

EMBARGOED UNTIL 2 PM, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- I. Introduction
- II. Factual Findings on Academic Misconduct
- III. Factual Findings on Extra Benefits and Recruiting
- IV. Factual Findings on Interference with the University's Investigation
- V. Factual Findings on Institutional Control and Monitoring
- VI. Miscellaneous Violations and Allegations Involving Other Sports

I. Introduction

On March 24, 1999, University of Minnesota President Mark G. Yudof announced the appointment of outside counsel to investigate "recent public allegations of academic misconduct and benefits violations" involving the Men's Basketball program. Previously, on March 11, 1999, University officials reported to the NCAA that serious allegations relating to academic misconduct had been made against the University Men's Basketball Program, and that four members of the team would be withheld from playing in the NCAA Tournament.

Outside counsel's charge was to conduct an impartial, thorough investigation and prepare a factual report for the President detailing what we discovered. Over the past seven months our team has interviewed over 150 individuals (many on multiple occasions), including University

officers and central administration staff, Men's Intercollegiate Athletics Department (MICA) administrative and coaching staff, former and current student-athletes, and many non-University individuals. We reviewed electronic and hard copy documentation, including over 55,000 documents.

It is important to note that some important witnesses refused to cooperate in our investigation. Chief among them was Alonzo Newby, an academic counselor for Men's Basketball from 1992 until he was terminated for cause in June 1999. Several former basketball student-athletes either declined interview requests, or failed to respond to such requests. Additionally, there were significant and direct conflicts in testimony by key witnesses, suggesting that at least some of them were not truthful in their answers. Notwithstanding these serious obstacles, we believe this report provides a solid factual foundation for the University to proceed to remedy this very unfortunate situation, and pursue the Regents' goal of "amateur athletic excellence within the University's educational framework."

We conclude that between 1993 and 1998 there was systematic, widespread academic misconduct in the Men's Basketball program. The misconduct involved routine writing of assignments, papers and exams for at least 18 men's basketball student-athletes, and repeated manipulation of the University's academic policies and procedures to secure basketball student-athletes' eligibility to compete without regard to academic interests. During each season between 1994-95 and 1998-99, the University's Men's Basketball team competed with at least one student-athlete who received improper academic assistance, and who thus was ineligible.

A relatively small number of University employees (including Academic Counselor Alonzo Newby and Academic Counseling Office Manager Jan Gangelhoff) and several student-athletes deliberately and knowingly engaged in this academic fraud. We also conclude that Basketball Head Coach Clem Haskins knew that Newby and Gangelhoff were involved in helping prepare student-athletes' course work in violation of basic academic integrity standards. Other faculty and staff at a minimum abetted an ongoing climate of academic misconduct, and in several instances actually were aware that improper academic assistance was being provided to basketball student-athletes.

The investigation also revealed that Coach Haskins gave cash (sometimes in amounts as high as the \$200 range) directly to three basketball student-athletes in violation of NCAA rules. Coach Haskins also made a standing arrangement for a hotel lodging discount for parents of student-athletes, despite the fact that he had been cited for a similar violation at Western Kentucky University. We also discovered some secondary recruiting violations and other instances of impermissible benefits which violate NCAA rules.

In addition, Coach Haskins and Alonzo Newby interfered with the University's efforts to discover the truth about these matters by themselves not being truthful with University investigators when this matter first arose, and, in the case of Coach Haskins, by instructing student-athletes to mislead the University's attorneys when questioned about their academic conduct immediately prior to the 1999 NCAA Men's Basketball Tournament.

Finally, we conclude that there was an institutional failure in control and monitoring of the Men's Basketball Program. The *Board of Regents' Policy on Intercollegiate Athletics Philosophy: Twin Cities Campus* (Regents' Policy) provides that maintenance of appropriate academic standards and student-athletes' academic work must take precedence over athletic competition. It also requires that "[t]he academic support program that serves the student-athletes will be independent from the athletic departments and part of academic affairs." Both the letter and spirit of these requirements were violated. In various instances, MICA, the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA), the MICA Faculty Athletics Representative and the Office of the Vice President for Student Development and Athletics failed effectively to administer and supervise the Men's Basketball Program to meet these requirements, and more generally, to meet the Board of Regents' "commitment to the well-being of the individual student participant, to academic standards, and to the integrity of the University itself...."

