- Solicit or accept a bet on any intercollegiate competition for any item (e.g., cash, shirt, dinner) that has tangible value; or
- Participate in any gambling activity that involves intercollegiate athletics or professional athletics, through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method used by organized gambling.

Benefits, Gifts and Services – NCAA Bylaw 16.12

General Rule: A student-athlete may not receive any extra benefit. The term "extra benefit" refers to any special arrangement by an institutional employee (including tutors) or representative of the institution's athletics interests ("booster") to provide the student-athlete, his or her relatives or friends with a benefit not expressly authorized by NCAA legislation, unless it is demonstrated that the same benefit is generally available to the institution's students and their relatives or friends. **Remember: Once a student-athlete, always a student-athlete.** You may not provide gifts or benefits even after a student-athlete's eligibility has expired!

(OVER)

Permissible Benefits, Gifts, Services

- ✓ **Local Transportation [16.10.1-(e)]:** IU staff members may provide reasonable local transportation to student-athletes on an occasional basis (trips to the Indianapolis airport or anywhere outside Monroe County are not permissible).
- ✓ **Occasional Meals [16.12.1.5]:** IU staff members may provide an occasional meal (at their home or restaurant) to student-athletes on infrequent and special occasions in the locale of IU and may provide reasonable local transportation to student-athletes to attend such meals. (Limit 3-4 times per semester and 1-2 times during the summer, per institutional policy.)
- ✓ **Telephone Calls [16.12.1.11]:** Student-athletes may use institutional telephones to make long distance calls in emergency situations if approved by an IU athletics department administrator. Local telephone calls may be made from institutional telephones free of charge (IU policy).
- ✓ **Token of Support [16.12.1.11-(e)]:** Student-athletes may receive reasonable tokens of support and transportation in the event of serious injury or serious illness.

Nonpermissible Benefits, Gifts, Services

- × **Typing Costs [16.3.1]:** Typing/word processing/editing services or costs cannot be provided to student-athletes free of charge or at a discounted rate. They must pay the going rate.
- × **Discounts [16.12.2.2]:** Student-athletes may not receive a special discount, payment arrangement or credit on a purchase (e.g., airline ticket, clothing, food) or a service (e.g., dry cleaning, haircut).
- × **Telephones and Credit Cards [16.12.2.2]:** Use of a telephone, pager, long distance access code or credit card for personal reasons without charge or at a reduced rate.
- × **Entertainment Services [16.12.2.2.3]:** A student-athlete may not receive services (e.g., movie tickets, dinners, use of car) from commercial agencies (e.g. movie theaters, restaurants, car dealers) without charge or at reduced rates, or free or reduced-cost admission to professional athletics contests from professional sports organizations, unless such services are also available to the student body in general.

Other Prohibited Benefits, Gifts, Services

- × Cash, a loan (including Signing or cosigning a note with outside agency) or a guarantee of bond.
- × An automobile or use of an automobile.
- × Transportation (except reasonable local transportation) even if the student-athlete reimburses the institution or staff member for the appropriate amount of gas or expense.
- × Preferential treatment, benefits, or services based on the student-athlete's athletics reputation or skill or pay-back potential as a future professional.
- × Payment or other compensation for work not performed.
- × Use of personal property (e.g., boats, summer homes, cars, computers, stereos).
- × Christmas, birthday, special occasion gifts and presents.
- × Free or reduced cost professional services not available on the same basis to other students.

REMEMBER TO ASK BEFORE YOU ACT!

Please contact the compliance office with any questions:

Jennifer Brinegar, Assistant Athletics Director – Compliance, 855-0451, jhooker@indiana.edu
Charnele Kennedy, Assistant Compliance Coordinator, 856-6074, cmkenned@indiana.edu
Anitra House, Eligibility & Systems Officer – 855-5126, ahouse@indiana.edu
Chip Armbruster, Assistant Compliance & Eligibility Officer – 855-0877, carmbrus@indiana.edu
Kathy Arnold, Assistant Compliance & Financial Aid Officer – 855-9970, karnold@indiana.edu

FIGURE 13-1

Division I Men's Basketball Recruiting Calendar

August 1, 2005 - July 31, 2006

(See Bylaw 30.11.1 for Division I men's basketball calendar formula)

e) The month of April 2006 [except for (1), (2) and (3) below]:

All live evaluations during the April contact period are limited to events that are approved, sanctioned, sponsored or conducted by the applicable state high-school, preparatory school or two-year college association, National Federation of High School Associations or the National Junior College Athletic Association and may occur at sites other than the prospect's educational institution only on Saturday and/or Sunday and not on any weekend during which the PSAT, SAT, PLAN or ACT national standardized tests are administered. Evaluations are permissible at a prospect's educational institution only in conjunction with an off-campus contact. **Contact Period**

(1) April 1-4, 2006, (noon): **Dead Period**

(2) One men's basketball event certified by the NCAA (see Bylaw 30.18) held in conjunction with, and conducted in the host city of the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Championship. **Evaluation Period**

(3) April 10-13, 2006: **Dead Period**

(f) May 1 through July 5, 2006, except for (1) below: **Quiet Period**

(1) NBA Predraft camp: **Evaluation Period**

(g) July 6-15, 2006: **Evaluation Period**

(h) July 16-21, 2006, [except for (1) below]: **Dead Period**

(1) It is permissible for an institution to have contact with a prospect who is enrolled in the institution's summer term (i.e., summer session or summer bridge program) and has signed a National Letter of Intent or other written commitment to attend the institution. *(Adopted: 4/25/02)*

(i) July 22-31, 2006: **Evaluation Period**

Pope, Christian Dean

From: Big Ten - Chad Hawley [CHawley@bigten.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 22, 2006 6:11 PM
To: Compliance Group
Cc: Big Ten - Greg Walter
Subject: Quick Tip on April Basketball Events (Men's Basketball)

What do injured dogs, large wooden horses, and "approved" April basketball events have in common? You should approach each of them with caution...

With respect to the last item, it seems that some April events that will include high-school prospects have been approved not by the applicable high-school association, but by a regional office of the National Junior College Association (see the following link: http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/enforcement/bkb_certification/mens_ac_events?ObjectID=10375) That's problematic because if we're talking about a high-school prospect, a junior-college association is not the applicable governing body. Consequently, April events involving high-school prospects that have not been approved by the appropriate high-school association are off-limits.

I'm sure there will be more on this, but I wanted to give you an early warning. Also, the Ivy League's list of legitimate events should be up soon—I'll pass that along as soon as I get it.

Take care and more soon,
Chad

Chad Hawley
Director of Compliance
Big Ten Conference
1500 W. Higgins Rd.
Park Ridge, IL 60068
ph: 847/696-1010, x. 118
fax: 847/696-1150

21-6

Pope, Christian Dean

From: Big Ten - Chad Hawley [CHawley@bigten.org]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 6:31 PM
To: Compliance Group
Cc: Big Ten - Greg Walter
Subject: FW: Information Related to Division I Men's Basketball Coaches' Attendance at Nonscholastic Events During the April Con

See the below message from Membership Services (this is the issue to which I referred in Wednesday's email). Again, I'll send the list the Ivy League is compiling (state-by-state listings) as soon as it's available. Have a good weekend.

Chad

"The staff has received numerous inquiries regarding nonscholastic events involving prospects approved by entities other than what is considered the applicable or appropriate body. Bylaw 13.1.8.8-(a)-(3)-(i) specifies that during the April contact period, Division I men's basketball coaches may only attend nonscholastic events that are sanctioned, conducted, approved or sponsored by the applicable (as opposed to any) scholastic association/entity. A two-year college association is not the applicable entity to sanction, sponsor, conduct, ect. a nonscholastic event that includes high school/prep school prospects in order for coaches to attend. As a result, such events do not meet the rule and Division I men's basketball coaches' attendance is not permissible. There has been some confusion regarding a list of nonscholastic events posted on the NCAA basketball event certification site which had provided some indication that they had received appropriate approval from a scholastic entity. Please note that this list was being provided as a courtesy to the membership and did not indicate that the event met NCAA Division I legislation regarding such events in order for coaches to attend. A disclaimer to indicate such was included on the site, however, some perceived the list as a list of "approved" events. In order to avoid any further confusion, the site has been removed and event operators have been notified of the clarification."

11.01.3.1 Replacement of Graduate Assistant Coach. [I-A] The compensation or remuneration set forth in Bylaw 11.01.3 shall be charged against an academic year. In Division I-A football, once the amount set forth in Bylaw 11.01.3-(a) is paid to a graduate assistant coach for that academic year, additional funds may not be spent on a replacement until the start of the next academic year, even though the graduate assistant coach subsequently leaves the institution's athletics program during the academic year. *(Adopted: 1/11/94)*

11.01.4 Coach, Student Assistant. A student-coach is any coach who is a student-athlete who has exhausted his or her eligibility in the sport or has become injured to the point that he or she is unable to practice or compete ever again, and who meets the following additional criteria: *(Revised: 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04)*

(a) Is enrolled at the institution at which he or she participated in intercollegiate athletics;

(b) Is participating as a student-coach within the five-year eligibility period (see Bylaw 14.2);

(c) Is completing the requirements for his or her baccalaureate degree or graduate program; *(Revised: 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04)*

(d) Is a full-time student (see Bylaws 14.1.8.2 and 14.1.8.2.1.4), unless during his or her final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate program, per Bylaw 14.1.8.2.1.3; *(Revised: 1/12/04 effective 8/1/04)*

(e) Is receiving no compensation or remuneration from the institution other than the financial aid that could be received as a student-athlete and expenses incurred on road trips that are received by individual team members; and *(Revised: 1/9/96)*

(f) Is not involved in contacting and evaluating prospective student-athletes off campus or scouting opponents off campus.

11.01.5 Coach, Volunteer. In sports other than football and basketball, a volunteer coach is any coach who does not receive compensation or remuneration from the institution's athletics department or any organization funded in whole or in part by the athletics department or that is involved primarily in the promotion of the institution's athletics program (e.g., booster club, athletics foundation association). The following provisions shall apply: *(Revised: 1/10/92 effective 8/1/92, 4/26/01 effective 8/1/01)*

(a) The individual is prohibited from contacting and evaluating prospective student-athletes off campus or from scouting opponents off campus. *(Revised: 1/16/93, 1/11/94)*

(b) The individual may receive a maximum of two complimentary tickets to home athletics contests in the coach's sport. *(Revised: 1/16/93)*

(c) The individual may receive complimentary meals incidental to organized team activities (e.g., pre- or postgame meals, occasional meal, but not training table meals) or meals provided during a prospective student-athlete's official visit, provided the individual dines with the prospective student-athlete. *(Adopted: 4/29/04 effective 8/1/04, Revised: 11/10/05 effective 8/1/05)*

11.01.6 Supplemental Pay. Supplemental pay is the payment of cash over and above an athletics department staff member's institutional salary by an outside source for the purpose of increasing that staff member's annual earnings (see Bylaw 11.3.2.2).

11.1 CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL

11.1.1 Standards of Honesty and Sportsmanship. Individuals employed by or associated with a member institution to administer, conduct or coach intercollegiate athletics shall act with honesty and sportsmanship at all times so that intercollegiate athletics as a whole, their institutions and they, as individuals, represent the honor and dignity of fair play and the generally recognized high standards associated with wholesome competitive sports. (See Bylaw 10 for more specific ethical-conduct standards.)

11.1.2 Responsibility for Violations of NCAA Regulations. Institutional staff members found in violation of NCAA regulations shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in the provisions of the NCAA enforcement procedures, whether such violations occurred at the certifying institution or during the individual's previous employment at another member institution.

11.1.2.1 Responsibility of Head Coach. It shall be the responsibility of an institution's head coach to promote an atmosphere for compliance within the program supervised by the coach and to monitor the activities regarding compliance of all assistant coaches and other administrators involved with the program who report directly or indirectly to the coach. *(Adopted: 4/28/05)*

11.1.3 Use of Association Name or Affiliation. Staff members of member institutions and others serving on the Association's committees or acting as consultants shall not use, directly or by implication, the Association's name or their affiliation with the Association in the endorsement of products or services.

11.1.4 Representing Individuals in Marketing Athletics Ability/Reputation. Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution shall not represent, directly or indirectly, any individual in the marketing of athletics ability or reputation to an agent, a professional sports team or a professional

21-8

2. **Head Men's Basketball Coaches.** All head men's basketball coaches are required to attend the following media events, unless approval for being absent is granted by the Commissioner: the annual Big Ten Basketball Media Day; the telephone news conference held prior to the postseason Conference tournament, and postgame interviews held at the site of the Conference tournament following their team's participation. *(Revised & effective 5/1/95; revised & effective 5/18/98)*

3. **Head Women's Basketball Coaches.** All head women's basketball coaches are required to attend the following media events, unless approval for being absent is granted by the Commissioner: the annual Big Ten Basketball Media Day; the telephone news conference held prior to the postseason Conference tournament, and postgame interviews held at the site of the Conference tournament following their team's participation. *(Updated 6/97; revised & effective 5/18/98; revised & effective 8/6/98)*

11.2 CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS

11.2.2 Athletically Related Income - Equipment and Apparel Contracts. By September 1, 1994 all future contracts for athletic equipment and apparel shall be either between the university and vendor or a tripartite arrangement between the university, coach/support personnel and vendor. The university must be a party to agreements entered into after the effective date described above between coaches and/or support personnel and vendors. *(Adopted 6/8/94, revised & effective 8/1/94)*

11.6 SCOUTING AND FILM EXCHANGE

11.6.1 Scouting. The provisions of NCAA Bylaw 11.6 shall govern limitations on scouting except as follows:

A. **Women's Basketball.** Verbal and written scouting reports regarding Conference teams to other Conference teams is forbidden. *(Revised & effective 11/13/91)*

11.6.1.3 Film or Videotape Exchange.

A. **Men's Basketball.** There shall be no film or videotape exchange in men's basketball.

B. **Women's Basketball.** Videotape exchange in women's basketball may take place only as indicated in the Conference Game Management Manual for women's basketball.

C. **Football.** The Conference has adopted a formal policy for the exchange of football videotape as described in the Game Management Manual for Football.

entertainment purposes as permitted under NCAA legislation. *(Revised and effective 1/9/99; revised & effective 7/27/00)*

C. **Conference Championships.** The Conference or host institution shall not issue complimentary or any other form of free admission to any competitor in a Conference championship. Championship management, press personnel with credentials, and the participants shall be admitted without charge. An institution may purchase admissions that may be used by student-athletes consistent with Big Ten and NCAA legislation.

16.2.1.3 Institution's Home Contests in Other Sports. A student-athlete may receive a complimentary admission to all regular-season home athletic events as long as tickets are available, except in football, men's basketball, and men's ice hockey. *(Revised & effective 7/27/00)*

A. **Exceptions.** Student-athletes who are not participants in football, men's basketball, or men's ice hockey may receive a complimentary admission for those sports under the following circumstances *(Revised & effective 7/27/00):*

1. For the purpose of hosting a prospect on an expense-paid visit. *(Updated 9/92)*

2. For the purpose of being recognized or honored at the contest and it is the institution's policy to provide complimentary admission to any student of the university for this purpose. A student-athlete may also receive a maximum of three additional complimentary admissions to be used by the student-athlete's parents, legal guardians and/or spouse as permitted under NCAA legislation. *(Updated 4/93; revised & effective 10/17/00)*

16.4 MEDICAL EXPENSES.

16.4.1 Medical Examinations. Each student-athlete shall have an initial physical examination when they enter a Conference intercollegiate sports program. The extent of the physical examination including laboratory studies and other diagnostic procedures will be determined by each team physician. Thereafter, an annual review of their health status shall be performed. This may include a physical examination at the discretion of the team physician.

A. The final decision on physical qualification or reason for rejection shall be the responsibility of the team physician.

B. The team physician shall have final authority regarding participation in practice and competition subsequent to an injury or illness.

16.5 TRAINING TABLE MEALS

16.5.1. Permissible. The provisions of NCAA Bylaw 16.5 shall govern housing and meal benefits except as those noted below.

A. **Training Table Meals - General Interpretations and Definitions for Football and Men's Basketball**

1. Coaches shall not give instruction in the sport during the meal.

2. The term meal is defined as a meal for a group taken together, so that the food is of proper kind, quantity, and quality and properly served. It is not permissible to reimburse players or to compensate those furnishing meals eaten elsewhere when a training table meal is offered or the institution's dining facilities are available, and the student-athlete chooses to eat elsewhere. *(Revised 10/91)*

3. The full cost of the meal shall be defined as the actual cost to provide that meal, regardless of the source of funds.

4. **Football.** An institution may furnish a meal seven days a week during the football season (including any bowl participation) and five days a week out of season during the remainder of the academic year. *(Revised & effective 7/25/96; reaffirmed 7/14/05)*

5. **Men's Basketball.** An institution may furnish a meal seven days a week during the season (including any postseason participation) and five days a week out of season during the remainder of the academic year. *(Updated 8/92; 8/93; 8/94; revised 5/19/97, effective 8/1/97)*

16.8 TRAVEL SQUAD SIZE LIMITS & EXPENSES

16.8.1.2 Competition While Representing Institution.

A. **Home and Travel Squad Limits.** Only student-athletes who are eligible to compete may dress in uniform for a game or contest. *(Updated 9/92; revised & effective 1/9/99)*

1. **Squad Size Limitations.** The following home and travel squad limits shall apply to all regular season (championship and non-championship segments) competition including exhibition, scrimmages, Conference championships, and Conference postseason tournaments (**See 16.8.1.2.Chart**). *(Revised & effective 1/21/92; updated 9/92; editorial revision 7/04)*

1) Only members of the official travel squad shall participate in an intercollegiate meet. A student-athlete who is not a member of the official travel squad may not travel to an away-from-home contest at his or her own expense to participate in practice or competition activities (e.g., warm up with the team) or sit on the bench unless that student-athlete is included in the travel squad limits. *(Revised 4/7/98; revised & effective 10/4/04)*

2) An athlete who is not eligible for competition shall not travel with the team in any capacity to an off-campus site, regardless of whether or not the athlete offers to pay an appropriate share of the travel expenses.

3) If fewer than the permissible number of athletes travel to a contest, the university may transport a replacement for an injured or ill athlete.