The failure of institutional control manifested itself in five particular areas: (A) failure to assure the independence of the academic support program from control by the Basketball Head Coach; (B) failure adequately to manage and resolve operational conflicts; (C) failure adequately to supervise the performance of those providing academic support services to men's basketball student-athletes; (D) failure to adhere to Board of Regents' Policies and the NCAA Principle of Sound Academic Standards; and (E) failure to adequately monitor rules compliance and investigate allegations of rules violations in the Men's Basketball program, including academic counseling.

II. Factual Findings on Academic Misconduct

The Regents' Policy establishes academic standards, student-athlete responsibility, and institutional integrity and responsibility as follows:

Subd. 4. Academic Standards. Students who participate in intercollegiate competition must meet all appropriate academic standards for admission to the University and for continued progress after beginning an academic program. A student's academic work takes precedence over athletic activity. The University will not allow participation in intercollegiate athletics to interfere unreasonably with a student's academic program or progress towards a degree. A student may not participate in intercollegiate athletics unless the student is making continuously responsible progress towards obtaining a degree. The goal of the University is to have student-athletes graduating at a rate that is better than that of non-athletes at the University of Minnesota.

Subd. 5. Student-Athlete Responsibility. Student participants in intercollegiate athletics carry a special responsibility as representatives of the University. For the privilege of participating in intercollegiate athletics and, in many cases, receiving athletic grants-in-aid, the University expects its student-athletes to adhere to team and departmental rules and to reflect exemplary standards of academic and personal behavior, including those principles of sports-like conduct applicable to all Big Ten institutions.

Subd. 8. Institutional Integrity and Responsibility. The University will operate its intercollegiate athletics programs in conformance with its own institutional rules as well as the rules of the NCAA, the Big Ten conference, the WCHA, and other appropriate governing bodies. [Emphasis added.]

NCAA Constitution 2.5 (The Principle of Sound Academic Standards) provides that:

Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be maintained as a vital component of the educational program, and student-athlete shall be an integral part of the student body. The admission, academic standing and academic progress of student-athletes shall be consistent with the policies and standards adopted by the institution for the student body in general.

In addition, NCAA Bylaw 10.1-(b) (Unethical Conduct) provides that unethical behavior by institutional staff includes "knowing involvement in arranging for fraudulent academic credit or false transcripts for a prospective or an enrolled student-athlete."

Our investigation found that between 1993 and 1998 Jan Gangelhoff helped prepare over 400 separate assignments, papers, exams, and similar documents for basketball student-athletes. The papers were generated on a fairly consistent basis throughout her employment at the academic counseling office. Approximately one-third of the papers were produced by Gangelhoff while she was under the direct supervision of Elayne Donahue. Gangelhoff worked on the computer files at all times of the day; significantly, 38 percent of the files showed work between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, presumably when she was at work and in plain view of others in the office. Our analysis also showed that, on several occasions, Gangelhoff copied papers submitted by one student-athlete in one course for use by another student-athlete in another course, or for use by another student taking the same course in a subsequent quarter.

It was difficult to conclude with certainty the level of Gangelhoff's involvement with respect to each student-athlete or each specific item of course work. Gangelhoff initially told the investigators that the extent of her contribution with the course work varied with each student-athlete, ranging from simple typing to complete preparation of substantive content. In a later statement, she suggested that she performed most of the work for the student-athletes she assisted. In any event, it was clear that for several student-athletes, Gangelhoff's involvement

was so substantive and extensive that it suggested that the student-athletes would not have completed their course work and remained eligible to compete but for Gangelhoff's work.

Gangelhoff has denied that anyone instructed her to provide improper academic assistance to basketball student-athletes. Nor has anyone else alleged that other individuals specifically instructed Gangelhoff to provide such assistance. Nevertheless, there is compelling circumstantial evidence showing that others, specifically including Newby and Coach Haskins, either encouraged or permitted Gangelhoff to provide such assistance without any appropriate controls or supervision. It is also abundantly clear that Elayne Donahue, Director of Academic Counseling, failed to properly supervise or control Gangelhoff's activities while she reported to her. Throughout the relevant period, Donahue was in virtually daily contact with Gangelhoff, had ample opportunity to inquire of her activities, and become aware of her inappropriate involvement with basketball student-athletes.

Beside Gangelhoff, there were allegations that other former University employees also improperly produced course work for student-athletes. However, with the exception of Jeanne Payer (Gangelhoff's sister), these other allegations were unsubstantiated.