16.8.1.2.A. 2 c. Football.

1) The home team may dress as many players as it desires for a varsity game.

2) For any Conference game, the visiting varsity team may carry and dress not more than 70 eligible players (including in that number players who may be injured and unable to play) as the traveling squad. *(Revised & effective 6/8/92; revised & effective 5/20/04)*

For any non-Conference game, the visiting varsity team may carry and dress not more than 70 eligible players (including in that number players who may be injured and unable to play).

3) Squad members who are not eligible for intercollegiate competition shall not be permitted to travel to any game or contest at the expense of the university.

4) The travel squad limits shall apply when the team is housed in a hotel, motel or similar "extra cost" facility on the night prior to any home Conference or non-Conference game. *(Revised 10/14/91)*

16.8.1.2.A TRAVEL SQUAD LIMITS FOR MEN'S SPORTS

Sport	Regular Season Travel	Home	Conference Championship or Conference Postseason Tournament	
Baseball	25	Unlimited	25	(Revised 8/1/94; 2/19/96)
Basketball	15	Unlimited	15	(Revised 6/8/92, 7/1/92; 2/15/97, effective 8/1/97)
Cross Country	12	Unlimited	9	(Revised 7/24/96; revised 5/19/02)
Football - Conference	70	Unlimited	--	(Revised 6/8/92, 8/1/94, revised 5/17/03; revised 5/20/04)
Football – Nonconference	70			
Golf	6	Unlimited	6	
Gymnastics	15	Unlimited	15	
Soccer				
Single contest	24	Unlimited		(Revised 5/20/04)
Multiple contests	24	Unlimited	20**	(Revised 8/1/95; revised 5/20/04)
Swimming	24***	Unlimited	24***	(Revised 10/14/91,6/8/92, 8/9/93; 7/24/96; 2/15/97; revised 10/7/03 effective 03-04 season)
Tennis				
Single contest	9	Unlimited		(Revised 2/24/03)
Multiple contests	9	Unlimited	9	(Revised 2/15/97; effective 8/1/97)
Track - Indoor	32	Unlimited	32****	(Revised 5/24/99; effective 8/1/99; Revised 5/23/00; effective 8/1/00; Revised 10/9/01; effective 8/1/02)
Track - Outdoor	34	Unlimited	34****	(Revised 2/15/97; effective 8/1/97) Revised 10/9/01; effective 8/1/02)
Wrestling				
Open	20	Unlimited		
Single contest	13	Unlimited		
Multiple contests	15	Unlimited+	15	(Revised & effective10/17/00)

* The travel squad limit shall be 70 for conference games (12th game situation no longer applicable). For preseason or other exempted contest situations, the Directors have agreed in principle to use postseason bowl guidelines for travel squad limits. *(Revised 8/3/95; revised 5/18/03; revised 5/20/04)*

** For the Conference championship, the travel squad limit of 20 shall apply to all teams, except that the host institution may dress an unlimited number (*Revised 2/19/95, effective 8/1/95).*

*** Swimmers shall count as one and divers shall count as one-half. (*Revised & effective 8/9/93; revised 7/24/96, effective 8/1/96; revised 10/7/03 effective 03-04 season)*

**** The number of participants from each school in any one event shall not exceed the number of places to score in that event, and never more than four entries per event.

\+ The home squad may be unlimited only if two conference teams are not competing against each other (*Revised & effective 10/17/00)*

game replays or electronic messages shall be permitted at those Big Ten institutions whose football stadiums and basketball arenas are so equipped as follows:

1) **Football.** On a one-year trial basis for the 2005 season only, institutions are allowed to show one replay of any play at no less than 75% of real-time speed. However, institutions shall refrain from showing additional replays on video boards where an officiating call could be considered a substantial part of the play. Institutions are not limited in the use of replays where officiating is not considered a substantial part of the play. *(Refer to Football Game Management Manual for specific guidelines.) (Adopted & effective 5/19/02; revised 10/7/02; revised 6/23/03; revised 5/19/05, effective 8/1/05; 1/4/06)*

2) **Basketball.** Institutions shall not show replays when an officiating call could be considered a substantial part of the play. Institutions are not limited in the use of replays where officiating is not considered a substantial part of the play. *(Refer to Basketball Game Management Manual for specific guidelines. Revised & effective 5/19/05)*

b. **Protection of Visiting Team & Officials.** Host institutions must provide adequate security and protection for the visiting team and officials and their vehicles immediately upon arrival on campus continuing through their departure. *(Refer to Football and Basketball Game Management Manuals; Adopted & effective 5/19/02; revised 10/7/02; revised 6/23/03)*

c. **Student and Band Sections.** Institutions will be held responsible for school sponsored student and band sections that attack or single out student-athletes. An institution not in compliance with this policy shall be subject to conference review and action. *(Refer to Football and Basketball Game Management Manuals for specific guidelines and penalties.) (Adopted & effective 5/19/02; revised 10/7/02; revised 6/23/03; revised 5/19/05)*

B. **Tobacco Ban.** The use of all tobacco products by all individuals at the site of Conference regular season competition, championships, and postseason Conference competition as well as during other activities associated with competition such as banquets, autograph sessions, press conferences, and post game interviews, shall be prohibited. *(Adopted 8/8/94)*

See also p.57 NCAA Bylaw 11.1.5

C. **Forfeiture Policy.** See Appendix C.

21-14

complimentary pass seats may be returned for credit after the close of business on Friday of game week. *(Revised & effective 8/4/93)*

17.1.D. 2. **b.** **Men's Basketball.** 100 tickets shall be made available for purchase to a visiting institution. The location of 36 of these tickets shall be behind the visiting university's bench.

c. **Women's Basketball.** A maximum of 60 complimentary admissions located behind the visiting team bench shall be allotted at no charge to Conference institutions. An additional 40 tickets shall be made available for purchase by the visiting team. *(Revised 7/24/96; revised & effective 9/29/97)*

d. **Women's Volleyball.** A total of 60 complimentary admissions shall be allotted at no charge to a visiting institution. *(Revised 5/24/99, effective 8/1/99)*

e. **All Other Men's and Women's Sports.** For all other sports, a ticket allotment shall not be made for a scheduled game or event unless otherwise mutually agreed.

17.1.D.3. **Officials.** All officials may receive a maximum of two complimentary admissions for each game officiated. Officials will be instructed to make their own arrangements with the host institution.

17.1. D.4. **Scouts.** Any individual representing a professional organization, scouting service, or any individual evaluating team or individual student-athletes shall not receive a complimentary admission to an event or be seated in the section that is designated specifically for the media or press (e.g., press box, press row, etc.). *(Editorial revision 6/00)*

17.1. D 5. **Press**. Members of the working press may receive a press pass only.

17.1. D 6. **Press Box Policies - Football**

a. A standard set of credentials for visiting Big Ten football travel parties (excluding media press box credentials) must be sent to the visiting school two weeks prior to the first game of the season. The standard credential set will include the following: *(Revised & effective 7/26/96; revised and effective 5/19/05)*

45	Sideline
8	Visiting Athletic Director Booth
8	Visiting Coaches' Booth
4	Video
4	All Over
10	Parking.

21-15

b. Each school shall reserve at least two radio booths for a visiting school's regular stations. *(Revised 5/10/93; 2/15/97)*

c. Professional scouts, scouting services, or any individual in attendance to evaluate team or individual student-athletes, shall not receive a complimentary admission to the event, and shall not be allowed in the press box.

d. The press box booth for visiting coaches should be uniform throughout the Conference, or at least comparable for the visiting and home teams.

e. The public address announcer shall follow the manner prescribed in the NCAA Football Rule Book and as further directed by Conference bulletin with respect to excessive crowd noise.

17.1.D.7. **Press Box Policies - Men's and Women's Basketball.** *(Revised & effective 8/5/98)*

a. Professional scouts, scouting services, or any individual in attendance to evaluate team or individual student-athletes, shall not receive a complimentary admission to the event, and shall not be seated in the section that is designated specifically for the media or press (e.g., press box or press row, etc.).

17.1. D 8. **Press Box Policies - Professional Sports Organization.** A professional sports organization's management, ownership, or head coach may be present in the press box as a guest of the institution's Director of Athletics or Head Coach provided there is no intention to conduct scouting activities, including the scouting of officials. *(Adopted 10/27/94; updated 9/96)*

17.1.E. **Administration of Officials.** In addition to the following provisions, there are specific policies that govern football and men's basketball officials. See the Game Management Manuals for these sports.

1. **Appointment and Assignment**

a. **Football and Men's Basketball.** Football and men's basketball officials shall be appointed by the Commissioner. Officials shall be subject to rules and regulations governing their operations and working conditions as established by the Commissioner.

1) A person shall not be appointed or retained as an official if the person's other employment or conditions might affect the efficiency or quality of the person's officiating. A

person employed by, or a student at a Conference university shall not be appointed as an official.

b. **Women's Sports.** Conference registered officials shall be used for those sports in which inseason play determines the Conference champion.

1) In those sports in which inseason play determines the Conference champion, a person shall not be appointed or retained as an official if the person's other employment or conditions might affect the efficiency or quality of the person's officiating. A person employed by, or a student at a Conference university shall not be appointed as an official at the university's events.

2) The Conference office shall assign, train, and evaluate officials for basketball and volleyball competition.

2. **Complimentary Admissions.** All officials may receive a maximum of two complimentary admissions for each game officiated. The basketball officials must make their own arrangements through the ticket manager at the host school. The football official should contact the ticket manager for any additional tickets.

3. **Publicity.** Publicity shall not be given to the assignment of officials. Names of officials are to be announced only in the press box at game time.

4. **Fees and Expenses**. See Appendix D.

17.1.F. **Radio, Television, Press Policies.** Terms and conditions of Conference agreements govern television policies. See the Game Management Manual for details on radio and press box policies.

17.1.G. **Jewelry.** Jewelry is defined to include all forms of body piercing and other ornamentation that could cause injury to the wearer or other participants. Tongue studs are specifically prohibited for competition and practice in all sports.

For the following sports, no jewelry may be worn in all competition or practice, with the exception that one pair of stud earrings may be worn by student-athletes in women's gymnastic. For all other sports, jewelry may be worn that presents no hazard to the competitor or opponents. *(Revised 5/24/99, effective 8/1/99; revised & effective 10/5/99).*

Basketball (Men's & Women's)	Soccer (Men's & Women's)
Baseball	Softball
Field Hockey	Volleyball
Football	Wrestling
Gymnastics (Men's & Women's)	

Appendix N

Student-Athlete/Team Compliance Meeting
End of 2005-06 Academic Year

I. Introduction - 3rd of 3 (4th of 4 for FB and MBB) meetings per academic year)

II. Summer Activities – Review Handout(s) (CP)

III. Financial Aid Issues (KA)

A. Summer School – applications for athletics scholarship are due!
B. Update Summer Address
C. Sign up for Direct Deposit
D. Summer Room & Board – one lump-sum payment at the beginning of the respective summer session you are attending ($1050 at the beginning of the 1st summer session to last for 6 weeks and $1400 at the beginning of the 2nd summer session to last for 8 weeks).
E. Fill out a FAFSA application (online) now to get Pell Grant next year!

IV. Eligibility Issues (AH & CA)

A. If your spring semester grades turn out less well than you expected and you have any concerns about eligibility, please contact either Chip Armbruster (female athletes) or Anitra House (male athletes) to see if you have influenced your eligibility negatively and need to reassess summer school attendance, etc. Do this as soon as possible, so that athletic academic advisors can help you register for summer school as soon as possible, if needed. (Summer I starts on Tuesday 5/9 but spring semester grades are not official until Thursday 5/11.)
B. Any changes in your major this summer before fall 2006 could make you ineligible to meet the NCAA degree completion percentages for eligibility 2006-07. Please discuss any major changes with both the athletic academic advisors and the eligibility officers in athletics. Campus advisors do not know all of the Big Ten/NCAA academic eligibility rules and could give information that might unintentionally make you ineligible.

V. Questions???

WHEN IN DOUBT, CHECK IT OUT!
CONTACT THE COMPLIANCE OFFICE!

Summer Activities for Enrolled IU Student-Athletes

Summer Practice

Summer practice is PROHIBITED by NCAA legislation. Practice is defined as any meeting, activity, or instruction involving sports-related information and having an athletics purpose, held at the direction of or supervised by a member of the IU coaching staff.

Practice has occurred if one or more IU coaches and one or more IU student-athletes engage in any of the following activities (either voluntary or mandatory)

1. **Team Conditioning Activities**
2. **Activities on the playing or practice field/court/pool/course**
3. **Setting up offensive or defensive alignments**
4. **Chalk talk**
5. **Lecture on or discussion of strategy related to the sport**
6. **Activities using equipment related to the sport**
7. **Discussions or review of game films, motion pictures or videotapes related to the sport; or**
8. **Activities conducted under the guise of physical education class work.**

During the summer, it is not permissible to make ANY activities mandatory for student-athletes (e.g., weight training, participation in camps/clinics, running, etc). All activities engaged in by student-athletes during the summer must be VOLUNTARY and NO COACHING STAFF MEMBER MAY BE PRESENT.

It is not permissible for an IU coach to require student-athletes to report any information regarding their voluntary workout programs or to provide any expenses (postage costs, collect calls) for the purpose of the student-athlete reporting the progress of voluntary workout programs.

Strength and Conditioning Activities

It is permissible for strength and conditioning coaches to design and conduct specific workout programs for student-athletes, provided such workouts are voluntary and conducted at the request of the student-athlete.

Reserving Facilities

It is not permissible to reserve the use of an IU facility exclusively for student-athletes during the summer as this arrangement would constitute practice that is financially supported by IU.

Equipment and Apparel

Student-athletes may retain and use institutional athletics apparel and equipment during the summer in accordance with our institutional policy and procedures for issuance and retrieval.

Individual Sports

In individual sports, an IU coach may participate in individual workout sessions with IU student-athletes, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete.
However, in no other circumstance may a coach observe enrolled IU student-athletes in non-organized sport specific activities (e.g. practice). Additionally, it is permissible to reserve an IU facility for an individual workout session, however, at no time may IU pay for the use of a facility for student-athletes (i.e., driving range fees, tennis court time, pool time).

Team Sports

In team sports, an IU coach may not observe enrolled student-athletes in nonorganized sport-specific activities (e.g., practice, pick-up games), in as much as such activity is considered a nonpermissible out-of-season , countable ARA.

Safety Exception

In safety exception sports, (swimming/diving, field events in track/field, wrestling, rowing) a coach may be present during voluntary individual workouts without the workouts being considered as countable ARA as long as the coach is providing only safety/skill instruction and not conducting the individual's workouts.

Summer Participation on Outside Teams

The NCAA places limits on the number of enrolled student-athletes from any one team who can train/practice and compete with an outside team during the summer (AAU, USS, club team, etc). Please make sure you check with your coach before participating on any outside team during the summer.

Field Hockey, Soccer & Volleyball student-athletes begin summer participation on May 1, 2006
The limit for each is no more than 5 student-athletes form IU may participate in Field Hockey or soccer on any one team. Volleyball may have just 2 student-athletes on any given team. Classes cannot be missed and the director of athletics must provide written consent.

Promotional Activities

All IU student-athletes are required to receive preapproval from the compliance office **prior** to participating in any promotional activity even during the summer. Please contact your coach or the compliance office if you are invited to participate or interested in participating in a promotional activity (e.g., hometown parade, fundraiser, speaking engagement, etc)

Summer Employment

There are no restrictions on the amount of compensation that a student-athlete may receive for summer employment (even if the SA is enrolled in summer school) provided the student-athlete is paid the going rate for work actually performed and may not be paid based upon athletics reputation or ability. Additionally, student-athletes may work in the athletics department or at a job arranged by an IU staff member.

Summer Camps

Enrolled IU student-athletes (except Football) may work at IU camps or clinics as long as they receive preapproval for their employment from the compliance office. Student-athletes' duties should be of a general, supervisory nature in addition to any coaching or officiating assignments.

For questions please contact the compliance office:

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director
812.855.0451
jhooker@indiana.edu

Christian D. Pope
Director of Compliance
812.856.6074
cdpope@indiana.edu

Appendix O

Men's Basketball Staff and Compliance Staff Meeting
Agenda
May 30, 2006

1. Introductory Remarks (RG)
2. NCAA and Self-Imposed Restrictions (JB)
3. Identification of Issues that need Clarification (all)
4. Monitoring Requirements (JB and CP)
5. Weekly Meetings (CP)
6. Monthly Meetings (JB)
7. Summer Activities – both currently enrolled and prospective student-athletes (JB)
8. Sunshine (JB)
9. Questions/Concerns (all)

Summer Activities

Summer Practice

Summer practice is PROHIBITED by NCAA legislation. Practice is defined as any meeting, activity, or instruction involving sports-related information and having an athletics purpose, held at the direction of or supervised by a member of the IU coaching staff.

Practice has occurred if one or more IU coaches and one or more IU student-athletes engage in any of the following activities (either voluntary or mandatory)

1. Team Conditioning Activities
2. Activities on the playing or practice field/court/pool/course
3. Setting up offensive or defensive alignments
4. Chalk talk
5. Lecture on or discussion of strategy related to the sport
6. Activities using equipment related to the sport
7. Discussions or review of game films, motion pictures or videotapes related to the sport; or
8. Activities conducted under the guise of physical education class work.

During the summer, it is not permissible to make ANY activities mandatory for student-athletes (e.g., weight training, participation in camps/clinics, running, etc). All activities engaged in by student-athletes during the summer must be VOLUNTARY and NO COACHING STAFF MEMBER MAY BE PRESENT.

It is also not permissible for an IU coach to require student-athletes to report any information regarding their voluntary workout programs or to provide any expenses (postage costs, collect calls) for the purpose of the student-athlete reporting the progress of voluntary workout programs, nor may any other institutional staff member (S & C coach, athletic trainer, administrator) report any information regarding the SA's participation in voluntary workouts back to a member of the coaching staff!

NO COACHES ARE ALLOWED IN THE WEIGHT ROOM WHEN MEMBERS OF YOUR TEAM ARE PRESENT.