To be sure, Coach Haskins has vehemently denied that he authorized, or had knowledge of, Gangelhoff's improper academic activities. Given Gangelhoff's long record of deliberate, serious misconduct, we place little reliance upon her own speculations concerning others' knowledge of her activities. We stress that our findings on this question (and on others in this report) have not

been tested in any administrative or judicial forum, and the outcome of such an adjudication necessarily is unknown. Nevertheless, we believe circumstantial evidence is sufficiently compelling to indicate that Haskins knew that both Gangelhoff and Newby were involved in helping prepare student-athletes' course work in violation of basic academic integrity standards.

This conclusion is compelled by a variety of circumstances that are highly probative of Haskins' actual knowledge:

- Gangelhoff's longstanding high visibility in the men's basketball "family";
- the magnitude of the course work Gangelhoff prepared over a four-year period;
- Coach Haskins' personal contact with Gangelhoff, such as an October 1995 letter of recommendation, hospitality, and travel, including her November 1995 trip to Hawaii with the team which Haskins paid for with personal funds, for the purpose of helping student-athletes with their course work;
- a June 1998 payment of \$3,000 to Gangelhoff for tutoring a student-athlete outside the University's approved tutoring program; the only reasonable source of the \$3,000 was Coach Haskins;
- Coach Haskins' close supervision and control of Newby, whose relationship with Gangelhoff was a catalyst for her inappropriate behavior;
- most importantly, Coach Haskins' instruction to at least two student-athletes to provide misleading information to University attorneys and the Athletics Compliance Director when questioned regarding their contacts with Gangelhoff.

In addition to Gangelhoff's improper academic assistance, there were numerous instances in which Coach Haskins, Alonzo Newby, and other staff and faculty manipulated University academic policies and procedures in order to preserve basketball student-athletes' eligibility to compete. Many of these instances also violated NCAA rules that bar student-athletes from receiving any "extra benefit", defined as any special arrangement by an institution's employee or representative which is not authorized by NCAA rules and not generally available to all students at the institution. For example:

- In fall quarter 1995, at Newby's request, a professor permitted a student-athlete to submit a term paper to make up points he needed to pass the course. The professor accepted the paper and awarded the student-athlete a "B" in the course, even though he suspected that the paper was not the student-athlete's own work. We determined that the paper was written by Gangelhoff.
- In fall quarter 1997, Newby arranged for a General College advisor to process a late change in the grade-base for a student-athlete enrolled in a science course, allowing the student-athlete to be graded on a "satisfactory/non-satisfactory" basis instead of an "A" to "F" letter grade. Newby also manipulated the registrar staff into processing a second grade-base change for a second writing course in which the student-athlete was enrolled, even though the deadline had passed and the required approvals had not been secured from the course instructor or the General College administrator.

- In March 1997, when a student-athlete failed to take a final examination in a Kinesiology course, the instructor permitted the student-athlete to receive an "I" so as not to jeopardize his eligibility to compete in the upcoming NCAA tournament.

III. Factual Findings on Extra Benefits and Recruiting

NCAA rules, incorporated by reference in the Regents' Policy, prohibit specific arrangements and benefits for student-athletes that are not available to the student body in general. Three basketball student-athletes reported that, on one or more occasions, they received cash from Coach Haskins in individual amounts ranging as high as \$200. The student-athletes' statements are consistent with each other, and with two third-party witnesses, each of whom stated that he/she had seen a student-athlete with cash supplied moments earlier by either Haskins or an assistant coach. Although the evidence as to a specific receipt of cash is sometimes conflicting, and Coach Haskins and each assistant coach have denied ever making any improper cash payments to students, the cumulative nature of the student-athletes' accounts, corroborated by third parties, supports our conclusion that improper cash payments were made to student-athletes by Coach Haskins.

We also found instances in which both Gangelhoff and Coach Haskins provided other improper extra benefits to basketball student-athletes.

Finally, our investigation found a handful of activities which constituted secondary violations of the NCAA's recruiting rules during the 1995-96 period:

- During late summer 1995, Newby arranged for Gangelhoff to tutor a prospective basketball student-athlete in two independent study courses to enable the student-athlete to fulfill his junior college transfer requirements.
- During the summer of 1996, the coaching staff arranged for another prospective basketball student-athlete to reside at no cost in the dormitory room or home of student-athletes. A friend of the same prospective student-athlete received a small basketball as a memento from Haskins.
- During the 1995-96 school year, Haskins entertained a third prospective basketball student-athlete with dinner at his home. In the spring of 1996, Haskins assisted the same prospective student-athlete in obtaining a summer job at a local restaurant owned by a Gopher booster.