Individual Sports Additional Guidelines

In individual sports, an IU coach may participate in individual workout sessions with IU student-athletes, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete. Additionally, it is permissible to reserve an IU facility for an individual workout session, however, at no time may IU pay for the use of a facility for student-athletes (i.e., driving range fees, tennis court time, pool time).
However, in no other circumstance may a coach observe enrolled IU student-athletes in non-organized sport specific activities (e.g. practice).

Team Sports Additional Guidelines

In team sports, an IU coach may not observe enrolled student-athletes in non-organized sport-specific activities (e.g., practice, pick-up games), in as much as such activity is considered a Nonpermissible out-of-season , countable ARA.

Safety Exception Sports

In safety exception sports, (swimming/diving, field events in track/field, wrestling, rowing, wrestling) a coach may be present during voluntary individual workouts without the workouts being considered as countable ARA as long as the coach is providing only safety/skill instruction and not conducting the individual's workouts.

Exception: Local Sports Club Participation during the Summer

Coaches who have submitted the required LSC information to the compliance office may operate local sports clubs that involve enrolled IU student-athletes provided the student-athletes have paid the established membership fees for the organization.

Strength and Conditioning Activities

It is permissible for strength and conditioning coaches to design and conduct specific workout programs for student-athletes, provided such workouts are voluntary and are conducted at the request of the student-athlete. Prospects who have signed an NLI may participate in voluntary weight lifting/conditioning activities with the S & C coach present provided there is no prearrangement by the institution, and the strength coach is performing his/her normal duties in supervising the weight room and may not work directly with the prospect. PROSPECTS WHO HAVE NOT SIGNED AN NLI (incoming walk-ons) MAY NOT USE OUR WEIGHT ROOM BECAUSE IT IS NOT OPEN TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC. *In the sport of football, see Proposal 2002-84 for specific S &C guidelines for enrolled and prospective student-athletes.*

Reserving Facilities

It is not permissible to reserve the use of an IU facility exclusively for student-athletes during the summer as this arrangement would constitute practice that is financially supported by IU.

Equipment and Apparel

Student-athletes may retain and use institutional athletics apparel and equipment during the summer in accordance with our institutional policy and procedures for issuance and retrieval.

Medical Expenses

We may ONLY provide medical expenses (including rehabilitation and physical therapy expenses) for student-athletes who sustain injuries while participating in voluntary conditioning activities during the summer that are conducted by the strength and conditioning staff or for on-going medical treatment/medication for athletically related injuries that occurred during the academic year. Prospects who have signed an NLI and are enrolled in summer school may use the training room facilities.

Summer Participation on Outside Teams

The NCAA places limits on the number of enrolled student-athletes from any one team who can train/practice and compete with an outside team during the summer. Not more than the following number of IU student-athletes may participate (practice/compete) on an outside, amateur team: Baseball/Softball 4; Field Hockey/Soccer 5; Football 0; Volleyball 2. For all other sports there are no restrictions for other sports. All BASKETBALL STUDENT-ATHLETES MUST RECEIVE PERMISSION FROM THE COMPLIANCE OFFICE PRIOR TO PARTICIPATING ON ANY SUMMER LEAGUE.

Promotional Activities

All IU student-athletes are required to receive preapproval from the compliance office **prior** to participating in any promotional activity (e.g., hometown parade, fundraiser, speaking engagement, etc). even during the summer.

Summer Employment

There are no restrictions on the amount of compensation that a student-athlete may receive for summer employment (even if the SA is enrolled in summer school) provided the student-athlete is paid the going rate for work actually performed and may not be paid based upon athletics reputation or ability.

Summer Camps

Currently enrolled IU student-athletes (except Football) may work at IU camps or clinics as long as they receive preapproval for their employment from the compliance office. Student-athletes' duties should be of a general, supervisory nature and any coaching or officiating assignments cannot represent more than one-half of the student-athlete's work time.

Summer Activities for Enrolled IU Student-Athletes

Summer Practice

Summer practice is PROHIBITED by NCAA legislation. Practice is defined as any meeting, activity, or instruction involving sports-related information and having an athletics purpose, held at the direction of or supervised by a member of the IU coaching staff.

Practice has occurred if one or more IU coaches and one or more IU student-athletes engage in any of the following activities (either voluntary or mandatory)

1. Team Conditioning Activities
2. Activities on the playing or practice field/court/pool/course
3. Setting up offensive or defensive alignments
4. Chalk talk
5. Lecture on or discussion of strategy related to the sport
6. Activities using equipment related to the sport
7. Discussions or review of game films, motion pictures or videotapes related to the sport; or
8. Activities conducted under the guise of physical education class work.

During the summer, it is not permissible to make ANY activities mandatory for student-athletes (e.g., weight training, participation in camps/clinics, running, etc). All activities engaged in by student-athletes during the summer must be VOLUNTARY and NO COACHING STAFF MEMBER MAY BE PRESENT.

It is not permissible for an IU coach to require student-athletes to report any information regarding their voluntary workout programs or to provide any expenses (postage costs, collect calls) for the purpose of the student-athlete reporting the progress of voluntary workout programs.

Strength and Conditioning Activities

It is permissible for strength and conditioning coaches to design and conduct specific workout programs for student-athletes, provided such workouts are voluntary and conducted at the request of the student-athlete.

Reserving Facilities

It is not permissible to reserve the use of an IU facility exclusively for student-athletes during the summer as this arrangement would constitute practice that is financially supported by IU.

Equipment and Apparel

Student-athletes may retain and use institutional athletics apparel and equipment during the summer in accordance with our institutional policy and procedures for issuance and retrieval.

Individual Sports

In individual sports, an IU coach may participate in individual workout sessions with IU student-athletes, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete.
However, in no other circumstance may a coach observe enrolled IU student-athletes in non-organized sport specific activities (e.g. practice). Additionally, it is permissible to reserve an IU facility for an individual workout session, however, at no time may IU pay for the use of a facility for student-athletes (i.e., driving range fees, tennis court time, pool time).

Team Sports

In team sports, an IU coach may not observe enrolled student-athletes in nonorganized sport-specific activities (e.g., practice, pick-up games), in as much as such activity is considered a nonpermissible out-of-season , countable ARA.

Safety Exception

In safety exception sports, (swimming/diving, field events in track/field, wrestling, rowing) a coach may be present during voluntary individual workouts without the workouts being considered as countable ARA as long as the coach is providing only safety/skill instruction and not conducting the individual's workouts.

Summer Participation on Outside Teams

The NCAA places limits on the number of enrolled student-athletes from any one team who can train/practice and compete with an outside team during the summer (AAU, USS, club team, etc). Please make sure you check with your coach before participating on any outside team during the summer.

Field Hockey, Soccer & Volleyball student-athletes begin summer participation on May 1, 2006
The limit for each is no more than 5 student-athletes form IU may participate in Field Hockey or soccer on any one team. Volleyball may have just 2 student-athletes on any given team. Classes cannot be missed and the director of athletics must provide written consent.

Promotional Activities

All IU student-athletes are required to receive preapproval from the compliance office **prior** to participating in any promotional activity even during the summer. Please contact your coach or the compliance office if you are invited to participate or interested in participating in a promotional activity (e.g., hometown parade, fundraiser, speaking engagement, etc)

Summer Employment

There are no restrictions on the amount of compensation that a student-athlete may receive for summer employment (even if the SA is enrolled in summer school) provided the student-athlete is paid the going rate for work actually performed and may not be paid based upon athletics reputation or ability. Additionally, student-athletes may work in the athletics department or at a job arranged by an IU staff member.

Summer Camps

Enrolled IU student-athletes (except Football) may work at IU camps or clinics as long as they receive preapproval for their employment from the compliance office. Student-athletes' duties should be of a general, supervisory nature in addition to any coaching or officiating assignments.

For questions please contact the compliance office:

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director
812.855.0451
jhooker@indiana.edu

Christian D. Pope
Director of Compliance
812.856.6074
cdpope@indiana.edu

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2006 9:35 AM
To: McElroy, Barbara J
Cc: Pope, Christian Dean
Subject: FW: Coach Sampson

BJ – please print this off and give it to Coach Sampson – he IS allowed to go and visit with any one of our signees AND as long as he doesn't do ANY other recruiting activities on that trip, it will NOT count against his 19 days he gets this academic year. See below where I have highlighted the response from the Big Ten. Thanks! JB

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451

From: Pope, Christian Dean
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2006 5:22 PM
To: 'Big Ten - Greg Walter'
Cc: McElroy, Barbara J; Brinegar, Jennifer L
Subject: RE: Coach Sampson

Greg,

You are correct. The penalties statement specifically states, "head men's basketball coach will engage in off campus recruiting activities for a maximum of 19 days" and references Bylaw 13.1.9 so I believe we are talking about the 130 recruiting days. Thanks for the information.

Christian
Go Hoosiers!

P.S. BJ, please make certain this is forwarded to Coach Sampson. Thanks.

From: Big Ten - Greg Walter [mailto:gwalter@bigten.org]
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2006 4:57 PM
To: Pope, Christian Dean
Cc: Big Ten - Chad Hawley
Subject: RE: Coach Sampson

CP:

When you say 19 days, I infer that we are talking about 19 of the institution's 130 "recruiting-person days" as defined by 13.02.7. Is this correct? If so, a coach whose only off-campus recruiting activity on a particular day is contact with an NLI signee would not utilize a recruiting-person day.

Hope this helps,

Greg

From: Pope, Christian Dean [mailto:cdpope@indiana.edu]
Sent: Friday, April 07, 2006 11:04 AM
To: Big Ten - Greg Walter
Subject: Coach Sampson

Greg,

To further our conversation the other day, I do now have a copy of the penalties self-imposed by OU and we do plan to see those penalties through.

The one area we have a question about is the reduction to 19 days from August 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006, that Coach Sampson himself may utilize for off campus recruiting. He has 5 days left and is curious if visiting a PSA off campus who has previously signed a NLI with IU will utilize one of those days. The specific language states that "this prohibition shall apply to all off-campus appearances at which prospects may be in attendance including exceptions provided in Bylaw 13.1.9."

Any help is most appreciated in this area. Thanks again.

Christian D. Pope
Go Hoosiers!

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Rohleder, Mary Ann
Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2006 3:14 PM
To: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Subject: RE: Weekly Update

Thanks....

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2006 3:03 PM
To: Rohleder, Mary Ann
Subject: Weekly Update

Christian has continued with April team compliance meetings. He reviewed and edited compliance portion for 06-07 SA Handbook/academic planner inclusion; wrote a SA newsletter article regarding camps & clinics as well as small piece regarding summer/academic year employment; edited 05-06 volunteer coaches' materials to reflect new academic year and set up 06-07 Volunteer coaches' materials for automatic dispersal in August; and met with Gerry Green, Men's Basketball director of Basketball operations regarding recruiting and process review for future handling. He continues rules education efforts concerning interpretation requests from various coaching staffs.

Kathy has been very busy with changes to renewal tenders, initial tenders and non–renewal of aid (this means issuing, monitoring and posting changes to data base). She is currently posting summer aid; working with financial aid on campus to obtain official figures for tuition and fees and cost of attendance for the 2006-07 school year; and working with the business office on verification of balance for the special assistance fund and summer school aid issues.

Chip is working on his general weekly tasks as far as updating the IRL, checking admission status and communicating this information to the coaching staffs so that they can follow up and have these students take care of these lingering issues. He is also working with Buck Walters on some logistics as far as housing is concerned along with gathering information from coaches on the number of beds needed for '06-07. He processed a Rowing Addendum for the Big Ten Championships; met with a representative from the physical plant to discuss integrated computer system that will enter student-athletes eligible for equipment; discussed degree completion percentage requirements with several female student athletes who stopped by after compliance meetings because they are education majors (which can be problematic); and he continues to deal with transfer release requests (coming and going).

Jennifer is planning for the May and June ICN and compliance meetings, researching and responding to various compliance issues/interpretations, continuing to conduct team meetings, and trying to catch up after dealing w/various MBB issues, three self reports and the semester-long fight to get Heather Chapman's waiver for an additional season of competition (lots of filing and catching up on little issues/fires to put out).

Anitra completed Big Ten Survey for Bruce Jaffee; completed w/ Ron Edge open records request from *Minneapolis Star Tribune* (aggregate academic background info. on selected teams); shared notes from Big 10 Compliance Meetings with J.B. & C.A; and collected information on possible faculty sponsor candidates at request of Bruce Jaffee. She is evaluating transfers for M. Basketball, M. Swimming, etc; working c[redacted]ase (multiple issues and petitions) with Big Ten and Tory; and, attending compliance year-end meetings with teams when possible.

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
2-855-0451

Verification that Rob was aware of call restrictions by 5/1/06!

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Sent: Monday, May 01, 2006 10:29 AM
To: Senderoff, Robert A.
Cc: Pope, Christian Dean
Subject: MBB Questions

Hi Rob,

Maybe we can meet face-to-face today!

Anyway, just a few quick clarifications:

You can begin sending out written correspondence to sophomores (2008 graduates) beginning June 15 at the conclusion of their sophomore year (not at the conclusion of each prospect's sophomore year). Until June 15, you can send out a generic cover letter for questionnaires. I am checking with the Big Ten to see about generic cover letters for camp brochures (didn't find anything on point in the database or our camp/clinic guide regarding this issue).

Also, for the 2007 graduates, currently in their junior year, you may:

1. Call them once every other month (per IU's and UO's self-imposed penalties regarding 13.1.3.1.2. MBB may NOT call juniors once a month until after June 30, 2007!
2. Send recruiting correspondence per 13.4.1. Please be sure to carefully review this bylaw as it was changed last year! But, you can definitely include a personalized cover letter for camp brochures and questionnaires.

As for 2006 graduates, we can only call them once a week (again per the self-imposed penalties), unless they have signed an NLI with IU.

I'll forward on the Big Ten's response regarding generic cover letters as soon as I get it. Also, in the future, please contact Christian Pope (856-6074 or cdpope@indiana.edu) as he is our point person on recruiting and interpretations.

Finally, we need to schedule an orientation (regarding IU's compliance policies and procedures) with you and Jerry Green as soon as possible.

Thanks and looking forward to meeting you!

Jennifer

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Sent: Monday, May 01, 2006 11:09 AM
To: Senderoff, Robert A.
Subject: RE: MBB Questions

No problem - we have a compliance meeting tomorrow at 10 over in the Hoosier Room. We will be doing the annual review for the coaches certification exam. Hopefully, all of you can make it over for that meeting (60 minutes or less)!

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance Indiana University
812-855-0451

-----Original Message-----
From: Senderoff, Robert A.
Sent: Monday, May 01, 2006 10:44 AM
To: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Subject: Re: MBB Questions

today is bad...i will be in all day on Tuesday

-----Original Message-----

From: "Brinegar, Jennifer L" <jhooker@indiana.edu>
Subj: MBB Questions
Date: Mon May 1, 2006 10:28 am
Size: 2K
To: "Senderoff, Robert A." <rsendero@indiana.edu>
Cc: "Pope, Christian Dean" <cdpope@indiana.edu>

Hi Rob,

Maybe we can meet face-to-face today!

Anyway, just a few quick clarifications:

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2006 12:24 PM
To: Greenspan, Richard I
Cc: Rohleder, Mary Ann; Calhoun, M. Grace
Subject: RE:

Rick,

This is definitely a high priority for my office. Prior to yesterday's report, I already had Christian documenting each week's meetings with the DOBO, as well as his monitoring efforts regarding the self-imposed sanctions. I will change the Compliance Agreement (signed by you, Kelvin and Bruce) to reflect the additional sanctions and I will develop specific guidelines, acceptable standards, follow-up, logs and reporting mechanisms as well. I have set aside next Tuesday morning to accomplish these tasks.

I just spoke with BJ and Coach Sampson and his staff would be available to meet with us at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday afternoon. I checked with Terri and she said you were open and we could use your conference room. Around that meeting, we will need to have you and Kelvin sign off on the amended Compliance Agreement (I can get Bruce's signature later).

Would you like for me to contact the NCAA staff regarding clarification on the recruiting restrictions, or should I wait until after this preliminary meeting to see if our coaching staff has additional questions? Either way works for me. As for your question below, I don't think the intent of the sanction was to hurt IU, so I think it's pretty clear that 3 coaches can be out – just not Coach Sampson. But, I can certainly get that clarified if you think it's necessary.

Thanks,

'ennifer

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451

From: Greenspan, Richard I
Sent: Friday, May 26, 2006 10:26 AM
To: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Cc: Rohleder, Mary Ann; Calhoun, M. Grace
Subject:

Jennifer,

It is very important that you develop specific guidelines, acceptable standards, follow-up, logs and reporting mechanisms in order for us to adequately fulfill the NCAA sanctions as they relate to Coach Sampson and Men's Basketball. We do not want to have any ambiguity as to his restrictions and responsibilities/capabilities. I would suggest a meeting with Coach and his entire staff as soon as he returns. It might be helpful to have me involved to reinforce the strong institutional commitment to doing this correctly. I believe there remain some areas of clarification that NCAA staffers will need to answer for us such as the number of coaches on the road at one time (I assume it is still 3 but not Sampson), etc.

Please make this a high priority for full and faithful completion.

THx,

RG

Men's Basketball Staff and Compliance Staff Meeting
Agenda
May 30, 2006

1. Introductory Remarks (RG)
2. NCAA and Self-Imposed Restrictions (JB)
3. Identification of Issues that need Clarification (all)
4. Monitoring Requirements (JB and CP)
5. Weekly Meetings (CP)
6. Monthly Meetings (JB)
7. Summer Activities – both currently enrolled and prospective student-athletes (JB)
8. Sunshine (JB)
9. Questions/Concerns (all)

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2006 9:34 AM
To: Greenspan, Richard I
Subject: Amended Compliance Agreement
Attachments: Men's Basketball Amended and Highlighted Corrective Action 05-30-06 Memo.doc; Men's Basketball Corrective Action 04-19-06 Memo.doc

Good Morning Rick,

I amended the compliance agreement based upon the COI report and additional penalties. I have copied both – in case you want to look at the 4/19 version when reading the amended memo (I also highlighted the amendments/changes in the 5/30 version for your convenience).

Please let me know if the 5/30 version needs any changes. When you have given your final approval, I will remove the highlights and send it to Terri Jo to print out on your letterhead.

Thanks!