IV. Factual Findings on Interference with the University's Investigation

Prior to interviews conducted by attorneys in the University's Office of the General Counsel and with the Director of Athletics Compliance, Coach Haskins met in Seattle with at least two of the four student-athletes who had eligibility remaining and instructed them not to report the extent of Gangelhoff's involvement in the preparation of their academic course work.

In addition, the decisions of Gangelhoff, Payer, Donahue and their mutual legal counsel, James Lord, to immediately report to Twin Cities news media the topics discussed during each of their interviews may in some instances have influenced testimony and/or "chilled" witnesses whose cooperation was being sought. Further, on April 19, 1999, Donahue and Lord released private student records to Twin Cities news media in clear violation of the students' privacy rights. Finally, because Lord represented both Gangelhoff and Donahue, whose interests often were in conflict (Gangelhoff was a primary wrongdoer in the academic fraud matters and Donahue was her supervisor), the investigators were unable to question one on a subject that involved the other without also advising the other through her attorney of the issue.

V. Factual Findings on Institutional Control and Monitoring

The Board of Regents' Policy declares that "*[t]he educational values, practices, and mission* of the University of Minnesota determine the standards by which the intercollegiate athletics

programs are conducted." Subd. 10 (emphasis added). The Regents' Policy further states, in relevant part:

All aspects of the programs will be administered by central administration, the athletic directors, and the coaches, with direct oversight and involvement by the faculty representatives through the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. The academic support program that serves the student-athletes will be independent from the athletic departments and part of academic affairs [Subd. 10]

The Assembly Committee for Intercollegiate Athletics shall exercise faculty control, in consort with the administration and the NCAA and conference faculty representatives, to ensure that the above operating principles are carried out. [Subd. 13]

The Twin Cities Faculty Assembly Bylaws specifically assigns to the ACIA responsibility:

To conduct on a team-by-team basis, an in-depth, annual review of the academic progress and performance of all Twin Cities campus student-athletes participating in intercollegiate athletics

NCAA rules and case decisions require the University to monitor its intercollegiate athletics programs to assure compliance with NCAA legislation, and require reporting to the NCAA of any instances in which the University has failed to comply with that legislation. In July 1988 the University established a position of NCAA Compliance Coordinator, and promulgated a "Mission in Compliance" that affirmed that the University "places great emphasis on compliance with NCAA and Big Ten conference rules." The position description for the Compliance Coordinator position (now director of Athletics Compliance) includes responsibility for the

coordination of procedures for responding to rule violations. The duties specifically include: "Investigating alleged violations," and assisting in reporting violations.

The current Athletics Compliance Manual contains the principle that "all coaches, administrators, athletes, or institutional representatives shall be required to report any violation of NCAA or Big Ten rules of which they are aware. Failure to report such violations shall be deemed as serious as if the violation had been committed by the person failing to report."

A "Rules Violations Reporting Policy" also was developed in November 1989 and currently appears in the Men's Intercollegiate Athletics Department Policies and Procedures Manual. It calls for a "prompt institutional response when rule violations occur." It anticipates that the response will include correcting the situation that led to the problem. The policy states, "It is further our position that no violation is so minor that it need not be reported to someone." Primary goals of encouraging communication, seeking consistency and accountability, and "above all," sending a "strong message that the University of Minnesota is serious about rule(s) compliance" are set forth in the policy.

Notwithstanding the above policies and procedures, our investigation revealed a failure of institutional control and monitoring of the Men's Basketball program. This breakdown manifested itself in five particular areas:

- A. There was a failure to assure the independence of the academic support program from control by the Basketball Head Coach.

- B. There was a failure adequately to manage and resolve operational conflicts.

- C. There was a failure adequately to supervise the performance of those providing academic support services to men's basketball students-athletes.

- D. There was a failure to adhere to Board of Regents' Policies and the NCAA Principle of Sound Academic Standards.

- E. There was a failure adequately to monitor rules compliance and investigate allegations of rules violations in the Men's Basketball program, including academic counseling.

Overall, these failures reflected a broader problem: some administrators and faculty treated the Men's Basketball program as "untouchable." The Men's Basketball program's many on-court successes, culminating in the team's 1997 NCAA Final Four appearance, caused Coach Haskins' personal control over the Program to grow virtually unchallenged. His on-court victories, prominent media and political contacts, and assertive approach to resolving issues affecting "his" players, made University administrators and faculty reluctant to directly address him about academic problems in the Men's Basketball program.

- A. The failure to control the "power coach" led to the surrender of the independence of academic counseling (for Men's Basketball student-athletes), which Board of Regents' policy required to be separated from the administration of the Men's Intercollegiate Athletics Department and created the environment in which the academic misconduct in this case took place and escaped detection.

From the time he arrived at the University, Clem Haskins sought absolute control over the Men's Basketball program. Central administration allowed Haskins' control over everything associated with his program to expand and intensify until it essentially was absolute. Directors of men's athletics either failed to seriously challenge his control or were unsuccessful when they attempted to do so. Their lack of success was due at least in part to a lack of substantive support of their efforts from the central administration. At no time was there effective action to diffuse Haskins' absolute control and to open the program to effective monitoring and management.

Haskins involved himself in and managed virtually all aspects of the lives of his student-athletes, including their academic programs. He insisted on control over and absolute loyalty from the academic advisor assigned to men's basketball. He created an atmosphere in which any shortcomings in the Men's Basketball program (including academic failures of and misconduct by student-athletes) were not to be shared "outside the family."

In 1995, then-President Nils Hasselmo restructured the University's upper-level administration, establishing the position of vice-president for student development and athletics. The restructuring resulted in the men's and women's athletics programs, the athletics academic counseling office, and the athletics compliance office all reporting to a new vice president who

was the immediate past director of men's athletics. This contradicted the plan Hasselmo developed and implemented earlier in his presidency in response to the 1988 and 1991 NCAA infractions cases. The restructuring occurred despite prior conflicts between the head of the athletics academic counseling office, Elayne Donahue, and the new vice-president, McKinley Boston, and created the risk that disputes between the men's athletics department and Donahue's office would be resolved with a bias toward the interests of men's athletics.

Haskins' absolute control, which manifested itself in part through his assertive and combative approach to resolving issues concerning his program and the student-athletes participating in it, intimidated many in the University community. As a result and in the absence of an institutional policy or a mandate from a supervisor restricting interaction by Haskins and his assistants with members of the University faculty, members of the men's basketball academic support and coaching staff frequently contacted faculty, some of whom were susceptible to intimidation and pressure, and obtained special academic accommodations for student-athletes.

In the end, it was this absolute control that created the environment in which the massive academic misconduct described in this report could take place and could escape detection by those outside the program.

- B. The failure to manage and resolve operational conflicts resulted in men's basketball student-athletes being deprived of important academic support services.

Early in the time that Elayne Donahue and Clem Haskins were brought together at the University, it became apparent to their direct supervisors and to the central administration that there were significant personal, philosophical and control conflicts between the two.

The position of academic counselor for men's basketball, which eventually was filled by Alonzo Newby, served as the focal point of the conflict between them. Donahue was strict in her adherence to a model of academic counselors which emphasized self-action and independence for student-athletes. Haskins sought to redefine the counselor's position to provide the kind of overall counseling and student development services that he thought was important for the men's basketball student-athletes, many of whom were academically "at-risk."

By 1994, no effective action had been taken to resolve the conflict between Donahue and Haskins. Rather than find a resolution to the conflict over the academic counselor or to make a determination that Haskins or Donahue or both could not continue, central administration and the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics allowed the faculty men's athletics representative and the director of men's athletics to address the personnel conflict related to Newby's position by devising a "stand-alone" academic counseling approach for men's basketball. In October 1994, Newby was reassigned from the athletics counseling office to the supervision of the Men's Athletics Department. The new approach in reality was accountable

only to Haskins and directly contradicted the independent academic counseling structure explicitly mandated by the Board of Regents.

As a result, many men's basketball student-athletes were deprived of any chance that their academic counseling would be guided by true academic pursuit interests. Instead they received counseling guided by the concept of eligibility maintenance.

- C. The failure to adequately supervise Newby and Gangelhoff wasted an opportunity to detect the academic misconduct and manipulation of academic policies that were being committed by Gangelhoff and Newby.

Alonzo Newby's job performance was questioned throughout the time of his employment, but neither of his direct supervisors (Elayne Donahue and Rufus Simmons) or their superiors required adherence to a personnel evaluation and monitoring system that effectively managed and controlled his performance. Closer supervision could have led to earlier detection of the violations that occurred during his employment, including those arising from his relationship with Jan Gangelhoff.