Jennifer

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451

Memorandum

To: Coach Kelvin Sampson

From: Rick Greenspan
Bruce Jaffee

Date: May 30, 2006

Re: Amended Compliance Agreement

This memorandum serves to amend the April 19, 2006, compliance agreement signed off on by all the parties listed above. Specifically, the Committee on Infractions report dated May 25, 2006, noted that although Indiana University adopted and transferred the penalties listed below, further recruiting restrictions were warranted. Therefore, we have amended paragraphs 1 and 4, and added paragraphs 6 and 7 to this compliance agreement. The complete list of corrective actions is as follows:

1. The director of compliance will meet, on a weekly basis, with the head coach or the director of men's basketball operations to review men's basketball recruitment activities and documentation for the previous and upcoming weeks. Indiana University shall submit a report to the Committee on Infractions by August 1, 2006, detailing our monitoring of rules education sessions for Coach Kelvin Sampson and his staff. The report will also include documentation of Indiana University's compliance with all other penalties adopted and transferred to IU. Furthermore, Indiana University will file a written report with the NCAA not later than August 31, 2007, detailing the implementation and fulfillment of the penalties which were transferred to Coach Sampson upon his employment at Indiana University, as well as those assessed by the committee on May 25, 2006.

2. Reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school through July 31 of the prospect's junior year in high school from one call per month to one call every other month for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

3. Reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after August 1 of the prospect's senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

4. Restrict the number of days which Coach Kelvin Sampson may recruit off-campus to a maximum of 4 during the period of March 29, 2006 through May 25, 2006 (Coach Sampson used 15 of the 19 recruiting-person days he was permitted pursuant to the University of Oklahoma's self-imposed penalties while still employed at the University of Oklahoma).

5. Impose similar base and bonus compensation restrictions on Coach Kelvin Sampson, for the period beginning March 29, 2006 and concluding June 30, 2007.

6. Coach Kelvin Sampson is prohibited, for a period of one year beginning May 25, 2006 through May 24, 2007, from making any phone calls that relate, in any way, to recruiting or being present when members of his staff make such calls.

7. Coach Kelvin Sampson is prohibited, for a period of one year beginning May 25, 2006 through May 24, 2007, from engaging in any off-campus recruiting activities. The prohibition on off-campus recruiting activities shall apply to all off-campus appearances at which prospects may be in attendance, including banquets, booster functions and exceptions provided by Bylaw 13.1.9.

It is understood that any additional sanctions imposed on you or IU by the NCAA and/or the Big Ten Conference will be followed as well.

By signing and dating this memo, all parties agree to abide by the penalties set forth above.

Kelvin Sampson	(date)
Rick Greenspan	(date)
Bruce Jaffee	(date)

Memorandum

To: Coach Kelvin Sampson

From: Rick Greenspan
Bruce Jaffee

Date: April 19, 2006

Re: Compliance Agreement

We agree, in light of the circumstances of which we are aware, that the University of Oklahoma imposed a number of significant penalties on its men's basketball program. Like Oklahoma, Indiana University believes that when violations occur, regardless of the intent, appropriate penalties must follow. Therefore, it is our plan to carry out those penalties that relate directly to you, as well as to place a few additional requirements on your program. Accordingly, the following corrective action will be implemented:

1. The director of compliance will meet, on a weekly basis, with the head coach or the director of men's basketball operations to review men's basketball recruitment activities and documentation for the previous and upcoming weeks. Furthermore, Indiana University will file a written report with the NCAA not later than August 31, 2007, detailing the implementation and fulfillment of the penalties which were transferred to Coach Kelvin Sampson upon his employment at Indiana University.

2. Reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after June 15 of the prospect's sophomore year in high school through July 31 of the prospect's junior year in high school from one call per month to one call every other month for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

3. Reduce the number of permissible calls by the men's basketball coaching staff to prospects on or after August 1 of the prospect's senior year in high school from two calls per week to one call per week for a period commencing March 29, 2006, and concluding June

30, 2007. Exceptions to this penalty will be permitted in accordance with the provisions of NCAA Bylaws 13.1.3.3.2 (Official Visit Exception), 13.1.3.3.3 (Letter of Intent Signing Date Exception) and 13.1.3.3.4 (Telephone Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment).

4. Restrict the number of days which Coach Kelvin Sampson may recruit off-campus to a maximum of 4 during the period of March 29, 2006, through June 30, 2006 (Coach Sampson used 15 of the 19 recruiting-person days he was permitted pursuant to the University of Oklahoma's self-imposed penalties while still employed at the University of Oklahoma).

5. Impose similar base and bonus compensation restrictions on Coach Kelvin Sampson, for the period beginning March 29, 2006, and concluding June 30, 2007.

It is understood that any additional sanctions imposed on you or IU by the NCAA and/or the Big Ten Conference will be followed as well.

By signing and dating this memo, all parties agree to abide by the penalties set forth above.

_____ _____

Kelvin Sampson (date)

_____ _____

Rick Greenspan (date)

_____ _____

Bruce Jaffee (date)

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2006 8:50 PM
To: Senderoff, Robert A.
Subject: RE: Coach Sampson Question

Let me get clarification – b/c my instinct would be that the COI would question why he would be making these calls, but I would hope they would allow him to accept calls from coaches wanting to learn (professional development as opposed to recruiting contacts) from Coach Sampson and how he runs the Indiana offense/defense/practices/etc. I will add this to our list of questions.

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451

From: Senderoff, Robert A.
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2006 8:18 PM
To: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Subject: Coach Sampson Question

Jennifer-

his is something we thought about after our meeting today. Can Coach Sampson call High School coaches about basketball related issues, such as talking about our offense, defense, etc. What is the policy on this? Please let me know.

Rob Senderoff
Indiana University
Men's Basketball, Assistant Coach
O# 812-855-2238

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2006 9:03 PM
To: 'jelworth@ncaa.org'
Subject: Questions

Hi Jim,

Thanks for returning my call. I ended up in meetings from 2 until 6:30, so I wasn't able to get back with you this afternoon. Please let me know if I have the correct email address. I am working on a list of questions or issues that need clarification, but don't want to send them to you until I am sure I have the right email account.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks,

Jennifer

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 12:48 AM
To: Jaffee, Bruce L.
Subject: RE: Sampson Penalties
Attachments: Clarification Letter - Chair of COI 5-31-06.doc

If possible, can you review for revisions/edits before I send it to the NCAA to forward to the Chair? This was the procedure that Jim Elworth at the NCAA indicated in a voice mail he left for me yesterday (Tuesday) afternoon while I was in meetings for 4 ½ hours!

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451

From: Jaffee, Bruce L.
Sent: Sunday, May 28, 2006 6:18 PM
To: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Subject: Sampson Penalties

Jennifer,

read the Infractions Committee report carefully. I have a couple of questions that relate to our monitoring and enforcement:

1. Exactly who can Coach Sampson call? He is restricted from "making any phone calls that relate in any way to recruiting or being present when members of his staff make such calls." The restriction certainly applies to prospects, their coaches, and their parents. I can't think of anyone whom he should be permitted to call that has a relationship to high school, JC, or AAU basketball. Can you? I think it violates the spirit of this restriction if the assistants make a recruiting call and tell the person to call Sampson at some specific time that Sampson has arranged.

2. What off campus appearances are okay? I suspect the Big Ten tip-off lunch is okay, but what about Varsity Club outings, or other places where prospects are not the focus but might attend?

A monitoring and rules education plan is due by August 1. I would be happy to discuss and review anything that you come up with. Needless to say, a regular monitoring to phone records is a must.

Bruce

May 31, 2006

Mr. Thomas E, Yeager
Acting Chair of the NCAA Division I
Committee on Infractions
Colonial Athletic Association

Dear Mr. Yeager,

Our administrative and compliance staffs met with the men's basketball staff yesterday (the first opportunity after Coach Sampson's return from Kuwait on Memorial Day) to discuss the additional penalties and our procedures for implementing those restrictions, as well as monitoring full compliance with all penalties assessed during this process.

We would like to get the committee's input on a number of questions or concerns that have come up during our discussions of the recruiting restrictions placed on our coaching staff as a result of the violations that occurred at Oklahoma. I have tried to number the questions, but there are several that are multi-faceted. As of my last count, I think there were 21 specific questions in the following 12 paragraphs (the highlighted questions in paragraph 1 are the only extremely time-sensitive questions as they involve a previous commitment regarding a speaking engagement scheduled for this weekend):

1. We would like clarification regarding the prohibition on outside speaking engagements. Specifically, what is the institution's obligation to monitor attendance at the few speaking engagements Coach Sampson may make during the next year on behalf of our institution?

   For example, Coach Sampson was previously scheduled to speak at a local black tie fundraiser for the American Heart Association this weekend. What happens if an attendee brings his or her son or daughter in place of a business associate who cancels at the last minute?

   Is the intent of this restriction aimed at recruiting only? If so, is it possible to look at the target audience and then not hold Coach Sampson or the institution responsible if there happen to be a few prospect-aged individuals in the audience (using perhaps a reasonable person standard for determining in advance who the target audience is)?

   What about at our IU booster/donor events? We typically schedule the majority of these in the summer – around golf outings – they are aimed at the boosters/donors, but what happens if they bring along their children or grandchildren?

2. Coach Sampson has a long-standing speaking engagement at the 20 year reunion of the movie "Hoosiers" which is taking place in Knightstown, Indiana, where much of the movie was filmed. Is it okay for him to fulfill his obligation even though this event is open to the public and there may be prospect-aged individuals in the audience?

3. What about his local radio show during the season – it is broadcast from a local restaurant and he does take questions from the audience (actually, the host, Don Fisher, acts as the moderator and he is the one who takes the calls/questions)?

   What happens if prospect-aged individuals are eating at the restaurant during the show?

4. What happens if there are prospect-aged females in attendance at a speaking engagement?

5. It doesn't appear that the COI limited the number of IU coaches who could be on the road at any one time except for the fact that Coach Sampson can not be out at all. Is this an accurate statement?

6. Exactly who can Coach Sampson call? He is restricted from "making any phone calls that relate in any way to recruiting or being present when members of his staff make such calls." The restriction certainly applies to prospects, their coaches, and their parents. We can't think of anyone whom he should be permitted to call that has a relationship to high school, JC, or AAU basketball. Is our interpretation too restrictive? Does it violate the spirit of the penalties if the assistants make a recruiting call and tell the person to call Sampson at some specific time that Sampson has arranged?

7. Can Coach Sampson text message a recruit and type: "Call me at 1-800-IUBBALL" (or whatever his phone number is)?

8. If an AAU or HS coach calls one of the IU assistant coaches and then adds a prospect in on a 3-way call, can the assistant coach add in Coach Sampson at that time (since the original call was initiated by the AAU or HS coach and not by anyone at IU)?

9. Once a prospect signs an NLI with IU, is it possible for Coach Sampson to call him and to have off-campus contact with him (can he make a home visit to a current signee)?

10. What happens if Coach Sampson receives a call from a prospect (or coach or parent), but loses the connection (common problem with cell phones)? Can he call back or must he wait for the prospect (or coach or parent) to call him back?

11. Can Coach Sampson call high school and/or AAU coaches about basketball related issues, such as talking about our offense, defense, etc.?

12. If the institution determines we will not be appealing or contesting any findings made by the committee, do we need to notify you of that decision or is notification only necessary if we did decide to appeal or contest any findings?

Thank you for allowing us to seek clarification of these issues as we strive to follow the letter and intent of both the assessed and self-imposed penalties.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director – Compliance
Indiana University

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 3:20 PM
To: 'jelworth@ncaa.org'
Subject: Questions for the COI
Attachments: Clarification Letter - Chair of COI 5-31-06.doc

Hi Jim,

Could you please forward the attached list of questions to Mr. Yeager? The first question deals with a pre-existing speaking engagement that is scheduled for tomorrow evening. So, if possible, we would like to know how to proceed (what we need to tell the event organizers). With Coach Sampson's goodwill trip to Kuwait and the holiday weekend, this has quickly become (unfortunately) an urgent matter. The rest of the questions (and there are many!) are not as urgent, but we hope to have a response to #1 as soon as possible.

Thanks,

Jennifer

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451

May 31, 2006

Mr. Thomas E, Yeager
Acting Chair of the NCAA Division I
Committee on Infractions
Colonial Athletic Association

Dear Mr. Yeager,

Our administrative and compliance staffs met with the men's basketball staff yesterday (the first opportunity after Coach Sampson's return on Memorial Day from a 10 day trip to Kuwait) to discuss the additional penalties and our procedures for implementing those restrictions, as well as monitoring full compliance with all penalties assessed during this process.

We would like to get the committee's input on a number of questions or concerns that have come up during our discussions of the recruiting restrictions placed on our coaching staff as a result of the violations that occurred at Oklahoma. I have tried to number the questions, but there are several that are multi-faceted. As of my last count, I think there were 21 specific questions in the following 12 paragraphs (the highlighted questions in paragraph 1 are the only extremely time-sensitive questions as they involve a previous commitment regarding a speaking engagement scheduled for this weekend):

1. We would like clarification regarding the prohibition on outside speaking engagements. Specifically, what is the institution's obligation to monitor attendance at the few speaking engagements Coach Sampson may make during the next year on behalf of our institution?

   For example, Coach Sampson was previously scheduled to speak at a local black tie fundraiser for the American Heart Association this weekend. What happens if an attendee brings his or her son or daughter in place of a business associate who cancels at the last minute?

   Is the intent of this restriction aimed at recruiting only? If so, is it possible to look at the target audience and then not hold Coach Sampson or the institution responsible if there happen to be a few prospect-aged individuals in the audience (using perhaps a reasonable person standard for determining in advance who the target audience is)?

   What about at our IU booster/donor events? We typically schedule the majority of these in the summer – around golf outings – they are aimed at the boosters/donors, but what happens if they bring along their children or grandchildren?

2. Coach Sampson has a long-standing speaking engagement at the 20 year reunion of the movie "Hoosiers" which is taking place in Knightstown, Indiana, where much of the movie was filmed. Is it okay for him to fulfill his obligation even though this event is open to the public and there may be prospect-aged individuals in the audience?

3. What about his local radio show during the season – it is broadcast from a local restaurant and he does take questions from the audience (actually, the host, Don Fisher, acts as the moderator and he is the one who takes the calls/questions)?

   What happens if prospect-aged individuals are eating at the restaurant during the show?

4. What happens if there are prospect-aged females in attendance at a speaking engagement?

5. It doesn't appear that the COI limited the number of IU coaches who could be on the road at any one time except for the fact that Coach Sampson can not be out at all. Is this an accurate statement?

6. Exactly who can Coach Sampson call? He is restricted from "making any phone calls that relate in any way to recruiting or being present when members of his staff make such calls." The restriction certainly applies to prospects, their coaches, and their parents. We can't think of anyone whom he should be permitted to call that has a relationship to high school, JC, or AAU basketball. Is our interpretation too restrictive? Does it violate the spirit of the penalties if the assistants make a recruiting call and tell the person to call Sampson at some specific time that Sampson has arranged?

7. Can Coach Sampson text message a recruit and type: "Call me at 1-800-IUBBALL" (or whatever his phone number is)?

8. If an AAU or HS coach calls one of the IU assistant coaches and then adds a prospect in on a 3-way call, can the assistant coach add in Coach Sampson at that time (since the original call was initiated by the AAU or HS coach and not by anyone at IU)?

9. Once a prospect signs an NLI with IU, is it possible for Coach Sampson to call him and to have off-campus contact with him (can he make a home visit to a current NLI signee)?

10. What happens if Coach Sampson receives a call from a prospect (or coach or parent), but loses the connection (common problem with cell phones)? Can he call back or must he wait for the prospect (or coach or parent) to call him back?

11. Can Coach Sampson call high school and/or AAU coaches about basketball related issues, such as talking about our offense, defense, etc.?

12. If the institution determines we will not be appealing or contesting any findings made by the committee, do we need to notify you of that decision or is notification only necessary if we did decide to appeal or contest any findings?

Thank you for allowing us to seek clarification of these issues as we strive to follow the letter and intent of both the assessed and self-imposed penalties. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director – Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451 (O)
812-327-0071 (C)
812-856-5155 (F)
jhooker@indiana.edu

Brinegar, Jennifer Hooker

From: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 5:53 PM
To: Greenspan, Richard I
Subject: FW: Questions for the COI
Importance: High

Rick,

Jim Elworth says that the COI may want to address our list as a whole (rather than just the chair), so it may take a while to get their response to our questions. So, he suggests that if there's any chance that a prospect might be present at the American Heart Association event, he should cancel his appearance.

I have to leave, but you can reach me on my cell phone, if necessary: 327-0071.

Please let me know if you would like to tell Coach Sampson or if you prefer that I do it.

Thanks,

Jennifer

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451

From: Elworth, Jim [mailto:jelworth@ncaa.org]
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 3:28 PM
To: Brinegar, Jennifer L
Cc: Cooper, Shep; Tom Yeager
Subject: RE: Questions for the COI

Jennifer,

I am forwarding your questions to acting chair Yeager right now. He may want me to get input from the full committee which might take awhile. In the meantime, my suggestion (and please note that I am not the authority) is to plan on Coach Sampson cancelling his appearance if that appearance would violate the committee's directive. The order is in effect as of the release of the report and for him to make such an appearance, whether previously scheduled or not, may well run him afoul of the committee's sanction. As for what to tell the event organizer, that is up to you guys.

Again, I am sending this on right now and will get back to you as soon as I get something in return.

Jim Elworth

-----Original Message-----
From: Brinegar, Jennifer L [mailto:jhooker@indiana.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 3:20 PM
To: Elworth, Jim
Subject: Questions for the COI

Hi Jim,

Could you please forward the attached list of questions to Mr. Yeager? The first question deals with a pre-existing speaking engagement that is scheduled for tomorrow evening. So, if possible, we would like to know how to proceed (what we need to tell the event organizers). With Coach Sampson's goodwill trip to Kuwait and the holiday weekend, this has quickly become (unfortunately) an urgent matter. The rest of the questions (and there are many!) are not as urgent; but we hope to have a response to #1 as soon as possible.

Thanks,

Jennifer

Jennifer Brinegar
Assistant Athletics Director - Compliance
Indiana University
812-855-0451