Jan Gangelhoff engaged in most of the course work she did for and with men's basketball student-athletes during the time period of her employment in the athletics academic counseling office. Senior academic counselors noticed and reported to her supervisor, Donahue, several instances of suspicious activity between Gangelhoff and men's basketball student-athletes. Nonetheless, Donahue failed to act in any effective manner to manage Gangelhoff. Had Donahue exerted more control over Gangelhoff's work-day activities and monitored her over-

involvement with the Men's Basketball program, there likely would have been an earlier detection of the violations in which she was involved.

- D. The failure to adhere to the Board of Regents' Policies and the NCAA Principle of Sound Academic Standards severely compromised the integrity of the University's academic mission, resulting in the subordination of academic goals to athletic success and encouraging the manipulation of academic process to maintain eligibility to compete.

Throughout his coaching tenure at the University, Clem Haskins, with the tacit acceptance of both central administration and the Men's Athletics Department, recruited many academically under-prepared student-athletes who had little prospect of successfully completing a degree-granting program. Many of these student-athletes encountered difficulties in satisfactorily completing courses and needed additional academic support if they were to progress and earn degrees.

Regular academic reviews by the ACIA identified the academic deficiencies of these student-athletes in the Men's Basketball program. However, the ACIA did not direct its concerns to the president or central administration or insist on adequate corrective measures.

Haskins, the men's athletics administration, the ACIA and the central administration did not ensure that the men's basketball student-athletes received the academic counseling needed or that the basketball coaching staff would alter its recruiting approach to focus on more academically prepared student-athletes. Instead, Newby directed student-athletes to courses that would facilitate their eligibility rather than their progress toward degrees. In addition, waivers of

academic policies and procedures were obtained and grades were influenced, all for the purpose of maintaining athletics eligibility.

The ACIA routinely approved waivers of the University's 2.0 g.p.a. eligibility standards to allow student-athletes to continue to compete and remain eligible under less stringent NCAA and Big Ten Conference eligibility rules.

- E. The failure to adequately monitor rules compliance and investigate allegations of rule violations wasted yet other opportunities to prevent and detect many of the violations that occurred.

The University had in place adequate policies and procedures to evaluate and monitor compliance with governing NCAA and Conference regulations.

Despite concerns about Newby's job performance, Ganglehoff's interaction with the Men's Basketball program, and numerous indications of questionable academic work being submitted by basketball student-athletes or possible manipulation of academic policies by Newby, neither the athletics compliance office, the academic counseling office nor the men's athletics administration undertook a comprehensive review of the Men's Basketball program.

Investigation into some of the specific allegations made concerning the Men's Basketball program were inadequate. Denials of improper activity by those allegedly involved in the activity were accepted without a thorough investigation. Some information that appeared to directly contradict what involved student-athletes reported was not pursued.

More comprehensive monitoring of the activities of coaches, student-athletes and others involved in the Men's Basketball program and more aggressive inquiry into and "common-sense" analysis of the allegations raised concerning the program could have led to earlier detection of the violations and could have permitted the institution to intervene and stop them.

VI. Miscellaneous Violations and Allegations Involving Other Sports

A. Requirements for residence in Wilkins Hall for student-athletes.

A policy formulated by the University's housing department, in consultation with the men's and women's athletics departments, allowed student-athletes with less than 90 credits to reside in Wilkins under the reserved space policy. The policy also stated that student-athletes with at least 72 credits (the Big Ten and NCAA minimum for attaining junior credit status) would be automatically assigned to Wilkins, but this provision only applied to student-athletes. However, non-athlete students with less than 90 credits were required to petition the Housing Office for an exception to the policy. Student-athletes with less than 72 credits also were able to obtain residence in Wilkins with an appropriate waiver signed by the Vice President for Student Development and Athletics.

The investigation revealed that non-athlete students, albeit minimally, were granted exceptions and resided in Wilkins since the facility was opened. It is not clear how NCAA rules apply in this circumstance. We therefore recommend that the University seek a review of this issue by the NCAA.

B. The investigation revealed few other violations of NCAA extra-benefit rules.

- During the course of the investigation into the Men's Basketball program, we discovered the following violations involving other sports:
- In September 1996, Student Judicial Affairs released a "hold" on the registration of a football student-athlete to enable him to compete in a game.
- In December 1997, a grade-base change was authorized for a men's ice hockey student-athlete in part because of eligibility considerations.
- An education specialist typed an academic paper for a football student-athlete during the 1997-98 academic year.